

3A.13 POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING - LAND

3A.13.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

POPULATION

Sacramento County

The following population data for Sacramento County (County) was obtained from the adopted Sacramento County General Plan Housing Element (2008). Population data in the Housing Element was based on 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census Bureau data, California Department of Finance (DOF) data, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments' (SACOG's) most recent projections released in 2007. From 1990 to 2000, the population of Sacramento County increased from 1,041,219 to 1,223,499, or 17.5% (Sacramento County 2008). The population in the unincorporated area of the County declined by 26% during the same time period with the incorporation of the City of Elk Grove and the City of Rancho Cordova. As of January 1, 2008, the population of Sacramento County was estimated to be 1,424,415 (DOF 2008), an approximately 14.1% increase from 2000.

The Sacramento County General Plan Housing Element projects the County's population growth in the single-digit range for each five-year period between 2000 and 2025. Population growth per five-year period is anticipated to gradually decline, from nearly 9% between 2000 and 2005 to about 3% between 2020 and 2025. Modest population growth is also anticipated in the unincorporated County area. However, much of the projected population growth will occur in developing areas of the County that are now part of Elk Grove and Rancho Cordova. Sacramento County is projected to have a population of 1,695,498 by 2025 (Sacramento County 2008).

City of Folsom

The following population data for the City of Folsom are taken from City of Folsom General Plan Housing Element Background Report, adopted July 14, 2009. The population data in the City's adopted Housing Element is drawn largely from 2000 U.S. Census Bureau data, the DOF, and SACOG. The City's adopted Housing Element (2009) serves a 7.5-year planning period from January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2003. As presented in the City's 2002 Housing Element Background Report, from 1990 to 2000, the population of Folsom increased from 29,802 to 51,884, a 42.6% increase. Folsom's population was anticipated to increase from 51,884 in 2000 to 74,185 in 2010, an average annual growth rate of 3.6%. The City's current Housing Element (2009) estimates the population of Folsom will grow to 69,800 in 2013 and 76,333 in 2015. These population projections show a substantial decline in growth from what occurred between 1990 and 2008. By 2035, population is anticipated to increase to 97,485 persons. These projections do not include Folsom Prison or California State Prison Sacramento population. In addition, these projections do not include population that would be generated by the project.

As of January 1, 2008, the population of the City of Folsom, including the inmate population in Folsom Prison and the California State Prison Sacramento, was estimated to be 72,590 (DOF 2008). After subtracting the 7,284 inmates that the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation counted at Folsom Prison and California State Prison Sacramento in March 2008, the noninstitutionalized population in Folsom is estimated at 65,306 as of 2008.

Approximately 10% of Folsom's population is located in group quarters, which consists mainly of Folsom Prison, California State Prison Sacramento, and other facilities such as nursing care facilities. Per the adopted Housing Element (2009), the total group quarters population in Folsom increased only slightly from 6,720 in 1990 to 6,944 in 2000. The Folsom Prison population was 6,740 as of June 2001 (City of Folsom 2002). The total group quarters population in the City increased slightly from 6,944 in 2000 to 6,852 in 2007. Data from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation shows that the population at Folsom Prison and California State Prison Sacramento has increased from 6,523 inmates in March 2002 to 7,284 inmates in March 2008. The

estimated number of inmates in 2008 exceeds the 2007 DOF estimate of group quarters population by approximately 400 (City of Folsom 2009).

El Dorado Hills

El Dorado Hills is a census designated place (CDP) within unincorporated El Dorado County. El Dorado Hills is the most rapidly developing region of El Dorado County. This area is dominated by high-end housing that serves primarily residents commuting to the Sacramento region (El Dorado County 2003:5-1.7). From 1990 to 2000, the population of El Dorado Hills increased from 18,016 to 32,436, or 44.5% (U.S. Census 2000, 2007).

EMPLOYMENT

Employment growth is one of the primary determinants of housing demand. Working-age individuals often choose a place to live based on employment prospects in the local area. Therefore, employment trends are an important indicator of housing demand. The rate of employment growth, and the types of jobs most likely to be created, would determine how much housing would be needed by type and cost. For example, an economy based on seasonal tourism will generate different housing needs for workers than an economy based on government, education, research, and technology. The following discussions provide the historical, current, and future employment conditions for Sacramento County, Folsom, and El Dorado Hills. The anticipated trend in the jobs/housing index is provided in Chapter 4, "Other Statutory Requirements."

Sacramento County

The following summarizes employment trends in Sacramento County in the last 10 years (Sacramento County 2008:5-12).

- ▶ The Sacramento County economy diversified, with decreasing reliance on government employment on the long-term.
- ▶ Significant job growth occurred among companies that serve markets beyond Sacramento County.
- ▶ New jobs included higher-paying professional jobs and lower-paying service and retail jobs. However, three-fourths of new jobs in occupations with the greatest anticipated job growth will pay salaries below the Sacramento County median income.
- ▶ Most employment growth was centered within incorporated areas of the County. However, there will be an increasing potential for job growth through conversion and reuse of older commercial and industrial sites within unincorporated communities.

