

# Chapter 14—Population and Housing

## 14.1 Introduction

---

This chapter describes existing conditions (environmental and regulatory) and assesses the potential of the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (proposed MTP/SCS) to affect population and housing within the MTP/SCS plan area. This chapter also evaluates the potential impacts to population and housing that may result from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS. Where necessary and feasible, mitigation measures are identified to reduce these impacts.

The information presented in this chapter is based on a review of existing and available information and is regional in scope. Data provided in this section is programmatic. It is appropriate for general policy planning and tiering of subsequent environmental documents; however site-specific evaluations may be necessary to determine future project-level environmental effects and appropriate mitigation.

No comments were received on population and housing in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP). Appendix PD-1 includes all NOP comments received.

## 14.2 Environmental Setting

---

### 14.2.1 Existing Population, Housing, and Employment Distribution

The 2014 Department of Finance (DOF) City/County Population and Housing Estimates indicate that the current population within the six counties, excluding the Tahoe Basin, is 2,337,545<sup>1</sup>, representing a nearly 23 percent increase since 2000 (1,901,964). This is much higher than the growth rate of the state of California, which grew about 13 percent over the same period to a population of 38,340,074 in 2014. As of 2014, the MTP/SCS plan area was home to over six percent of the population in California (California Department of Finance, 2014).

The population centers of the region are located in and around the region's geographic center. Approximately 61 percent of the region's population lives in incorporated cities, of which the cities of Sacramento, Elk Grove, and Roseville are most populous (California Department of Finance, 2014). Unincorporated Sacramento County itself is home to 567,000 people, making it the most populous of the jurisdictions in the region. The City of Sacramento, with over 475,000 residents, is the most populous incorporated city in the region, followed by Elk Grove, Roseville, and Citrus Heights, which are all located close to the urban core. The least populous cities are located near the geographic edge of the region and include the cities of Isleton, Winters, Colfax, Live Oak, and Wheatland. Table 14.1 provides 2012 population, housing units, and employment for the region.

---

<sup>1</sup>Tahoe Basin portions of El Dorado and Placer Counties are based on 2010 Census counts of population, households and housing units.

**Table 14.1  
Population, Housing Units, and Employees by Jurisdiction (2012)**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Population<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Housing Units</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Jobs/Housing Ratio</b>
<b>El Dorado<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>151,639</b>	<b>64,373</b>	<b>43,164</b>	<b>0.7</b>
<i>Placerville</i>	9,543	4,529	9,338	2.1
<i>Unincorporated county</i>	142,096	59,844	33,825	0.6
<b>Placer<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>346,984</b>	<b>142,582</b>	<b>128,901</b>	<b>0.9</b>
<i>Auburn</i>	12,734	6,124	7,761	1.3
<i>Colfax</i>	1,986	911	814	0.9
<i>Lincoln</i>	47,845	18,246	8,416	0.5
<i>Loomis</i>	6,481	2,469	3,284	1.3
<i>Rocklin</i>	56,105	22,280	17,885	0.8
<i>Roseville</i>	124,041	49,247	64,638	1.3
<i>Unincorporated county</i>	97,792	43,306	26,103	0.6
<b>Sacramento</b>	<b>1,402,302</b>	<b>558,835</b>	<b>573,022</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<i>Citrus Heights</i>	84,758	35,477	17,939	0.5
<i>Elk Grove</i>	156,174	51,372	31,001	0.6
<i>Folsom</i>	66,590	26,224	35,848	1.4
<i>Galt</i>	23,739	8,007	4,565	0.6
<i>Isleton</i>	632	399	144	0.4
<i>Rancho Cordova</i>	63,259	25,619	48,792	1.9
<i>Sacramento</i>	456,374	191,749	257,369	1.3
<i>Unincorporated county</i>	550,776	219,987	177,365	0.8
<b>Sutter</b>	<b>93,877</b>	<b>33,790</b>	<b>29,533</b>	<b>0.9</b>
<i>Live Oak</i>	7,649	2,554	844	0.3
<i>Unincorporated county</i>	17,941	6,506	4,876	0.7
<i>Yuba City</i>	68,287	24,729	23,813	1.0
<b>Yolo</b>	<b>199,784</b>	<b>75,553</b>	<b>92,899</b>	<b>1.2</b>
<i>Davis</i>	67,590	26,440	15,430	0.6
<i>Unincorporated county</i>	23,566	7,807	28,383	3.6
<i>West Sacramento</i>	48,352	18,879	25,819	1.4
<i>Winters</i>	6,896	2,372	1,921	0.8
<i>Woodland</i>	53,380	20,054	21,347	1.1
<b>Yuba</b>	<b>73,552</b>	<b>28,331</b>	<b>20,402</b>	<b>0.7</b>
<i>Marysville</i>	12,874	5,349	8,473	1.6
<i>Unincorporated county</i>	57,072	21,644	11,497	0.5
<i>Wheatland</i>	3,606	1,337	432	0.3
<b>Region Total</b>	<b>2,268,138</b>	<b>903,464</b>	<b>887,920</b>	<b>1.0</b>

<sup>1</sup> Population estimates for 2012 are based on persons per household rates by housing type. County totals are for incorporated cities and unincorporated areas.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes the Tahoe Basin.

