

Chapter 14—Population and Housing

14.1 Introduction

This chapter describes existing conditions (environmental and regulatory) and assesses the potential population and housing impacts that may result from implementation of the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (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, analysis, and findings provided in this chapter were considered and prepared at a programmatic level. Direct or indirect inducement of substantial unplanned population growth is addressed in Chapter 19 – Other CEQA Considerations.

In response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), SACOG received comments related to housing from ECOS and Sierra Club (Placer). The commenters expressed that the Draft EIR should consider the following:

- gentrification and displacement in transit-oriented areas, and
- housing affordability generally and in transit-oriented areas.

The CEQA Guidelines note that comments received during the NOP scoping process can be helpful in “identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in depth in an EIR and in eliminating from detailed study issues found not to be important.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15083.) Neither the CEQA Guidelines nor Statutes require a lead agency to respond directly to comments received in response to the NOP, but they do require they be considered. Consistent with these requirements, this comment has been carefully reviewed and considered by SACOG and is reflected in the analysis of impacts in this chapter. Appendix PD-1 includes all NOP comments received.

14.2 Environmental Setting

14.2.1 Existing Population, Housing, and Employment Distribution

The 2016 Department of Finance (DOF) City/County Population and Housing Estimates indicate that the current population within the six counties, excluding the Tahoe Basin, is 2,376,311¹, representing a nearly 20 percent increase since 2000 (1,901,964). This is much higher than the growth rate of the state of California, which grew about 14 percent over the same period to a population of 39,328,337 in 2016. As of 2016, the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS was home to about six percent of the population in California (California Department of Finance 2019). Table 14-1 provides 2016 population, housing units, and employment for the region.

The population centers of the region are located in and around the region’s geographic center. Approximately 84 percent of the region’s population lives in incorporated cities, of which the cities

¹Tahoe Basin portions of El Dorado and Placer counties are based on 2010 Census counts of population, households and housing units.

of Sacramento, Elk Grove, and Roseville are most populous. Unincorporated Sacramento County itself is home to 577,323 people, making it the most populous of the jurisdictions in the region. The City of Sacramento, with approximately 472,693 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, Colfax, Winters, Live Oak, and Wheatland.

**Table 14-1
Population, Housing Units, and Employees by Jurisdiction (2016)**

Jurisdiction	Population ¹	Housing Units	Employees	Jobs/Housing Ratio
El Dorado²	147,202	63,812	48,690	0.8
Placerville	9,385	4,542	9,516	2.1
Unincorporated county	137,817	59,270	39,175	0.7
Placer²	363,896	146,701	162,577	1.1
Auburn	12,948	6,170	9,590	1.6
Colfax	2,044	916	736	0.8
Lincoln	47,659	18,615	9,704	0.5
Loomis	6,132	2,476	3,616	1.5
Rocklin	63,977	22,992	20,585	0.9
Roseville	135,355	51,494	82,398	1.6
Unincorporated county	95,781	44,038	35,948	0.8
Sacramento	1,476,573	570,360	688,897	1.2
Citrus Heights	85,740	35,584	20,435	0.6
Elk Grove	170,111	53,631	44,316	0.8
Folsom	72,918	27,542	45,425	1.6
Galt	24,806	7,932	4,942	0.6
Isleton	662	424	161	0.4
Rancho Cordova	72,320	26,859	59,503	2.2
Sacramento (City)	472,693	194,397	308,724	1.6
Unincorporated County	577,323	223,991	205,391	0.9
Sutter	96,392	34,186	34,405	1.0
Live Oak	7,611	2,572	1,012	0.4
Unincorporated county	21,863	7,786	6,799	0.9
Yuba City	66,918	23,828	26,594	1.1
Yolo	214,784	77,705	104,771	1.3
Davis	70,096	26,424	23,431	0.9
Unincorporated county	27,367	8,690	20,069	2.3
West Sacramento	53,395	19,728	33,123	1.7
Winters	7,067	2,401	2,277	0.9
Woodland	56,859	20,462	25,871	1.3
Yuba	77,464	28,378	21,403	0.8
Marysville	13,116	5,446	7,750	1.4
Unincorporated county	60,046	21,494	12,829	0.6
Wheatland	4,302	1,438	824	0.6
Region Total	2,376,311	921,142	1,060,742	1.2

¹ Population estimates for 2016 are based on persons per household rates by housing type. County totals are for incorporated cities and unincorporated areas.

² Excludes the portions of the county located within the Tahoe Basin.

Source: Data compiled and provided by SACOG in June 2019

Since adoption of the Blueprint Vision, many jurisdictions in the region have been 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 plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS.