The Sacramento County labor market has traditionally been dominated by public agency employment, services, and retail/wholesale trades. Sacramento County had an average of 573,100 civilian jobs in 2004. Of the total employment, 32% was in nonfinancial services, 28% in government, 20% in retail and wholesale trades, 12% in goods producing industries, 7% in financial/insurance/real estate services, and 1% in farming (Sacramento County 2008:5-12). Among all employers (public and private), the sectors that consist of local government agencies, health care and related services firms, educational establishments, and technology firms are among the major employers in the Sacramento region. The largest employers in Sacramento County include Kaiser Permanente, Raley's Inc., UC Davis Health Systems, Mercy/CHW, Intel Corporation, Sutter Health, and AT&T (Sacramento County 2008:5-13).

Between 1990 and 2000, business service firms added nearly 38,000 jobs to the Sacramento economy. Manufacturing firms added another 21,000 jobs, followed by engineering and management service firms at nearly 5,000 jobs. The U.S. Census Bureau's 2007 data estimates 655,300 persons in the Sacramento County labor force (population 16 years and over) during that period (Sacramento County 2008:5-12). Annual job growth is expected

to accelerate between 2005 and 2015 to over 4,000 jobs per year and then decline to about 1,400 jobs per year by 2025. The rate of projected job growth in the unincorporated area, about 1%, is below the projected Countywide level of 2.5% between 2000 and 2005. Much of the projected job growth is expected to occur in employment centers located within the newly incorporated City of Rancho Cordova (Sacramento County 2005). Projections for employment in Sacramento County indicate 814,220 in the labor force by 2025. (Sacramento County 2008 :5-14.)

Jobs with the greatest anticipated growth in the Sacramento region are health care services, security services, food and retail trades, business and personal services, and clerical/ administrative support. Substantial job growth is also anticipated in computer and other technical specialties, law enforcement and emergency services, and transportation. Most of these jobs will pay salaries at low- to moderate-income ranges, even accounting for an average of 1.4 workers per household. Among the jobs that are expected to experience the most growth are food service, maintenance, personal care, and retail jobs that pay average wages of \$8 to \$14 per hour, or approximately \$17,000 to \$29,000 per year (Sacramento County 2008:5-14).

City of Folsom

For many years, Folsom had an economy largely based on Folsom State Prison “industry,” which has been in existence for over a century. Recent economic and employment trends have shifted, however, with Folsom’s economic development efforts to plan for commercial and industrial development. A number of large, national corporations involved in the research, development, and manufacturing of electronic components have located regional offices and manufacturing facilities in Folsom. Additionally, several large retail/commercial centers have been completed or are under construction. Intel Corporation is the largest private industry employer in Folsom with approximately 6,800 employees at its Folsom branch (as of early 2008). About one-third of Intel’s employees are Folsom residents, another third reside in the Greater Sacramento Area, and the other third reside in El Dorado and Placer Counties. Other large employers in Folsom include the California State Prison system (1,500), Folsom-Cordova Unified School District (1,400), and Verizon Wireless (1,000) (SACOG 2005).

Employment in the City Folsom is projected to increase at a 4.8% annual rate from 2000 to 2010 (from 21,237 to 33,826 people), which is almost twice the projected annual employment growth rate of 2.5% for Sacramento County for the same period. Between 2000 and 2007, employment in Folsom increased from 25,311 to 33,782 (population of persons 16 years and older) (U.S. Census Bureau 2007). The City’s Housing Element (2009) projects future growth in employment to 26,548 in 2013 and 40,901 in 2025, but indicates that employment will increase at a declining rate because the City is reaching commercial/industrial buildout.

El Dorado Hills

Between 2000 and 2007, employment in El Dorado Hills increased from 9,001 to 16,927 (population of persons 16 years and older) (U.S. Census Bureau 2007). Of the total employment, 47% was in nonfinancial services, 29% in goods producing industries, 15% in retail and wholesale trades, and 12% in financial/insurance/real estate services (Sacramento County 2008:5-12). In general, these jobs do not pay in the range to support habitation in the type of housing available in El Dorado Hills. The result is an increasing number of individuals living in more affordable areas (in other parts of El Dorado County and Sacramento County) and commuting to work in El Dorado Hills (El Dorado County 2008).

The El Dorado Hills Business Park is one of the largest employment centers in El Dorado County (El Dorado County 2003:5.1-7). It is expected that the El Dorado Hills community area would develop 301 acres of job-generating land uses in the future (El Dorado County 2003:5.1-14).

HOUSING

Sacramento County

The total number of housing units in Sacramento County increased from 474,814 in 2000 to 541,106 in 2007. Sacramento County's housing growth rate was approximately 12.3%, with the supply and composition of housing changing little in this period. Approximately 63% of housing units Countywide are single-family homes (U.S. Census Bureau 2007). In 2007, Sacramento County had an average household size of 2.69 (considered to be a relatively large household). The County's Housing Element projects that in 2025, the total housing units would increase to 662,004 and the average household size would increase to 2.55, based on the assumption that housing development in the unincorporated area will attract more families with children and that, conversely, there will be slight declines in average household sizes for most of the cities in Sacramento County. The 2035 projections indicate a further increase in households in the county, with a total of 732,678 households by 2035 (SACOG 2007).