Source: SACOG, June 2015.

Since adoption of the Blueprint Vision, many jurisdictions in the region have begun implementing the Blueprint principles, which encourage compact, mixed-use development, a variety of housing types and transportation modes, quality design, and natural resource conservation. While all jurisdictions are striving to achieve the Blueprint goals, regional variations in population, housing, and employment patterns still exist because these goals are being implemented in a way that is appropriate based on topography, economy, local regulations, community preference, or other factors specific to a jurisdiction. Growing with the same goals in mind does not mean growing in the same way. Such variations are apparent when comparing centralized, urban areas of the region with more rural, agricultural-based areas. The following paragraphs describe the existing population, housing, and employment trends within each of the six counties in the MTP/SCS plan area.

#### *EL DORADO COUNTY*

Historically, El Dorado County has maintained a lower ratio of jobs to housing. The majority of the county's recent residential and employment growth has occurred in the unincorporated communities of El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park at the western edge of the county. These new communities are characterized by low-density residential and commercial development. However, in recent years, new business park and mixed-use developments have also emerged in El Dorado Hills.

#### *PLACER COUNTY*

Placer County's population has historically been concentrated along the southwest section of the I-80 corridor (i.e., Roseville, Rocklin, and Granite Bay), with tapering population densities towards the eastern end of the corridor (i.e., Colfax and Foresthill). The southwest Placer communities of Roseville and Rocklin have emerged as regional job centers in the past several years, accompanied by significant residential growth within and surrounding those communities.

#### *SACRAMENTO COUNTY*

Sacramento County is the region's population center, including both the largest city (City of Sacramento) and unincorporated area (County of Sacramento) within the region. Sacramento County housed 62 percent of the region's population in 2012. Sacramento County, and the cities therein, also contained a majority of the region's housing (62 percent) and employment (65 percent) in 2012.

#### *SUTTER COUNTY*

Currently, Sutter County is largely agricultural and is somewhat removed from the urbanized core of the region. Housing development has generally occurred within or contiguous to the two incorporated cities of Live Oak and Yuba City, in accordance with the county's general plan policies for urban development. There is also single-family housing in the unincorporated county, though at rural densities in accordance with the provisions of agricultural zoning districts. The county currently (2012) has a balanced jobs/housing ratio, which it is expected to maintain through 2036.

#### *YOLO COUNTY*

Yolo County and its jurisdictions have traditionally maintained strong land use policies to focus urban development towards incorporated cities and unincorporated communities such as Capay,

Clarksburg, Dunnigan, Esparto, Guinda, Knights Landing, Madison, and Yolo. The highest population and housing densities currently are in the City of Davis and the adjacent University of California at Davis due to the large student population, followed by the City of West Sacramento. Yolo County has a high jobs/housing ratio, with much of the employment located in the cities of West Sacramento and Davis.

#### *YUBA COUNTY*

Although historically an agricultural area, the Highway 70 corridor in unincorporated Yuba County and the City of Wheatland has seen several large residential developments. The county has a low jobs/housing ratio that is expected to improve through 2036. The county's current employment centers are the City of Marysville and Beale Air Force Base.

### 14.3 Regulatory Setting

---

#### **14.3.1 Federal Regulations**

##### *THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, TITLE VI*

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S. Code, § 2000d et seq.) prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance.

##### *THE ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS ACT OF 1968*

The Architectural Barriers Act (42 U.S. Code, § 4151 et seq.) requires that buildings and facilities designed, constructed, altered, or leased with certain federal funds after September 1969 must be accessible to and usable by handicapped persons.

##### *THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1968, TITLE VIII (FAIR HOUSING ACT)*

The Fair Housing Act (42 U.S. Code, 3601 et seq.) as amended, prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of dwellings, and in other housing-related transactions, based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status (including children under the age of 18 living with parents or legal custodians, pregnant women, and people securing custody of children under the age of 18), and handicap (disability).

##### *UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT OF 1970 (UNIFORM ACT)*

The Uniform Act (42 U.S. Code, § 4601 et seq.), passed in 1970 and amended in 1987, is intended to provide for uniform and equitable treatment for persons displaced through federally-funded or assisted transportation and redevelopment projects that require property acquisition. The act lays out rules for notification, relocation counseling, social services or assistance for disabled residents, and compensation for replacement housing and moving costs. The rules stipulate that replacement housing must be comparable to previous housing in terms of location, size, access to employment and public facilities, and must be “decent, safe, and sanitary.” The rules apply if federal funds are used in any phase of the program or project, even if the property acquisition itself is not federally funded.