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. As of 2016, the jobs/housing ratio is 0.8.

PLACER COUNTY

Placer County's population has historically been concentrated along the southwest section of the Interstate-80 (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. As of 2016, the jobs/housing ratio is 1.1.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Sacramento County is the region's population center, including both the largest city (i.e., City of Sacramento) and unincorporated area (i.e., County of Sacramento) within the region. Sacramento County housed 62 percent of the region's population in 2016. Sacramento County, and the cities therein, also contained a majority of the region's housing (62 percent) and employment (65 percent) in 2016. As of 2016, the jobs/housing ratio is 1.2.

SUTTER COUNTY

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. As of 2016, the jobs/housing ratio is 1.0.

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. Much of the employment located in the cities of West Sacramento and Davis. As of 2016, the jobs/housing ratio is 1.3.

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's current employment centers are the City of Marysville and Beale Air Force Base. As of 2016, the jobs/housing ratio is 0.8.

14.3 Regulatory Setting

14.3.1 Federal Regulations

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S. Code Section 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 Section 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, of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (Fair Housing Act) (42 U.S. Code Section 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

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act) (42 U.S. Code Section 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

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

THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

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

THE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974

The Housing and Community Development Act (42 U.S. Code Section 5301 et seq.) prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, or religion in programs and activities receiving financial assistance from U.S. 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 Sections 6101–6107) prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance.

THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (42 U.S. Code Section 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

The Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act (NAHASDA) (25 U.S. Code Section 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 Section 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 Section 12704) to make tribes and tribally designated housing entities eligible for Youth Build grants.

INDIAN VETERANS HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2010

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

FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACTS

Under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST Act) (Public Law 114-94) and the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21 Act) (Public Law 112-141)), the U.S. Department of Transportation requires that metropolitan planning organizations, such as SACOG, prepare long-range regional transportation plans (RTPs) and update them every four years if they are in areas designated as "nonattainment" or "maintenance" for federal air quality standards. Before enactment of MAP-21, the primary federal requirements regarding RTPs were included in the metropolitan transportation planning rules (Title 23 CFR Part 450 and 49 CFR Part 613). The FAST Act and MAP-21 Act make a number of changes to the statutes that underpin these regulations. With respect to population and housing, the rules and regulations require that RTPs must be developed for a period of not less than 20 years into the future and reflect the most recent assumptions for population, land use, employment, and economic activity.

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 Executive 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

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 SECTION 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 (Government Code Section 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 (Civil Code Section 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 (Government Code Section 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.

STATE HOUSING ELEMENT LAW

State law requires that each city and county prepare and adopt a general plan for its jurisdiction that contains certain mandatory elements, including a housing element. 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 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (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.

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.

A copy of the draft housing element for each jurisdiction must be sent to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review and comment before it may be adopted by the city or county. HCD will advise the local jurisdiction regarding whether the draft housing element substantially complies with Housing Element Law (Government Code Section 65580 et seq.). A housing element determined by HCD to be in substantial compliance is presumed to meet the requirements of Housing Element Law.

Several statutory changes related to state housing element law were enacted January 1, 2018, as part of the 2017 Legislative Housing Package. These changes included SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017), which creates a streamlined approval process for specific housing developments in localities that have not yet met their housing targets; AB 1397 (Chapter 375, Statutes of 2017), which requires cities to zone more appropriately for their share of regional housing needs and in certain circumstances requires by-right development; and AB 166 (Chapter 367, Statutes of 2017), which requires a city or county to identify additional low-income housing sites in their housing element when market-rate housing is developed on a site currently identified for low-income housing. Other new/revised statutes address the creation and preservation of affordable housing, housing element accountability and enforcement, and processes to streamline housing development.

REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND ALLOCATION

SACOG, like all other councils of governments in the state, receives an overall regional housing assessment from HCD and must develop a methodology for calculating and distributing to each jurisdiction its fair share of the assessment figure. Each city and county in the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS 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 counties, which are outside of the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS.

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.

THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES AND CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT OF 2008

The Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375) (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) required, in part, the preparation of a sustainable communities strategy (SCS) as part of the RTP. Among other things, the SCS must identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the RTP, taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation, and employment growth (Government Code Section 65080). Under SB 375, preparation of the RHNA is coordinated with preparation of the SCS. The RHNA must allocate housing units consistent with the SCS development pattern (Government Code Section 65584.04(i)). The SCS is required to use the most recent planning assumptions considering general plans and other factors (Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)).