The relative ability of a community to meet the demands for local housing is analyzed using a "vacancy rate," which establishes the relationship between housing supply and demand. If the demand for housing units is greater than the available supply, then the vacancy rate is low and the price of housing will most likely increase at a higher rate than an area where supply and demand are more in balance. According to HCD (2000), a housing vacancy rate of 5% is considered normal. Vacancy rates below 5% indicate a housing shortage in a community. Sacramento County had a vacancy rate of 7.5% from 2005–2007 (U.S. Census Bureau), which indicates that the County had a greater amount of housing supply than demand, not a housing shortage. However, SACOG (2001) projects a vacancy rate of 4.74% by 2025 (SACOG 2001), which may indicate there will be a slight shortage of housing in the County in the future.

City of Folsom

The City of Folsom is a suburban, bedroom community for the greater Sacramento area. The total number of housing units in Folsom increased from 17,968 in 2000 to 24,825 in 2007. The City's housing growth rate was approximately 27.6%, with the supply and composition of housing changing little in this period. Approximately 72% of housing units are single-family homes (U.S. Census Bureau 2007; City of Folsom 2008). In 2007, Folsom had an average household size of 2.63 (considered to be a relatively large household). The number of households is projected to grow to 26,548 in 2013 and 36,119 in 2035. With the population increasing at a faster rate than the number of households, household size is projected to increase to 2.63 in 2013 and 2.70 in 2035 (City of Folsom 2008:18).

The U.S. Census Bureau reports that Folsom had a vacancy rate of 1.6% for owner-occupied units and 2.6% for rental units in 2007. These vacancy rates indicate that the City experienced a tight housing market and a housing shortage.

El Dorado Hills

There is currently a concentration of high-end housing development in El Dorado Hills (El Dorado County 2008:28). The total number of housing units in El Dorado Hills increased from 6,071 in 2000 to 11,268 in 2007. The housing growth rate in El Dorado Hills was approximately 46%, with the supply and composition of housing changing little in this period. Approximately 72% of housing units are single-family homes (U.S. Census Bureau 2007). In 2007, El Dorado Hills had an average household size of 3.03 (considered to be a relatively large household). By 2025, El Dorado Hills is projected to have approximately 4,481 high-density residential units (El Dorado County 2003:5-1.37).

The U.S. Census Bureau reports that El Dorado Hills had a vacancy rate of 1.5% for owner-occupied units and 3.9% for rental units in 2007. These vacancy rates indicate that the community experienced a tight housing market and a housing shortage.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

The 2006–2013 Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) allocates to SACOG cities and counties their “fair share” of the region’s projected housing needs (SACOG 2008). Each city and county in the RHNP receives a Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of total number of housing units that it must plan for within a 7.5-year time period through their General Plan Housing Elements. Within the total number of needed units, allocations are also made for the number of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above-moderate-income units. The RHNP allocations take into consideration several factors: market demand for housing; type and tenure of housing supply; employment opportunities; commuting patterns; availability of suitable residential sites and public facilities; loss of assisted multifamily units; avoiding further concentration of lower income households; and special housing needs.

Sacramento County

As shown in Table 3A.13-1, SACOG anticipates that 59,093 housing units would be required in Sacramento County to meet regional housing needs. Of this total, 3,601 housing units have been allocated to the City of Folsom during the current planning period (2006-2013), as shown in Table 3A.13-2.

| Table 3A.13-1 Sacramento County Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 2006–2013 | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Income Grouping | Projected Housing Units (2013) | Percent of Housing Need |
| Very low | 12,604 | 21.3 |
| Low | 9,573 | 16.2 |
| Moderate | 11,265 | 19.1 |
| Above-moderate | 25,652 | 43.4 |
| Total | 59,094 | 100.0 |
| Source: SACOG 2008 | | |

| Table 3A.13-2 City of Folsom Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 2006–2013 | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Income Grouping | Projected Housing Units (2013) | Percent of Housing Need |
| Very low | 1,073 | 29.8 |
| Low | 766 | 21.3 |
| Moderate | 810 | 22.5 |
| Above-moderate | 952 | 26.4 |
| Total | 3,601 | 100.0 |
| Source: SACOG 2008 | | |

City of Folsom

As shown on Table 3A.13-3, the City has determined that there are a total of 1,399 affordable housing units under construction: 216 very low-income, 177 low-income, and 1,006 moderate-income housing units. There are an additional 479 planned and built above-moderate housing units for a total of 1,878 housing units (City of Folsom 2009:1-2). Folsom has estimated that 711 very low-income, 256 low-income, 213 moderate-income, and 1,273 above-moderate-income housing units for a total of 2,453 housing units could be constructed on vacant land within the existing City limits (City of Folsom 2009:6). In addition, the City has estimated that the project could construct 1,052 affordable housing units and 1,155 above-moderate housing units for a total of 2,816 housing units during the housing element planning period (City of Folsom 2009:7).