#### ***THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1972, TITLE IX***

The Education Amendments Act (20 U.S. Code, §§ 1681–1688) prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs or activities that receive federal financial assistance.

#### ***THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973, SECTION 504***

The Rehabilitation Act, Section 504 (Programs, Services and Activities) (29 U.S. Code, § 794) prohibits discrimination based on disability in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

#### ***THE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974, TITLE I, § 109***

The Housing and Community Development Act (42 U.S. Code, § 5301 et seq.) prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, or religion in programs and activities receiving financial assistance from United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Community Development and Block Grant Program.

#### ***AGE DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 1975***

The Age Discrimination Act (42 U.S. Code, §§ 6101–6107) prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance.

#### ***THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (ADA), TITLE II***

The ADA (42 U.S. Code, § 12101 et seq.) prohibits discrimination based on disability in programs, services, and activities provided or made available by public entities. HUD enforces Title II when it relates to state and local public housing, housing assistance, and housing referrals.

#### ***THE NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF DETERMINATION ACT OF 1996 (NAHASDA)***

NAHASDA (25 U.S. Code, § 4101 et seq.) reorganized the system of housing assistance provided to Native Americans through HUD by eliminating several separate programs of assistance and replacing them with a block grant program. The two programs authorized for Indian tribes under NAHASDA are the Indian Housing Block Grant, which is a formula-based grant program and Title VI Loan Guarantee, which provides financing guarantees to Indian tribes for private market loans to develop affordable housing.

#### ***NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005***

The Native American Housing Enhancement Act (25 U.S. Code, § 4101 et seq.) amends the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 in prohibiting the Secretary of HUD from restricting tribal access to housing grant funds if a tribe retains program income funds. The Act specifies that Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 shall not apply to federally recognized tribes. The Act also amends the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 (42 U.S. Code, § 12704) to make tribes and tribally designated housing entities eligible for YouthBuild grants.

### *INDIAN VETERANS HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2010 (VETERANS ACT)*

The Veterans Act (25 U.S. Code, § 4103) amends NAHASDA to exclude from consideration as income any amounts received by a family from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) as veterans' disability compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation for service-related disabilities of a member of the family.

### *MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY (MAP-21), 2014*

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) was signed into law in July 2012 and reauthorized the federal highway and public transportation programs for fiscal years 2013 and 2014. Since then, MAP-21 has been reauthorized three additional times: first in July 2014 through the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, next in May 2015 through the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, and finally in July 2015 through the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015, which extends MAP-21 authorization to October 29, 2015. The Code of Federal Regulations pertaining to the Department of Transportation (DOT) contains guidelines for statewide and metropolitan transportation planning. The rules and regulations require that the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) review and update the transportation plan to confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon.

### *FAIR HOUSING-RELATED PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS:*

#### **Executive Order 11063**

Executive Order 11063 prohibits discrimination in the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of properties and facilities owned or operated by the federal government or provided with federal funds.

#### **Executive Order 11246**

Executive Order 11246, as amended, bars discrimination in federal employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

#### **Executive Order 12892**

Executive Order 12892, as amended, requires federal agencies to affirmatively further fair housing in their programs and activities, and provides that the Secretary of HUD will be responsible for coordinating the effort. The Order also establishes the President's Fair Housing Council.

#### **Executive Order 12898**

Executive Order 12898 requires that each federal agency conduct its program, policies, and activities that substantially affect human health or the environment in a manner that does not exclude persons based on race, color, or national origin.

## **Executive Order 13166**

Executive Order 13166 eliminates, to the extent possible, limited English proficiency as a barrier to full and meaningful participation by beneficiaries in all federally assisted and federally conducted programs and activities.

## **Executive Order 13217**

Executive Order 13217 requires federal agencies to evaluate their policies and programs to determine if any can be revised or modified to improve the availability of community-based living arrangements for persons with disabilities.

### **14.3.2 State Regulations**

#### *CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 34, PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECT LAW*

The state Public Housing Project Law, Article 34 of the California Constitution, requires a majority vote of the electorate to approve the development, construction, or acquisition by a public body of any “low rent project” within that jurisdiction. In other words, for any project to be built and/or operated by a public agency where at least 50 percent of the occupants are low-income and rents are restricted to affordable levels, the jurisdiction must seek voter approval.

#### *CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE, § 65008*

Government Code Section 65008 prohibits, inter alia, discrimination of any group or individuals in the enjoyment of residence, landownership, tenancy, or any other land use or against any resident development or emergency shelter.

#### *FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT OF 1959*

The Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) of 1959 (Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.) prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, disability, or source of income.

#### *THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1959*

The Unruh Civil Rights Act (Civ. Code, § 51) prohibits discrimination in “all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.” The provision has been interpreted to include businesses and persons engaged in the sale or rental of housing accommodations.