Under SB 375, MPO schedules to adopt RTPs that determine regional housing needs assessments and housing-element due dates are differentiated based on the region's air quality attainment status for one or more pollutants regulated by the federal Clean Air Act. "Non-attainment" MPOs, such as SACOG, adopt RTPs every four years. Regional housing needs assessments and housing-element schedules must be coordinated with every other RTP, requiring housing elements be updated every eight years and no later than 18 months after RTP adoption. The preparation of the proposed MTP/SCS coincides with Cycle 6 of the RHNA for SACOG (June 30, 2021 to August 31, 2029).

CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODE

The minimum standards for structural design and construction in the State of California are identified in the California Building Code (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 24). The 2016 triennial edition of Title 24 was published July 1, 2016 with an effective date of January 1, 2017. Additionally, an intervening supplement was published January 1, 2017 with an effective date of July 1, 2018. Information Bulletins 16-01 and 17-06 provide detailed information concerning changes to the 2016 publication. The 2016 California Building Standards Code contains the following 12 codes: Building (including Residential), Electrical, Plumbing, Administrative, Mechanical, Energy, Historical Building, Fire, Existing Building, Green Building Standards (CALGreen), 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 2016 triennial edition remains in effect until the effective date of the 2019 triennial edition, which will become effective January 1, 2020.

14.3.1 Local Regulations

LOCAL HOUSING ELEMENTS

The Housing Element is one of the eight 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 plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS.

**Table 14-2
Status of Housing Elements in the Plan Area of the Proposed MTP/SCS**

Jurisdiction	Housing Element Status	Date Received	Date Reviewed	Compliance Status
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 County ¹	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	CONDITIONAL	6/11/2018	7/2/2018	IN
Marysville	CONDITIONAL	8/8/2018	9/4/2018	IN
Placer County ¹	ADOPTED	10/16/2013	11/22/2013	IN
Placerville	CONDITIONAL	10/17/2014	3/19/2015	IN
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	ADOPTED	5/30/2014	7/16/2014	IN
Sutter County	CONDITIONAL	5/29/2018	6/21/2018	IN
West Sacramento	ADOPTED	10/8/2013	10/14/2013	IN
Wheatland	ADOPTED	6/14/2019	--	IN REVIEW
Winters	ADOPTED	10/23/2013	11/20/2013	IN
Woodland	ADOPTED	10/4/2018	12/3/2018	IN
Yolo County	ADOPTED	10/11/2013	1/9/2014	IN
Yuba City	ADOPTED	2/28/2014	4/16/2014	IN
Yuba County	ADOPTED	1/29/2014	2/12/2014	IN

¹ For the RHNA, SACOG is required by state law to plan for the Tahoe Basin portions of El Dorado and Placer County. Source: California Housing and Community Development Department 2019

14.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

14.4.1 Methods and Assumptions

This program-level analysis generally evaluates potential physical displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing units based on the projected land use pattern and planned transportation network relative to the known distribution of existing population and housing units.

By 2040, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS would 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 2016. The proposed MTP/SCS uses 2016 because it is the most recent year for which comprehensive land use, demographic, traffic count, and VMT data are available for the SACOG region. Chapter 1 – Introduction includes a more detailed discussion of the baseline for the proposed MTP/SCS. For this chapter, 2016 serves as the baseline for all impact comparisons.

For each impact, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS is assessed on three levels. First, impacts are assessed at the regional level for the entire plan area. Second, impacts are assessed for the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS’s five Community Types: Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development. And third, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS is assessed in terms of its impacts to the region’s High Frequency Transit Areas (HFTAs). Refer to Chapter 2 – Project Description for a full description of the Community Types and HFTAs and the projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements within these areas.

The proposed MTP/SCS is evaluated to determine whether forecasted land use patterns and planned transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS would cause physical displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Displacement risk is a function of the location and availability of affordable housing near major job centers in a growing regional economy. As the growth in jobs (particularly those that pay higher wages) outpaces the supply of housing (particularly those that are affordable to lower-income households), the cost of housing inevitably rises faster than wages for all workers. In such market conditions, higher-income workers are better positioned to compete for the limited supply of housing opportunities, resulting in a higher risk of displacement for all other residents. To the extent that the private or the public sectors can provide more market rate and deed-restricted affordable housing in these communities, this risk subsides. Displacement risk for lower-income residents may increase because of other reasons as well. These include:

- physical constraints such as a lack of available land for new housing in communities that have a significant number of jobs, with the resulting potential for redevelopment of existing residential areas with new employment or residential development;
- policy constraints such as regulations that hinder environmentally-sound development of infill sites;
- lack of other sites that could support higher-density housing, and inadequate public spending on housing and transportation infrastructure;

- social constraints such as local community opposition to higher-density rental housing; and
- economic conditions, such as high land and labor costs, loss of household income as a result of a shrinking market for middle-wage jobs, and competition for available land from other uses.

