

## **3.12 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT**



## 3.12 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

This section of the Draft EIR (DEIR) discusses the population and housing impacts of the proposed project. Impacts on the current conditions, as well as the projected conditions, are examined. This section also contains information regarding the project's relationship to adopted programs and plans.

### 3.12.1 SETTING

#### NEVADA COUNTY DEMOGRAPHICS

##### Population Trends

As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of this DEIR, the proposed project site is located in the unincorporated area of Nevada County. The California Department of Finance estimates the 2011 total population of Nevada County to be 99,111 persons, with 66,895 persons living in the unincorporated portion of the county (CDF 2011). **Table 3.12-1** shows the population trends in Nevada County during the last decade (2000 to 2010). As shown, the unincorporated county population generally increased at a slower rate (approximately 4.12 percent) than the total county population (approximately 7.69 percent) in the ten-year period between 2000 and 2010. Overall, Nevada County has experienced a slow growth rate when compared to surrounding counties and the State of California as a whole (Nevada County 2010).

**TABLE 3.12-1**  
**NEVADA COUNTY POPULATION TRENDS**

Year	Unincorporated County Population*	Total County Population*
2000	64,251	92,033
2001	63,910	92,864
2002	64,767	94,240
2003	65,709	95,476
2004	66,379	96,617
2005	66,340	97,639
2006	66,913	98,426
2007	66,880	98,631
2008	66,683	98,699
2009	66,568	98,649
2010	66,601	98,682
2011	66,895	99,111
<b>Percent Change 2000 to 2011</b>	<b>4.12%</b>	<b>7.69%</b>

\* Only 2010 and 2011 population numbers reflect the 2010 Census results.  
Source: CDF 2010, 2011a

## 3.12 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

### Housing

Table 3.12-2 shows the total number of housing units in Nevada County as estimated by the California Department of Finance from 2000 through 2011. The majority of the housing stock in both the unincorporated county and the county as a whole consists of single-family housing units. In fact, no new multi-family housing units have been added in the unincorporated county since 2005 (CDF 2010).

TABLE 3.12-2  
NEVADA COUNTY HOUSING ESTIMATES\*

Year	Unincorporated County			Total County		
	Single-Family Housing Units	Multi-Family Housing Units	Total Housing Units**	Single-Family Housing Units	Multi-Family Housing Units	Total Housing Units**
2000	24,784	545	27,845	37,198	3,699	44,282
2001	24,991	423	27,793	37,716	3,727	44,884
2002	25,362	423	28,248	38,395	3,819	45,739
2003	25,760	436	28,753	39,001	3,862	46,484
2004	26,136	448	29,245	39,659	4,010	47,394
2005	26,432	361	29,478	40,374	4,267	48,393
2006	26,751	361	29,846	40,882	4,318	49,001
2007	27,023	361	30,173	41,453	4,370	49,671
2008	27,275	361	30,442	41,991	4,498	50,364
2009	27,455	361	30,637	42,349	4,549	50,788
2010	27,583	361	30,780	42,568	4,538	51,013
2011	Not Available	Not Available	31,697	Not Available	Not Available	52,677

\* Not updated to reflect the 2010 Census results.

\*\* Total housing unit count includes mobile homes, which are not included in the single- or multi-family totals.

Source: CDF 2010, 2011b

### Persons per Household

The ratio between population and households is reflected in the household size, referred to as persons per household. The U.S. Census Bureau states that the number of persons per household in Nevada County in 2000 was 2.45, which is just slightly above the 2.40 persons per household estimated by the California Department of Finance in 2008 (Nevada County 2010).

### Population and Housing Projections

The Nevada County General Plan EIR, Volume 1 (Final Draft, March 1995) projects that complete buildout of General Plan land uses, which would occur at an unspecified future date, would result in a total of approximately 81,745 dwelling units, a population of 175,760, and 95,445 employees in Nevada County. The County's most recently adopted Housing Element (2009–2014 Housing Element, adopted May 2010) projects that the county's population will reach 105,884 by 2014, with a population of 69,560 in the unincorporated county. The Housing Element does not project the total number of housing units in the county.

### Employment

The State of California Employment Development Department (EDD) prepares employment estimates for the State of California, including Nevada County. According to the EDD, the number of persons employed increased until 2009, when the unemployment rate jumped from 5.2 percent in 2008 to 10.6 percent and 12.0 percent in 2009 and 2010, respectively (EDD 2011). The EDD estimates that unemployment in Nevada County is currently 11.4 percent.