#### *CALIFORNIA RELOCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1971*

The California Relocation Assistance Act (Gov. Code, § 7260 et seq.) was passed in 1971, following the Uniform Act in 1970 (see discussion above in Federal Regulations). California’s version of the law has similar provisions requiring notification, counseling, social services, and financial assistance for persons displaced by transportation and land redevelopment projects. Under the California act, these procedural protections and benefits apply when the project causing the displacement has received state funding during any phase of the program or project, even if it did not receive federal funding.

## *THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES AND CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT OF 2008 (SEN. BILL 375 )*

Sen. Bill No. 375 (Stats. 2008, ch. 728) (SB 375) focuses on aligning transportation, housing, and other land uses to achieve regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets established under the California Global Warming Solutions Act, also known as Assem. Bill No. 32 (Stats. 2005, ch. 488) (AB 32). SB 375 requires California MPOs to develop an SCS as part of the MTP, with the purposes of identifying policies and strategies to reduce per capita passenger vehicle-generated GHG emissions.

SB 375 requires that the SCS:

- identify the general location of land uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region;
- identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region;
- identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need;
- identify a transportation network to service the regional transportation needs;
- gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resources areas and farmland in the region;
- consider the state housing goals; and
- set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region; and
- allow the regional transportation plan to comply with the federal Clean Air Act of 1970 (42 U.S. Code, § 7401 et seq.) (Gov. Code, § 65080, subd. (b)(F)(2)(B)), of which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies will reduce the GHG from automobiles and light duty trucks to achieve, if there is a reasonable way to do so, the GHG emission reduction targets approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). If the SCS does not achieve the GHG emission targets set by ARB, an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) must be developed to demonstrate how the targets could be achieved.

SB 375 also imposes a number of new requirements on the regional housing needs process. Prior to SB 375, the regional transportation plan and regional housing needs processes were not required to be coordinated. SB 375 now synchronizes the schedules of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) and regional transportation plan processes. The RHNA, which is developed after the regional transportation plan, must also allocate housing units within the region consistent with the development pattern included in the SCS (see Chapter 12 – Land Use Planning for a discussion of consistency between the 2013-2021 RHNA and the 2016 MTP/SCS).

As discussed in the section above, existing law requires local governments to adopt a housing element as part of their general plan. Unlike the rest of the general plan, where updates sometimes occur at intervals of 20 years or longer, under previous law the housing element was required to be updated as frequently as needed and no less than every five years. Under SB 375, this time period has been lengthened to eight years and timed so that the housing element period begins no less than 18 months after adoption of the regional transportation plan, to encourage closer coordination between the housing and transportation planning. SB 375 also changes the implementation schedule

required in each housing element. Previous law required the housing element to contain a program which set forth a five-year schedule to implement the goals and objectives of the housing element. The new law instead requires this schedule of actions to occur during the eight-year housing element planning period, and requires each action have a timetable for implementation.

#### *CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (CTC) REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) GUIDELINES*

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(c), each Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) is required to adopt and submit an updated RTP to CTC and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every four years. SACOG is the designated RTPA for Sacramento, Yolo, Sutter, and Yuba counties. Under Government Code Section 14522, the CTC is authorized to prepare guidelines to assist in the preparation of RTPs. The CTC's RTP guidelines suggest that projections used in the development of an RTP should be based upon available data (such as from the U.S. Census Bureau), use acceptable forecasting methodologies, and be consistent with the Department of Finance baseline projections for the region. The guidelines further state that the RTP should identify and discuss any differences between the agency projections and those of the DOF.

#### *GENERAL PLAN LAW (GOV. CODE, § 65000 ET SEQ.)*

Housing element law requires local governments to adequately plan to meet their existing and projected housing needs. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65580, a Housing Element of a General Plan must contain local commitments to:

- provide sites with appropriate zoning and development standards, and with services and facilities to accommodate the jurisdiction's RHNA for each income level; the RHNA is the only population and/or housing requirement that applies to the General Plan;
- assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of lower and moderate-income households;
- address and, where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, including housing for all income levels and housing for persons with disabilities;
- conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock;
- promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability; and
- preserve assisted housing developments for lower income households.

State Housing Element law mandates specific topics and issues that must be addressed in the Housing Element. These include:

- an analysis of population and employment trends, documentation of projections, and quantification of existing and projected housing needs for all income levels;
- an analysis and documentation of household characteristics, such as the age of housing stock, tenancy type, overcrowded conditions, and the level of payment compared to ability to pay;

- an analysis and documentation of special needs, such as female-headed households, homeless individuals, persons with disabilities, large households, farmworkers, and the elderly;
- a regional share of the total regional housing need for all income categories;
- an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant land and infill/redevelopment opportunities; this analysis also looks at potential residential sites and their accessibility to adequate infrastructure and services;
- identifying actual and potential governmental and nongovernmental constraints that could potentially impede the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing for all income groups;
- identifying and analyzing opportunities for energy conservation in residential developments;
- an inventory of at-risk affordable units that have the possibility of converting to market rate; and
- a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the improvement, maintenance, and development of housing.