| Category | Very Low | Low | Moderate | Above-Moderate |
|---|--------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Built and planned projects | 216 | 177 | 1,006 | 479 |
| Potential housing units within the existing City limits | 711 | 256 | 213 | 1,273 |
| Potential housing units within the SPA | 1,052 | -- | 609 | 1,155 |
| Total housing units | 1,979 | 433 | 1,828 | 2,907 |
| Projected housing units (2013) | 1,073 | 766 | 810 | 952 |
| Total Difference | +906 | -333 | +1,018 | +1,955 |

Source: City of Folsom 2009

The City anticipates that a total of 7,147 housing units could be constructed in Folsom during the current planning period (2006–2013) to meet regional housing needs. The total number of very low income, moderate income, and above-moderate income housing units would exceed the total required number of housing units in these categories. The total number of low income housing units would be less than that required to meet regional housing needs. Nevertheless, the projected number of housing units (7,147) would exceed the required number of housing units (3,601) identified in the RHNA.

3A.13.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

There are no Federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws related to population, employment, and housing that apply to the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration.

STATE PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

Regional Housing Needs Plan

A RHNP is mandated by the State of California (California Government Code Section 65584) for regions to address housing issues and needs based on future growth projections for the area. The RHNP is developed by SACOG and allocates to cities and counties their “fair share” of the region’s projected housing needs based on household income groupings over the planning period for the housing elements of each specific jurisdiction. On February 21, 2008, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the 2006–2013 RHNP. Cities and counties must develop and adopt their Housing Elements to address how they will meet their allocations. The Sacramento County General Plan and the City of Folsom General Plan Housing Elements are described below.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

Sacramento County General Plan

The following goals and policies of the *Sacramento County General Plan* (1993) are applicable only to the off-site detention basin east of Prairie City Road under the Proposed Project and the other four action alternatives. There are no Sacramento County goals and policies that are applicable to the No Project Alternative.

Land Use Element

GOAL: Accommodate projected population and employment growth in areas where the appropriate level of public infrastructure and services are or will be available during the planning period.

- ▶ **Policy LU-9.** Specific plans may be prepared for subareas of an urban growth area for the purpose of prioritizing development opportunities. In such cases, the Plan shall have defensible boundaries and address development of all lands within them.

GOAL: Land use patterns that minimize the impacts of new and existing development while maintaining the quality, character, and identity of neighborhood and community areas.

Objective: Neighborhoods with a balanced mix of employment, neighborhood services, and different housing types.

- ▶ **Policy LU-11.** Specific Plans and Community Plans for areas within the Urban Service Boundary should provide a balance of employment, neighborhood services, and different housing types wherever feasible.

GOAL: Accommodate an effective range of residential densities or commercial and industrial land use intensities within areas defined by the General Plan Land Use Diagram of the unincorporated County area.

Housing Element

GOAL: Provide an adequate supply of suitable sites for the development of a range of housing that varies sufficiently in terms of cost, design, size, location, and tenure to meet the housing needs of all segments of the County's population.

El Dorado County General Plan

There are no *El Dorado County General Plan* (2004) policies that are applicable to the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration.

City of Folsom General Plan

The following goals and policies of the *City of Folsom General Plan* (January 1993) are applicable to the Proposed Project and the other four action alternative. There are no City of Folsom goals and policies that are applicable to the No Project Alternative.

Land Use Element

GOAL 4: To provide opportunities for residents to work, shop and enjoy leisure activities in the City.

- ▶ **Policy 4.1.** The City will plan for additional housing as determined in the Housing Element for the next 5 to 25 years.

GOAL 8: To allow a variety of housing types which provides living choices for Folsom residents.

GOAL 10: To provide for a commercial and industrial base of the City to encourage:

1. A strong tax base.
2. More jobs within the City.
3. A greater variety of commercial goods and services.
4. A regional shopping center.
5. Businesses and industries compatible with Folsom's quality of life.

Housing Element

GOAL 18: To provide for the City's regional share of new housing for all income groups.

- ▶ **Policy 18.1.** The City shall ensure that sufficient land is designated and zoned in a range of residential densities to accommodate the City's regional share of housing.
- ▶ **Policy 18.3.** The City shall identify sites that are suitable for multifamily housing and residential redevelopment.
- ▶ **Policy 18.4.** The City shall encourage home builders to develop their projects on multifamily-designated land at the high end of the applicable density range.

3A.13.3 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The thresholds for determining the significance of impacts for this analysis are based on the environmental checklist in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. These thresholds also encompass the factors taken into account under NEPA to determine the significance of an action in terms of its context and the intensity of its impacts. The Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration could result in a significant impact related to population, employment, and housing if they would do any of the following:

- ▶ induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (by proposed new homes and businesses) or indirectly (through the extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- ▶ generate a substantial demand for new housing, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts; or
- ▶ displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The examination of population, employment, and housing conditions in this section is based on information obtained from review of available population, employment, and housing data and projections, including those in the Sacramento County General Plan (1996) and Housing Element (2008), the City of Folsom General Plan (1988) and Housing Element (2009), the U.S. Census Bureau (1990, 2000, 2007), the DOF (2008), and other sources. El Dorado Hills is included in the area of consideration for population, employment, and housing issues for the Proposed Project Alternative only, because it is the only alternative that would include off-site roadway connections into El Dorado County.