CEQA requires analysis and mitigation of potentially substantial adverse changes in the physical environment (PRC Sections 21151, 21060.5, and 21068). “Economic and social changes resulting from a project are not treated as significant environmental effects [citation] and, thus, need not be mitigated or avoided under CEQA.” (*San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco* (1984) 209 Cal.App.3d 1502, 1516.). Physical changes in the environment caused by economic or social effects of a project may constitute significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15131 and 15064(e)). Social and economic effects in and of themselves, however, are not significant effects on the environment under CEQA. (*Melom v. City of Madera* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 41, 55.). Impact POP-1 addresses the potential for physical displacement impacts at the three levels of analysis.

To the extent households are indirectly displaced and move to new housing because of social or economic factors (e.g., increasing rents), household travel behavior and associated environmental impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation, and noise would be affected. These impacts are analyzed in other chapters of this EIR as part of the analysis of overall impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS on these resource topics. Such indirect impacts of physical displacement are not addressed further in this chapter.

The impact analysis takes into account the methodology used to create the land use forecast of the proposed MTP/SCS, which is the result of a technical process that included local agency plans and development codes, coordination with local agency planning departments and stakeholders, consideration of market and policy/regulatory factors, and direction from the SACOG Board of Directors. The land use forecast methodology is described in more detail in Section 2.6.2 of this EIR and in Appendix C: Land Use Forecast and D; Land Use Forecast Documentation, of the proposed MTP/SCS. Direct or indirect inducement of substantial unplanned population growth is addressed in Chapter 19 – Other CEQA Considerations.

The analysis assumes implementing agencies will ensure population and housing are treated in accordance with applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations as part of project planning, design and engineering.

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 would result in significant population and housing impacts under CEQA, if the following would occur:

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

14.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

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

Regional Impacts

Regional displacement is addressed by SB 375, which requires that the proposed MTP/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 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 2040.

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 growth 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). The projected 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, and locating growth near existing infrastructure to improve the financial stewardship of the transportation system.

To achieve these objectives, the land use forecast focuses housing and employment growth in areas of existing development. 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, taking into account localized displacement of some people or housing units. The forecast and subsequent allocation of regional housing is enough to meet the demand. As such, the proposed MTP/SCS would accommodate any displacement that may occur and would not result in the need for new replacement housing to be constructed elsewhere.

Adoption of the proposed MTP/SCS does not authorize or provide entitlements to redevelopment or construction projects in the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS. Rather, the proposed MTP/SCS is a regional strategy that sets a vision for future development, which must still be reviewed, analyzed and approved by local governments, which retain full control over local land use authority. In addition, 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 potential for regional impacts associated with displacement of substantial numbers of people or housing that results in construction of replacement housing elsewhere from implementation of the projected land use pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact POP-1. No mitigation is required.

The proposed MTP/SCS planned 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. Planned transportation improvements would largely be constructed within existing rights-of-way and with minimal to no acquisition of land, with acquired lands typically consisting of areas immediately adjacent to existing rights-of-way that does not contain residential housing units. In rare cases, residential structures may have to be removed to make way for new or expanded transportation facilities. In other cases, certain planned transportation improvements could permanently alter the characteristics and qualities of a neighborhood. The degree of the disruption would generally depend on the size and extent of the transportation improvement and the associated need to acquire new right-of-way. In any case, the potential for displacement and disruption are considerations in the final design of individual planned 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 would occur. However, because the proposed projects have not yet been designed, the exact number and location of displacements cannot be known at this time and any attempt to predict them would be speculative.

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 planned transportation improvements 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.

In addition, 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 potential for regional impacts associated with displacement of substantial numbers of people or housing that results in construction of replacement housing elsewhere from implementation of the planned transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS 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 the projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements that occurs in the proposed MTP/SCS differs by each Community Type. While some existing people or housing units 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 projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS are not anticipated to result in the substantial displacement of people or housing that would require the construction of new replacement housing. This impact is considered less than significant (LS) for Impact POP-1 for all Community Types. No mitigation is required.

High Frequency Transit Area Impacts

Placer County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County High Frequency Transit Areas

The HFTAs, 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 HFTA-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 projected land use pattern or planned transportation improvements in the proposed MTP/SCS would not result in the construction of new replacement housing units beyond what is already included with the plan.

Therefore, like the regional impacts above, the projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS are not anticipated to result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing within HFTAs that would require the construction of new replacement housing elsewhere. This impact for the projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements is considered less than significant (LS) for Impact POP-1 for all HFTAs. No mitigation is required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.