Sen. Bill 2 (SB 2), effective as of January 1, 2008, amended State housing element law regarding shelter for homeless persons. The legislation requires that every jurisdiction identify potential zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without discretionary review. It also added new requirements for local governments to treat emergency shelter facilities and transitional housing or supportive housing developments the same as other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.

SACOG, like other councils of governments in the state, receives an overall regional housing allocation from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and must develop a methodology for calculating and distributing to each jurisdiction its fair share of the allocation. Each city and county in the plan area will receive an allocation of housing units, which it must accommodate with an eight-year zoned land supply. For the RHNA, SACOG must also plan for the Tahoe Basin portions of El Dorado and Placer County, which are outside of the MTP/SCS plan area. Allocations are distributed to each jurisdiction based on the state-defined economic categories: very low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and above moderate-income. The sum of the allocations of these four categories must equal the overall allocation for that jurisdiction. Each jurisdiction must then develop its housing element to address how it will zone for enough housing units during the eight-year period to meet the overall allocation and allocations by income category.

A copy of the draft housing element for each jurisdiction must be sent to HCD for review and comment before it may be adopted by the city or county. HCD will advise the local jurisdiction about the element's compliance with Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.). A housing element approved by HCD is presumed to meet the requirements of Housing Element Law. Table 14.2 on the next page shows the status of housing elements for all jurisdictions in the SACOG region as of June 2015.

## *CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODE*

The State of California’s minimum standards for structural design and construction are given in the California Building Code (CBC) (Cal. Code Regs. Title 24). The CBC is based on the IBC (International Code Council, 2012), which is used widely throughout the United States (generally adopted on a state-by-state or district-by-district basis) and has been modified for California with numerous, more detailed or more stringent regulations. California Building Standards Code contains nine parts: Electrical Code, Plumbing Code, Administrative Code, Mechanical Code, Energy Code, Elevator Safety Construction Code, Historical Building Code, Fire Code, and the Code for Building Conservation Reference Standards. These codes promote public health and safety and ensure that safe and decent housing is constructed in the Sacramento region. The codes serve to protect residents from hazards and risks, and are not considered to be undue constraints to housing production. The 2013 triennial edition of the Code applies to all occupancies that applied for a building permit on or after January 1, 2014, and remains in effect until the effective date of the 2016 triennial edition.

The CBC also incorporates the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code, otherwise known as “CALGreen,” which became effective January 1, 2014. CALGreen, which is the first State-mandated green building code in the nation, establishes mandatory minimum green building standards and optional Tier 1 and Tier 2 more stringent provisions. Cities and counties have the discretion to adopt either tier as mandatory or to adopt their own more stringent standards. The green building standards included in CALGreen enhance the design and construction of buildings using planning and design concepts that reduce negative impacts to the environment through energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, and material conservation and resource efficiency.

### **14.3.1 Local Regulations**

#### *GENERAL PLANS*

The Housing Element is one of the seven mandated elements of the local general plan, but it is the only element that must be certified by the State of California. Housing element law, enacted in 1969, mandates that local governments adequately plan to meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. The law acknowledges that, in order for the private market to address adequately housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory systems, which provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development. Though required by state law, this element (like others) is implemented at the local level. As a result, housing policy in the state rests largely upon the effective implementation of local general plans and, in particular, local housing elements. Table 14.2 lists the current status of housing element adoption and compliance in the region.

**Table 14.2  
Status of Housing Elements in the SACOG Region**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Housing Element Status</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>Date Reviewed</b>	<b>Compliance Status</b>
Auburn	ADOPTED	2/12/2014	2/20/2014	IN
Citrus Heights	ADOPTED	5/28/2013	6/4/2013	IN
Colfax	ADOPTED	3/7/2014	3/19/2014	IN
Davis	ADOPTED	3/6/2015	5/27/2015	IN
El Dorado <sup>2</sup>	ADOPTED	11/6/2013	11/13/2013	IN
Elk Grove	ADOPTED	2/28/2014	3/21/2014	IN
Folsom	ADOPTED	11/4/2013	12/3/2013	IN
Galt	ADOPTED	2/12/2014	2/20/2014	IN
Isleton	ADOPTED	2/27/2014	4/24/2014	IN
Lincoln	ADOPTED	11/18/2013	2/7/2014	IN
Live Oak	ADOPTED	9/9/2013	9/16/2013	IN
Loomis	ADOPTED	2/24/2014	4/30/2014	IN
Marysville	ADOPTED	2/24/2014	3/4/2014	IN
Placer <sup>2</sup>	ADOPTED	10/16/2013	11/22/2013	IN
Placerville	CONDITIONAL	10/17/2014	3/19/2015	OUT
Rancho Cordova	ADOPTED	1/13/2014	1/29/2014	IN
Rocklin	ADOPTED	10/28/2013	12/16/2013	IN
Roseville	ADOPTED	7/1/2013	8/22/2013	IN
Sacramento	ADOPTED	1/9/2014	3/19/2014	IN
Sacramento County	ADOPTED	11/5/2013	12/26/2013	IN
South Lake Tahoe <sup>2</sup>	ADOPTED	5/30/2014	7/16/2014	IN
Sutter County	ADOPTED	2/28/2014	3/7/2014	IN
West Sacramento	ADOPTED	10/8/2013	10/14/2013	IN
Wheatland	DRAFT	--	--	OVERDUE <sup>1</sup>
Winters	ADOPTED	10/23/2013	11/20/2013	IN
Woodland	ADOPTED	10/28/2013	11/6/2013	IN
Yolo County	ADOPTED	10/11/2013	1/7/2014	IN
Yuba City	ADOPTED	2/28/2014	4/16/2014	IN
Yuba County	ADOPTED	1/29/2014	2/12/2014	IN