Population projections for the SPA were calculated by multiplying the number of proposed housing units by the City of Folsom persons per dwelling unit factor. Single-family dwelling units were assumed to generate 2.92 persons per dwelling unit. Multifamily and mixed use dwelling units were assumed to generate 1.94 persons per dwelling unit. The population estimate has been rounded (either up or down) to create a whole number estimate for each land use category.

The Proposed Project and the other four action alternatives include new housing and businesses that would result in direct increases in population in Folsom over the buildout time period, estimated to be complete in 2030. This analysis assumes that project development would generate the numbers of residents and housing units, as presented in see Table 3A.13-4. Housing and population increases under the No Project Alternative would not be added to the City of Folsom because the SPA would remain under the jurisdiction of Sacramento County, therefore, the No Project Alternative is not included in the following or in Table 3A.13-4).

- ▶ The No USACE Permit Alternative would have a maximum of 6,373 dwelling units and generate approximately 15,808 new residents in Folsom.
- ▶ The Proposed Project Alternative would have a maximum of 10,210 dwelling units and generate approximately 24,335 new residents in Folsom.
- ▶ The Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would have a maximum of 7,965 dwelling units and generate approximately 19,584 new residents in Folsom.
- ▶ The Centralized Development Alternative would have a maximum of 9,026 dwelling units and generate approximately 20,689 new residents in Folsom.
- ▶ The Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would have a maximum of 11,553 dwelling units and generate approximately 25,022 new residents in Folsom.

In addition, the project would include development of mixed-use, office park, and commercial land uses. The target floor area ratios attached to each commercial/office/mixed-use acreage were developed by DKS Associates and were used to calculate the potential building square footage generated by project development. This analysis assumes that development of the Proposed Project and the other four action alternatives would generate the building square footage and numbers of employees listed below. No employees would be generated under the No Project Alternative.

- ▶ The No USACE Permit Alternative would include 401.9 acres of commercial land use, which would provide for an estimated 5,910,527 square feet of commercial building space and generate 13,021 employees.
- ▶ The Proposed Project Alternative would include a total of 475.6 acres of commercial land use, which would provide for an estimated 5,054,616 square feet of commercial building space and generate 13,210 employees.
- ▶ The Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would include a total of 349.7 acres of commercial land uses, which would provide for an estimated 5,083,059 square feet of commercial building space and generate 9,749 employees.
- ▶ The Centralized Development Alternative would include 349.7 acres in commercial land use, which would provide for an estimated 6,893,631 square feet of commercial building space and generate 16,860 employees.

| Table 3A.13-4 Folsom South of 50 Specific Plan Residential Population Projections | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Land Use Type | Acreage | | | | | Dwelling Units (DU) ¹ | | | | | Projected Population ² | | | | |
| | PP | RIM | CD | RHD | NCP | PP | RIM | CD | RHD | NCP | PP | RIM | CD | RHD | NCP |
| Single - Family ² | 557.8 | 504.5 | 213.7 | 370.7 | 795.8 | 1,687 | 1,513 | 641 | 989 | 2,388 | 4,926 | 4,418 | 1,872 | 2,888 | 6,973 |
| Single-Family High Density ² | 532.5 | 491.5 | 473.1 | 331.0 | 204.9 | 2,933 | 2,703 | 2,602 | 1,619 | 1,127 | 8,564 | 7,893 | 7,598 | 4,727 | 3,291 |
| Multifamily Low Density ³ | 266.7 | 245.9 | 282.4 | 483.2 | 147.0 | 2,434 | 2,213 | 2,542 | 3,866 | 1,323 | 4,722 | 4,293 | 4,931 | 7,500 | 2,567 |
| Multifamily Medium Density ³ | 67.0 | 52.3 | 113.6 | 144.6 | 54.5 | 1,224 | 942 | 2,044 | 2,314 | 981 | 2,375 | 1,827 | 3,965 | 4,489 | 1,903 |
| Multifamily High Density ³ | 49.9 | 11.5 | 30.5 | 107.1 | 8.4 | 1,251 | 287 | 764 | 2,380 | 210 | 2,427 | 557 | 1,482 | 4,617 | 407 |
| Mixed-Use District ^{3,4} | 35.5 | 15.4 | 21.7 | 36.1 | 17.2 | 681 | 307 | 433 | 385 | 344 | 1,321 | 596 | 840 | 747 | 667 |
| Total | 1,509.4 | 1,321.1 | 1,135 | 1,472.7 | 1,227.8 | 10,210 | 7,965 | 9,026 | 11,553 | 6,373 | 24,335 | 19,584 | 20,689 | 25,022 | 15,808 |

PP = Proposed Project; RIM = Resource Minimization Alternative; CD = Centralized Development Alternative; RHD = Reduced Hillside Development Alternative; NCP = No USACE Permit Alternative.

¹ Target dwelling unit allocation is an estimate. Actual total dwelling units may be higher or lower, so long as it falls within land use density ranges and does not exceed the total target dwelling units.

² Based on the City of Folsom persons per dwelling unit for single-family dwelling units (2.92).

³ Based on the City of Folsom persons per dwelling unit for multifamily and mixed-use dwelling units (1.94).