### 3.12.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

#### LOCAL

#### Nevada County General Plan

The Nevada County General Plan serves as the overall guiding policy document for the unincorporated areas of Nevada County. A summary of the proposed project's consistency with applicable General Plan policies is contained in **Appendix 3.0-A**. While this Draft EIR analyzes the project's consistency with the General Plan pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15125(d), the Nevada County Board of Supervisors makes the ultimate determination of consistency with the General Plan.

#### Nevada County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 95530

In 1995, the Nevada County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 95530, stating that as part of the General Plan Final EIR certification process, the Board selected a modified Alternative 4: Mitigated General Plan with a buildout population cap of 150,000 persons for the county. As part of the adoption process of the Draft General Plan, the Board made changes to the land use maps and text, effectively revising this cap to approximately 140,000 persons.

### 3.12.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The impact analysis provided below is based on the State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds of significance, which indicate that the project would have a significant impact if it would:

- 1) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.
- 2) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction or replacement housing elsewhere.
- 3) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

#### METHODOLOGY

This section was prepared using U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance, and California EDD data, as well as demographic, housing, and employment information and projections contained in the County's 2009–2014 Housing Element adopted in May 2010. It should be noted that CEQA Guidelines Section 15131 states that economic and social effects

### 3.12 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

are not considered environmental impacts. However, physical impacts to the environment as a result of social and economic effects may be considered significant. The reader is also referred to Sections 3.1 through 3.14 of this DEIR for detailed analysis of other environmental impacts. Discussion regarding potential growth-inducing impacts due to the project is located in Section 6.0, Long-Term Implications of the Project, of this Draft EIR.

#### PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Induce Population, Housing, and Employment Growth (Standard of Significance 1)

**Impact 3.12.1** Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase of 239 more new residents than the 176 new residents the existing General Plan designation and zoning would allow on the project site. The population increase represents 0.14 percent of the county as a whole and therefore a **less than significant** impact.

The proposed project would result in development of the 215-acre project site with a continuing care retirement community (CCRC) featuring a variety of independent and supportive living arrangements including independent living, assisted living, and nursing care within a campus-like setting featuring commercial and recreational uses, transportation, and a variety of other services. The CCRC would include a total of 345 dwelling units, 275 of which would be single-occupancy units and 70 of which would be double-occupancy units. As shown in **Table 3.12-3** below, the proposed dwelling units would accommodate a maximum of 415 additional residents on the project site. In addition, the project would result in the need for approximately 43 employees on the project site.

**TABLE 3.12-3  
RINCON DEL RIO DWELLING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY**

Type of Dwelling Unit	Number of Double-Occupancy Units	Number of Double-Occupancy Residents	Number of Single-Occupancy Units	Number of Single-Occupancy Residents	Total Number of Residents
Independent Living	54	108	203	203	311
Assisted Living	3	6	56	56	62
Nursing Care	13	26	16	16	42
<b>TOTAL</b>	70	140	275	275	415

Source: SCO 2011

The *Draft Economic Analysis of the Proposed Rincon del Rio Senior Housing Project in Nevada County, California* (Applied Development Economics 2009) indicates that as many as 60 to 70 percent of the proposed project's residents would be drawn from western Nevada County and that the project is intended to serve existing Nevada County senior residents. While this would reduce the cumulative population growth effects of the project, the existing units vacated by the seniors would presumably be occupied, potentially by new residents from outside of the county. Furthermore, there is no requirement or guarantee that any of the project site residents would be from Nevada County. Therefore, this EIR assumes that growth on the project site would result in direct localized impacts (i.e., population, housing, and employment growth), as well as indirect environmental effects associated with growth (such as increased noise, increased

demand for public services, increased traffic), which are discussed in the relevant sections of this Draft EIR.

The proposed project would require an amendment to the site's General Plan land use designation from Planned Development, Estate (PD-EST) to Planned Development, Continuing Care Retirement Community (PD-CCRC). The Planned Development (PD) land use designation is intended to designate planned developments in locations where a mix of uses is desirable. The PD designation may allow a variety of land uses, including single-family and multi-family, residential, commercial, industrial, open space, and/or other land uses, consistent with the capability and constraints of the land.