<sup>1</sup> An "overdue" Housing Element is out of compliance for not being submitted during the current planning period in which due date has passed.

<sup>2</sup> For the RHNA, SACOG is required by state law to plan for the Tahoe Basin portions of El Dorado and Placer County, including the city of South Lake Tahoe.

Source: California Housing and Community Development Department, August 2015.

## 14.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

---

### 14.4.1 Methods and Assumptions

This impacts analysis looks at each significance criterion individually, assessing how implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS, including changes to the land use pattern and transportation network, may impact population and housing. For each impact, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS is assessed on three levels. First, impacts are assessed at the regional level. Second, the analysis considers impacts in the region based on five Community Types: Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development in the proposed MTP/SCS. Finally, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS is assessed in terms of its impacts to the region's Transit Priority Areas (TPAs). TPAs are areas of the region that are within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor. For a full description of Community Types and TPAs in the region, see Chapter 2 – Project Description.

The proposed MTP/SCS was evaluated to determine its potential to cause displacement of housing or people. The analysis evaluates the methodology used to create the land use forecast and transportation system of the proposed MTP/SCS. This methodology is described below. For an analysis of direct and indirect growth inducement, see Chapter 19 – Other CEQA Considerations.

#### *METHODOLOGY FOR LAND USE FORECAST AND TRANSPORTATION NETWORK OF THE PROPOSED MTP/SCS*

As discussed in Chapter 2 – Project Description, SACOG updates the MTP/SCS on a four-year cycle. The 2012 MTP/SCS update commenced with an update of the regional population, employment, and housing growth forecast for the region. The Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy (CCSCE) develops regional growth projections for SACOG, including projections of future employment (by major employment sector), population, and household growth at the regional scale. The CCSCE's regional growth projection method follows three major steps: (1) employment projections are made based on projections of U.S. and California job growth and the competitive position of the Sacramento region to capture a share of the state and national job growth; (2) population projections are made based on projected job growth, accounting for foreign immigration and domestic migration into the region; and (3) household projections are made based on projected population growth. This forecasting methodology for population is similar to the DOF methodology, except that DOF projections do not forecast employment or households. During the 2012 MTP/SCS update, this draft information was summarized for, and reviewed by, the SACOG Board and staff, member cities and counties, and stakeholders, and was ultimately approved by the SACOG Board. Once approved by the SACOG Board, the projections become the growth forecast that is utilized for planning purposes in the MTP/SCS.

For this update, the SACOG Board voted to keep the employment, population, and housing projections unchanged from the 2012 MTP/SCS, since the framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS has an emphasis on implementation of the 2012 MTP/SCS principles and the horizon year of 2036 is only one year later than the 2012 MTP/SCS horizon year of 2035. Basically, the same population, housing unit, and employment projection totals used for the 2012 MTP/SCS were applied to a different base year (2012) and horizon year (2036) for the 2016 MTP/SCS, assuming the projected totals will over 24 years instead of 27 years. Therefore, the projected growth occurs over a shorter period of time though the increment of change for each indicator differs because of losses or gains

(i.e., employment) during the period from 2008 to 2012. This approach reflects the fact that long-term growth trends for the region have not changed since the prior growth projections were prepared in 2010. Using this approach for the 2016 MTP/SCS projections is consistent with both the short-term and long-term indicators and is supported by stakeholders in the region. Additionally, SACOG staff updated the interim year projection for 2020 with particular attention to the pace of recovery from the recession. SACOG validated those projections through an unbiased peer review by six locally-based experts who track and/or project growth in the region, including: Stephen Levy, Director and Senior Economist at the Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy; Dr. Jeffrey Michael, Director at the Center for Business and Policy Research at the University of the Pacific; Greg Paquin, President of The Gregory Group; Walter Schwarm, Demographer at DOF; Ryan Sharp, Senior Vice President at Economic Planning Systems; and Dr. Sanjay Varshney, Vice President and Wealth Advisor at Wells Fargo Bank and former Dean of the School of Business Administration at Sacramento State University (SACOG, 2015).