⁴ The Mixed-Use District assumes that 60% of the total land use acreage would be used for residential and 40% would be used for commercial.

Source: RRM Design Group 2008 and 2009, data compiled by AECOM in 2009

- ▶ The Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would include 485.3 acres of commercial land use, which would provide for an estimated 7,183,306 square feet of commercial building space and generate 17,484 employees.

Specific indirect impacts associated with increased population, employment, and housing, such as traffic congestion, air quality degradation, noise generation, and increased demand for public services and utilities, are addressed in each technical section of this EIR/EIS, as appropriate. These technical sections provide a detailed analysis of other relevant environmental effects of the project; therefore, indirect impacts are not discussed further in this section.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Impacts that would occur under each alternative development scenario are identified as follows: NP (No Action/No Project), NCP (No USACE Permit), PP (Proposed Project/Action), RIM (Resource Impact Minimization), CD (Centralized Development), and RHD (Reduced Hillside Development). The impacts for each alternative are compared relative to the PP at the end of each impact conclusion (i.e., similar, greater, lesser).

IMPACT 3A.13-1 Temporary Increase in Population and Subsequent Housing Demand during Construction. *Project implementation would generate a temporary increase in employment and subsequent housing demand in Sacramento County and the City of Folsom from construction jobs.*

On-Site and Off-Site Elements

NP

The No Project Alternative could develop up to 44 rural residences and generate approximately 128 new residents under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. All or a portion of these dwelling units could be constructed by individual property owners over the proposed 19-year buildout period (2011–2030); however, it would be speculative to attempt to predict how many units would develop or when they would develop, since they would be constructed on a parcel-by-parcel basis. Construction of 44 individual dwelling units would require a minimal number of construction workers; therefore, the temporary increase in population growth and housing demand associated with construction of the No Project Alternative is considered a **direct, less-than-significant** impact. **No indirect** impacts would occur. [*Lesser*]

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Project construction activities would occur at intervals throughout the planning horizon of the project, and the site would ultimately be built out in approximately 19 years (2011-2030). A greater number of construction workers would be employed during peak construction periods (determined by market demand and overall economic conditions), while fewer construction workers would be employed during nonpeak periods. Each development phase would likely be constructed as several small projects that would be ongoing in each development phase. For example, roads, utilities, a housing development, a commercial center, and supporting off-site improvements could all be constructed simultaneously. It is estimated, based on prior analyses of similar projects, that project-related construction would generate approximately 500 construction jobs during the peak construction period of each of the four phases. A greater number of construction workers would be employed during peak construction periods (determined by market demand and overall economic conditions), whereas fewer construction workers would be employed during nonpeak periods.

Construction workers serving the project can be expected to come from Folsom, Sacramento County, El Dorado Hills, and from nearby communities. According to the latest labor data available from the U.S. Census Bureau (2007), it is estimated that 2,269 residents in the Folsom, 54,964 residents in Sacramento County, and 850

residents in El Dorado Hills are employed in the construction industry. These existing residents in the city and counties who are employed in the construction industry would likely be sufficient to meet the demand for construction workers that would be generated by the project. Because construction workers serving the project could be expected to come from Folsom itself and from nearby communities in Sacramento County or El Dorado County, neither substantial population growth nor an increase in housing demand in the region is anticipated as a result of these jobs. Furthermore, if some construction workers from outside the region were employed for the project, the temporary nature of the work supports the conclusion that these workers would not typically change residences when assigned to a new construction site. Therefore, substantial permanent relocations of construction workers to the area are not anticipated. The project would not be expected to generate the need for substantial additional housing stock in Folsom, Sacramento County, or El Dorado County during construction. Because of these conditions, the temporary increase in population growth and housing demand associated with project construction is considered a **direct, less-than-significant** impact. **No indirect** impacts would occur. *[Similar]*

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT **Permanent Increase in Population Growth.** *Project implementation would result in the development of*
3A.13-2 *new residential dwelling units, which would cause a direct long-term increase in population.*

On-Site Elements

NP

The No Project Alternative could develop up to 44 rural residences and generate approximately 128 new residents under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. Based on 2.92 persons per dwelling unit, these units could potentially generate 128 persons in Sacramento County over the proposed 19-year buildout period (2011–2030). These residents would not generate population growth that exceeds estimates for Sacramento County; therefore, the No Project Alternative would not result in unplanned population growth in the area. This impact is **direct** and **less than significant**. The **indirect** environmental impacts resulting from increase population growth are evaluated through Chapter 3 of this EIR/EIS. *[Lesser]*

NCP

Implementation of the No USACE Permit Alternative would directly induce population growth in Sacramento County and the City of Folsom through construction of new homes and businesses over the 19-year buildout period (2011–2030). The No USACE Permit Alternative would develop 6,373 residential units. As shown in Table 3A.13-3 above, these residential units are estimated to generate 15,808 new residents by build out in 2030.

The current City (2002) and County (2008) General Plan Housing Elements do not include estimates of population from planned development beyond 2010 and 2025, respectively. The project-related estimated increases in population (15,808 new residents) could be potentially greater than the increases in population from the planned residential growth in the city or county. Therefore, development of the No USACE Permit Alternative could potentially generate population growth exceeding projections for Folsom and Sacramento County as a whole.