The Estate (EST) land use designation is intended to provide for low-density residential development at a minimum lot size of 3 acres per dwelling unit in areas which are essentially rural in character, but are adjacent to community boundaries or near Community Regions and therefore are more accessible to shopping, employment, and services. The current land use designation would allow for 72 dwelling units (215 acres/3 acres for each dwelling unit = 71.6 dwelling units) and approximately 176 additional residents on the project site (72 dwelling units x 2.45 persons per household = 176 residents).

The project, as proposed, would increase the allowable density on the project site by 136 percent and result in greater general intensity of use than would be allowed under the current Nevada County General Plan designation (415 proposed residents – 176 residents under current designation = 239 additional residents; 345 proposed units – 72 units allowed under current designation = 273 additional units). The increase in population represents 0.14 percent of the county's total projected buildout population of 175,760 ( $239/175,760 = 0.00135$ ), which is not considered a substantial increase in population.

Other than construction jobs, it is unlikely that the existing zoning of the property would result in new employment opportunities. The project would also employ up to 43 employees, possibly increasing employment opportunities in Nevada County. With the county's unemployment rate of 11.4 percent, it is likely that at least some of the new jobs could be filled by existing Nevada County residents. Even if each employee was a new Nevada County resident, it is unlikely that new homes would be needed within the county to accommodate the increase in population due to the jobs created by the project. This is because review of only one of the real estate firms with a website shows over 200 single-family homes with three bedrooms or more for sale in the Lake of the Pines, Grass Valley, and Auburn area. Therefore, with the existence of so many homes for sale, it is reasonable to assume that, even if all 43 of the employees were from out of county and needed a home in Nevada County, the existing housing inventory would be sufficient to meet the demand.

While the proposed project would result in a higher residential density and general intensity of use on the project site than was anticipated in the Nevada County General Plan, the amount of population is minor when considered within the context of the county as a whole. The 0.14 percent potential increase in population is considered **less than significant**.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### 3.12 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

---

#### Displacement of a Substantial Number of Persons or Housing (Standards of Significance 2 and 3)

**Impact 3.12.2** Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of housing and/or persons. This is considered a **less than significant** impact.

The majority of the project site is currently undeveloped; however, there is one existing, 14,000-square-foot single-family residential structure on the property located near the southwest corner of the site. This existing structure would be modified to serve as a clubhouse for the proposed project. The clubhouse would be used by residents and prospective residents as a place to gather, socialize, relax, and party. The clubhouse would include common areas, pool, terrace, pool bar, exercise room, library, wine cellar, kitchen, theater, and bathrooms. In addition, the clubhouse would include a staff suite and four lodging suites that would serve as guest lodging for prospective residents. While the use of the existing home would be discontinued, the loss of a single housing unit will not affect housing overall in the region. The owner of the structure is one of the project applicants and is aware that construction of the project will require that the home no longer be used for residential purposes. Therefore, impacts would be considered **less than significant**.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### 3.12.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting consists of Nevada County and includes all existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the county. A list of projects in the cumulative setting can be found in **Table 3.0-2** in Section 3.0, Introduction to the Environmental Analysis and Assumptions Used, of this Draft EIR. The Nevada County General Plan EIR, Volume 1 (Final Draft, March 1995) projects that complete buildout of General Plan land uses, which would occur at an unspecified future date, would result in a total of approximately 81,745 dwelling units, a population of 175,760, and 95,445 employees in Nevada County. As part of the General Plan Final EIR certification process, the Nevada County Board of Supervisors selected a modified Alternative 4: Mitigated General Plan with a buildout population cap of 150,000 persons for the county. As part of the adoption process of the Draft General Plan, the Board made changes to the land use maps and text, effectively revising this cap to approximately 140,000 persons. As such, buildout of the county would result in a maximum of 140,000 persons.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Cumulative Increase in Population, Housing, and Employment

**Impact 3.12.3** The proposed project, along with other approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development, could induce population and housing growth in the region. However, the proposed project would have a **less than cumulatively considerable** contribution to this impact.

### Proposed CCRC Development

As discussed under Impact 3.12.1 above, implementation of the proposed project would result in the addition of 345 dwelling units, 415 residents, and 43 employees on the project site, an increase of 273 dwelling units and 239 residents over what would be allowed under the current Nevada County General Plan designation. For purposes of this analysis and to consider the worst-case environmental scenario, it is assumed that not only the project site residents but all of the 43 anticipated employees would be new residents of Nevada County. Under this assumption, the proposed project could result in an additional 282 residents over what would be allowed under the current Nevada County General Plan designation.