The growth forecast represents total growth in the region. SACOG staff allocates the employment, population, and housing growth to specific geographic locations with consideration of multiple supply and demand variables, including: local land use plans and policies (both adopted and proposed), availability of existing infrastructure and economic feasibility of providing needed additional infrastructure, floodplain issues and the timing and likelihood of successful provision of needed flood protection infrastructure, the need for and timing of federal natural resource permits, timing of local entitlements, and historical and recent market trends for housing and employment. Using the regional growth forecast of employment and housing, SACOG then prepares an estimated growth pattern for the region. This growth pattern represents where the projected employment and housing will occur throughout the region during the MTP/SCS planning period. This process is governed by federal requirements related to RTPs and the federal Clean Air Act, which require that land use, population, and employment model assumptions be based upon the best available information and establish a reasonable relationship between the expected land use and the envisioned transportation system. This process is also governed by SB 375, specifically through requirements to include a SCS that identifies areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need, identify a transportation network to service the regional transportation needs, and demonstrate how the region can coordinate land use and transportation planning to meet the ARB GHG emissions reduction targets established pursuant to SB 375 for cars and light duty trucks.

The transportation network of the proposed MTP/SCS was synchronized with the land use pattern that accommodates the forecasted employment, population, and housing growth through 2036. This transportation network is constrained by a budget based on revenues that can be reasonably expected over the MTP/SCS planning period, which is based on the population growth forecast and the SACOG region's share of the state's population growth over the MTP/SCS planning period. Both federal and state laws that govern regional transportation plans require this financial constraint test. In addition, transportation projects must be scheduled over the course of the planning period to match the pace at which revenues are available to pay for them. This also limits the number of projects that can be planned for any given year and necessitates decisions about the relative priority of projects. Because many local agencies want to build most of their projects within the first 10 years of the plan, SACOG and local agencies must collaborate to arrange projects in a priority order. The resulting transportation system investments of the proposed MTP/SCS are synchronized to support the travel generated by the forecasted land use pattern, which is designed to accommodate the growth projected to occur in the region over the MTP/SCS planning period.

Impacts of the land use pattern and transportation network under the proposed MTP/SCS are assessed at each of the three levels of analysis (i.e., regional, Community Type, and Transit Priority Areas). By 2036, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will result in a land use pattern and transportation network that is different from existing conditions. Unless otherwise stated, “existing conditions” in the proposed MTP/SCS refers to conditions in the baseline year of 2012. The proposed MTP/SCS uses 2012 because it is the most recent year for which comprehensive land use, demographic, traffic count and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) data are available for the SACOG region. Chapter 1 – Introduction includes a more detailed discussion of the baseline year for the proposed MTP/SCS.

Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines includes a sample “environmental checklist form” that poses numerous questions regarding whether a project would contribute to various kinds of environmental impacts. The questions posed for population and housing impacts ask whether the project would:

- a) induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- b) displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- c) displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impacts that would result in displacement of people or existing housing, as identified in criteria “b” and “c” above, are addressed together under Impact POP-1 below. Criteria “a” is addressed in Chapter 19 – Other CEQA Considerations under section 19.3 Analysis of Growth-Inducement.

#### **14.4.2 Criteria for Determining Significance**

For the purposes of this EIR, SACOG has determined that adoption and/or implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS (including adoption of the MTP policies, adoption of the SCS, and adoption of the transportation project list and financing plan) would result in significant impacts under CEQA, if the following would occur:

1. Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

#### **14.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

*IMPACT POP-1: DISPLACE SUBSTANTIAL NUMBERS OF PEOPLE OR EXISTING HOUSING, NECESSITATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING ELSEWHERE.*

### **Regional Impacts**

SB 375 requires that the SCS identify areas in the region sufficient to house all of the population of the region. The proposed MTP/SCS accomplishes this through the methodology for the land use forecast and transportation system, which analyzes a regional economic forecast of employees and population to determine how much housing and employment is required to accommodate projected growth. The proposed MTP/SCS then allocates the housing needed to accommodate the growth

throughout the region. This method, in conjunction with vacancy factors applied in the regional travel model to simulate market conditions, identifies areas in the region to accommodate sufficient housing supply in the proposed MTP/SCS for the population expected to reside in the plan area through 2036.