The 2035 projected population for the city (97,485) represents an increase of 32,179 persons from 2008 to 2035. Comparing the new residents expected to be generated by the No USACE Permit Alternative (15,808), the project-related estimated increase in population is within the increase in population that would result from the planned residential growth as projected by the City’s Housing Element.

Because it cannot be determined whether the No USACE Permit Alternative would generate population growth that exceeds estimates for Sacramento County or the City of Folsom under their currently adopted General Plans,

this alternative could potentially result in unplanned population growth in the area. Population growth consistent with current population projections by itself is not considered a significant environmental impact. However, development of housing, infrastructure, and facilities and services to serve this growth can have significant environmental impacts through land conversions, commitment of resources, and other mechanisms. Because the No USACE Permit Alternative would generate 8,527 fewer residents than the Proposed Project Alternative, it is likely that direct impacts associated with development would be less. The **indirect** impacts associated with the development needed to accommodate increased population are evaluated in each resource area within Chapter 3 of this EIR/EIS. Because population growth is not, itself, considered a significant environmental impact, this **direct** impact is considered **less than significant**. [Lesser]

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP

Implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would directly induce population growth in Folsom through construction of new homes and businesses over the 19-year buildout period (2011–2030). The Proposed Project would develop 10,210 residential units. As shown in Table 3A.13-3 above, these residential units are estimated to generate 24,335 new residents at buildout (2030).

The current City (2002) and County (2008) General Plan Housing Elements do not include estimates of population from planned development beyond 2010 and 2025, respectively. The project-related estimated increases in population (26,850 new residents) could be potentially greater than the increases in population from the planned residential growth in the city or county. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project Alternative could potentially generate population growth exceeding projections for Folsom and Sacramento County as a whole.

The City has recently prepared an updated Housing Element (2009). The Housing Element projects the city would result in a total population of approximately 97,485 persons by 2035. As of January 1, 2008, the population of Folsom was estimated to be 65,306 (excluding the inmate population at Folsom Prison and California State Prison Sacramento) (DOF 2008). The 2035 projected population for the City (97,485) represents an increase of 32,179 persons from 2008 to 2035. Comparing the new residents expected to be generated by the Proposed Project Alternative (24,335), the project-related estimated increase in population is within the increase in population that would result from the planned residential growth as projected by the City's Housing Element.

Because it cannot be determined whether the Proposed Project Alternative would generate population growth that exceeds estimates for Folsom or Sacramento County under their currently adopted General Plans, the project could potentially result in unplanned population growth in the area. Population growth consistent with current population projections by itself is not considered a significant environmental impact. However, development of housing, infrastructure, and facilities and services to serve this growth can have significant environmental impacts through land conversions, commitment of resources, and other mechanisms. The **indirect** impacts associated with the development needed to accommodate increased population under the Proposed Project Alternative are evaluated in each resource area within Chapter 3 of this EIR/EIS. Because population growth is not, itself, considered a significant environmental impact, this **direct** impact is considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RIM

Implementation of the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would directly induce population growth in Folsom through construction of new homes and businesses over the 19-year buildout period (2011–2030). The Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would develop 17,965 residential units. As shown in Table 3A.13-3 above, these residential units are estimated to generate 19,594 new residents by buildout in 2030.

The current City (2002) and County (2008) General Plan Housing Elements do not include estimates of population from planned development beyond 2010 and 2025, respectively. The project-related estimated increases in population (19,584 new residents) could be potentially greater than the increases in population from the planned residential growth in the city or county. Therefore, development of the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative could potentially generate population growth exceeding projections for Folsom and Sacramento County as a whole.

The 2035 projected population for the City (97,485) represents an increase of 24,985 persons from 2008 to 2035. Comparing the new residents expected to be generated by the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative (19,584), the project-related estimated increase in population is within the increase in population that would result from the planned residential growth as projected by the City's Housing Element.

Because it cannot be determined whether the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would generate population growth that exceeds estimates for Folsom or Sacramento County under their currently adopted General Plans, this alternative could potentially result in unplanned population growth consistent with current population projections in the area. Population growth by itself is not considered a significant environmental impact. However, development of housing, infrastructure, and facilities and services to serve this growth can have significant environmental impacts through land conversions, commitment of resources, and other mechanisms. Because the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would generate 4,751 fewer residents than the Proposed Project Alternative, it is likely that direct impacts associated with development would be less. The **indirect** impacts associated with the development needed to accommodate increased population are evaluated in each resource area within Chapter 3 of this EIR/EIS. Because population growth is not, itself, considered a significant environmental impact, this **direct** impact is considered **less than significant**. [*Lesser*]

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

CD

Implementation of the Centralized Development Alternative would directly induce population growth in Sacramento County and the City of Folsom through construction of new homes and businesses over the 19-year buildout period (2011–2030). The Centralized Development Alternative would generate 9,026 residential units. As shown in Table 3A.13-3 above, these residential units are estimated to generate 20,689 new residents by buildout in 2030.