As previously discussed, as part of the County's General Plan Final EIR certification process, the Board of Supervisors attempted mitigation of certain countywide environmental impacts by adopting General Plan policies generally consistent with the environmentally superior Alternative No. 4. This adoption of mitigating policies was intended to effect a reduction in buildout capacity from approximately 181,000 persons to 140,000 persons countywide. However, a General Plan Implementation Measure for a county buildout growth limitation tied to growth in the cities was never adopted. Therefore, the County has determined that this 140,000 capacity level is not a "cap" in the sense of a growth limitation. Rather, it is merely an estimate for the buildout capacity that was expected to result from the General Plan as mitigated by the policies consistent with Alternative No. 4. Moreover, it was never intended to require growth in the unincorporated county to be limited or reduced by reason of added buildout capacity in the incorporated cities. The estimate was not intended to preclude land use decisions by the County because of increases in buildout capacity within city limits that are beyond the County's control (see Final EIR, Vol. 1, p. 3-24). In addition, other approved projects in the county have not and do not always achieve maximum density due to site-specific conditions and Planning Commission decisions. Therefore, over time, the net changes in buildout capacity appear to be in equilibrium with increases offset by decreases. This equilibrium is very consistent with the policies and estimates in the adopted General Plan, including those policies consistent with Alternative No. 4.

Viewed in this context, the fact that the project significantly increases the residential density and general intensity of use on the project site over what was anticipated for the site in the Nevada County General Plan does not necessarily mean that the project would reach or exceed the countywide population buildout capacity. An increase of 282 potentially new residents represents only a 1.6 percent increase over what would be allowed under the current Nevada County General Plan designation. Given that other approved projects in the county have not and do not always achieve maximum density as discussed above, it is unlikely that a 1.6 percent increase in expected population on the project site would be inconsistent with the build out capacity and Alternative No. 4. Therefore, the resulting cumulative impact of the proposed project on the population of Nevada County as a whole is considered **less than cumulatively considerable**.

### **3.12 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT**

---

#### General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

As discussed in further detail in Section 4.0, Cumulative Impacts Summary, the proposed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance text amendments are policy actions that would not directly result in population and housing impacts within the cumulative setting. However, future cumulative development in Nevada County would be subject to the new uses allowed by the proposed amendments, meaning that, after implementation of the proposed project, CCRCs would be permitted in either a PD (Planned Development) or SDA (Special Development Area) land use designation with approval of a zone change. As the PD and SDA designations are intended for the development of a variety of uses, future CCRC development would only be allowed in areas already planned for urban development and associated population and housing increases. Furthermore, the proposed amendments are consistent with policy direction in the General Plan to allow an increased number of dwelling units for housing for senior citizen households through the density bonus provision of Policy HD-8.1.6 (Policy 1.22). Therefore, the cumulative impacts of the proposed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance text amendments are considered **less than cumulatively considerable**.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### REFERENCES

- Applied Development Economics. 2009. *Draft Economic Analysis of the Proposed Rincon del Rio Senior Housing Project in Nevada County, California*. Walnut Creek, CA.
- CDF (California Department of Finance), Demographic Research Unit. 2010. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001–2010, with 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento.
- . 2011a. *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change – January 1, 2010 and 2011*. Sacramento.
- . 2011b. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2010–2011, with 2010 Benchmark*. Sacramento.
- EDD (California Employment Development Department). 2011. Accessed April 11. <http://www.edd.ca.gov/>.
- Nevada County. 1995. *Nevada County General Plan Environmental Impact Report, Volume 1 Final Draft – March 1995*.
- . 2010. *Housing Element 2009–2014, Nevada County, California*.
- SCO Planning, Engineering, and Surveying. 2011. *Total Unit Count and Occupancy per Unit*. Grass Valley, CA.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 1999a. *2000 Summary File 3, Matrices P58, P62, P63, P64, P65, P67, P71, P72, P73, P74, P82, PCT39, PCT40, PCT42, PCT44, and PCT45*.
- . 1999b. *Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) – Sample Data, Poverty Status in 1999 by Age*.