The proposed MTP/SCS uses the adopted and proposed land use plans from the cities and counties of the SACOG region to help determine where the housing and employment growth is likely to occur. It concentrates a higher percentage of growth than the 2012 MTP/SCS in and near existing developed areas, near high frequency transit, and in areas that would improve local jobs/housing balances (e.g., locating new homes near existing jobs or new jobs near existing homes). This land use pattern is a realistic forecast of the expected growth in the region that also supports fundamental objectives of the proposed MTP/SCS, including continuing encouragement of the Blueprint Vision through a smart land use pattern, achieving the GHG emissions reduction targets of SB 375 by encouraging a reduction in miles driven by passenger vehicles, and locating growth near existing infrastructure to improve the financial stewardship of the transportation system.

To achieve these objectives, the land use forecast allocates housing and employment growth in areas of existing development to a greater degree than in the past. Although much of the growth is expected to occur through infill of vacant lots, some of the growth may occur through the redevelopment of existing buildings. To model the potential extent of redevelopment, SACOG's land use forecasting methodology identifies non-residential parcels for potential redevelopment by screening for a high land value to structure value ratio and a general plan designation that is higher value than the existing use (e.g., a commercial designation and an existing industrial use). However, this modeling exercise is not intended to dictate the exact parcels that may be redeveloped over the planning period and, therefore, the proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast the amount of housing and population that may be displaced by future land use changes. Instead, it assumes that the population and jobs forecast used to inform regional housing development is enough to meet the housing needs of that forecasted population. The amount of growth expected to occur during the MTP/SCS planning period could displace some existing homes and residents due to implementation of the land uses forecasted by the proposed MTP/SCS. However, the forecast and subsequent allocation of regional housing is enough to meet the demand, and therefore any displacement that occurs would not result in the need for new housing to be constructed.

In addition, the proposed MTP/SCS is a program-level document that forecasts the growth in population and housing, and develops a transportation system to support that growth. It does not regulate where growth actually occurs. The approval of land use projects occurs at the local level. Any project-level redevelopment that uses federal or state funds must follow the Uniform Act and the California Relocation Assistance Act to address the displacement of people or housing.

Therefore, the land use impacts associated with implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS at the regional level are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact POP – 1. No mitigation is required.

The proposed MTP/SCS transportation improvements are developed to most efficiently meet the demands created by the forecasted growth in population and jobs, and focus mainly on the existing regional transportation system. Proposed improvements will largely be constructed within existing right-of-ways and without the acquisition of land, or within an urbanizing area. In some cases, residential structures may have to be removed in order to make way for new or expanded

transportation facilities. In other cases, certain transportation improvements could permanently alter the characteristics and qualities of a neighborhood. In any case, the potential for displacement and disruption are considerations in the final design of individual transportation improvements and may be addressed in the project-level environmental review and mitigation process. From the regional perspective, it is assumed that some residential displacement and disruption will occur. However, because the proposed projects have not yet been designed, the exact number and location of displacements cannot be known at this time.

As described above, the housing developed in the proposed MTP/SCS accommodates the forecasted population for the region, taking into account market vacancy factors. For this reason, any displacement that occurs due to the construction of transportation projects in the proposed MTP/SCS is not expected to result in the construction of new housing units other than what is already included with the plan.

All transportation projects that use federal or state funds must follow the Uniform Act and the California Relocation Assistance Act for any displaced people or housing. Therefore, the transportation impacts associated with implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS at the regional level are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact POP – 1. No mitigation is required.

### **Localized Impacts**

*Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS*

The type and character of land use and transportation development that occurs in the proposed MTP/SCS differs by each Community Type. While some existing homes and residents may be displaced at the Community Type-level, the regional forecast and allocation of growth (described above in the Regional Impacts section of Impact POP-1) accommodate the housing demand and transportation system necessary to support the entire population projected during the planning period.

Therefore, like the regional impacts above, the localized impacts from the land use and transportation development of the proposed MTP/SCS are not anticipated to result in the displacement of people or housing that would require the construction of new housing. This impact from land use and transportation projects is considered less than significant (LS) for Impact POP – 1 for all Community Types. No mitigation is required.

### **Transit Priority Area Impacts**

*Placer County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County TPAs*

The TPAs, in aggregate, have more infill and redevelopment as compared to the region, which could displace more people and housing as a result of the implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS. While some existing homes and residents may be displaced at the TPA-level, the regional forecast and allocation of growth (as described above in the regional impacts section of Impact POP-1) accommodate the housing demand and transportation system necessary to support the entire population projected during the planning period. The allocation of regional housing is enough to meet demand, including that created through infill and redevelopment. Any displacement that occurs due to the construction of new housing or transportation projects in the proposed MTP/SCS

is not expected to result in the construction of new housing units other than what is already included with the plan.

Therefore, like the regional impacts above, the TPA impacts from the land use and transportation development of the proposed MTP/SCS are not anticipated to result in the displacement of people or housing that would require the construction of new housing. This impact for land use and transportation is considered less than significant (LS) for Impact POP – 1 for all TPAs. No mitigation is required.

***MITIGATION MEASURES***

None required.