The current City (2002) and County (2008) General Plan Housing Elements do not include estimates of population from planned development beyond 2010 and 2025, respectively. The project-related estimated increases in population (20,689 new residents) could be potentially greater than the increases in population from the planned residential growth in the City or County. Therefore, development of the Centralized Development Alternative could potentially generate population growth exceeding projections for Folsom and Sacramento County as a whole.

The 2035 projected population for the City (97,485) represents an increase of 32,179 persons from 2008 to 2035. Comparing the new residents expected to be generated by the Centralized Development Alternative (20,689), the project-related estimated increase in population is within the increase in population that would result from the planned residential growth as projected by the City's Housing Element.

Because it cannot be determined whether the Centralized Development Alternative would generate population growth that exceeds estimates for Folsom or Sacramento County under their currently adopted General Plans, this alternative could potentially result in unplanned population growth in the area. Population growth consistent with current population projections by itself is not considered a significant environmental impact. However, development of housing, infrastructure, and facilities and services to serve this growth can have significant environmental impacts through land conversions, commitment of resources, and other mechanisms. Because the

Centralized Development Alternative would generate 3,646 fewer residents than the Proposed Project Alternative, it is likely that direct impacts associated with development would be less. The **indirect** impacts associated with the development needed to accommodate increased population are evaluated in each resource area within Chapter 3 of this EIR/EIS. Because population growth is not, itself, considered a significant environmental impact, this **direct** impact is considered **less than significant**. *[Lesser]*

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RHD

Implementation of the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would directly induce population growth in Folsom through construction of new homes and businesses over the 19-year buildout period (2011–2030). The Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would develop 11,553 residential units. As shown in Table 3A.13-3 above, these residential units are estimated to generate 25,022 new residents by buildout in 2030.

The current City (2002) and County (2008) General Plan Housing Elements do not include estimates of population from planned development beyond 2010 and 2025, respectively. The project-related estimated increases in population (25,022 new residents) could be potentially greater than the increases in population from the planned residential growth in the City or County. Therefore, development of the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative could potentially generate population growth exceeding projections for Folsom and Sacramento County as a whole.

The 2035 projected population for the City (97,485) represents an increase of 32,179 persons from 2008 to 2035. Comparing the new residents expected to be generated by the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative (25,022), the project-related estimated increases in population exceed the population that would result from the planned residential growth as projected by the City’s Housing Element.

Because it cannot be determined whether the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would generate population growth that exceeds estimates for Folsom or Sacramento County under their currently adopted General Plans, this alternative could potentially result in unplanned population growth in the area. Population growth consistent with current population projections by itself is not necessarily considered a significant environmental impact. However, development of housing, infrastructure, and facilities and services to serve this growth can have significant environmental impacts through land conversions, commitment of resources, and other mechanisms. Because the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would generate 687 more residents than the Proposed Project Alternative, it is likely that direct impacts associated with development would be greater but still remain **less than significant**. The **indirect** impacts associated with the development needed to accommodate increased population are evaluated in each resource area within Chapter 3 of this EIR/EIS. Because population growth is not, itself, considered a significant environmental impact, this **direct** impact is considered **less than significant**. *[Greater]*

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

Off-Site Elements

Construction of U.S. 50 interchange improvements, the sewer force main, the detention basin, and the two roadway connections into El Dorado Hills would not involve construction of new housing or development of new long-term employment opportunities in Folsom, Sacramento County, or El Dorado County. Therefore, there would be no direct long-term increases in population in Folsom, Sacramento County, or El Dorado County from construction of these elements. **Indirect** impacts related to the potential that infrastructure improvements could induce additional long-term population growth are addressed in Chapter 4, “Other Statutory Requirements.” Because there would be no direct impact related to long-term increases in population growth from off-site infrastructure, this impact is **direct** and **less than significant**. *[Similar]*

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT Displacement of Existing Housing or People Resulting from Project Development. *Project*
3A.13-3 *implementation would displace one existing residence located in the SPA.*

On-Site Elements

NP

The No Project Alternative could develop up to 44 rural residences and generate approximately 128 new residents under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. It is likely that the existing single-family residence located in the SPA would remain under the No Project Alternative. No development would occur under the No Project Alternative that would result in housing displacement; thus, **no direct** or **indirect** impacts would occur. *[Lesser]*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

There is one existing single-family residence located in the SPA. This residence would likely be removed as part of project development. Project implementation would result in the construction of low-, medium-, and high-density residential dwelling units in the SPA. Construction of these residential dwelling units in the SPA would fully replace the single unit removed during project construction. Because the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, this impact is considered **direct** and **less than significant**. **No indirect** impacts would occur. *[Similar]*

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

Off-Site Elements

There are no existing residences within the areas proposed for off-site U.S. 50 interchange improvements, the sewer force main, or the detention basin. There are existing residences in the vicinity of the two roadway connections into El Dorado Hills. However, those roadway connections were planned at the time that community was constructed, and no residences would be displaced. Therefore, construction of these elements would not result in housing displacement and **no direct** or **indirect** impacts would occur. *[Similar]*

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

3A.13.4 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Impacts associated with population growth and housing demand are considered less than significant. Therefore, there would be no residual significant impacts.