

# 10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

## 10.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides information relevant to population and housing impacts under NEPA and CEQA in connection with the Proposed Action and alternatives. This chapter includes introduction, environmental and regulatory setting, impact analysis methods and assumptions, significance criteria, environmental effects of the action and alternatives, and mitigation measures to address effects that are identified as significant.

### 10.1.1 Data Sources

The following key sources of data and information were reviewed to prepare the population and housing chapter.

- ▲ *Yolo County 2013-2021 Housing Element* (Yolo County 2013);
- ▲ *City of Davis Housing Element Update 2013-2031* (City of Davis 2014);
- ▲ *City of West Sacramento 2013-2021 Housing Element Update* (City of West Sacramento 2013);
- ▲ *City of Winters 2013-2021 Housing Element Update* (City of Winters 2013);
- ▲ *City of Woodland 2013-2021 Housing Element Update* (City of Woodland 2013);
- ▲ Regional Housing Needs Plan for the SACOG Region January 1, 2013 through October 31, 2021 (SACOG 2012);
- ▲ Federal census data on demographics, income, and employment in Yolo County (U.S. Census Bureau 1990, 2000, 2010);
- ▲ California Department of Finance's (DOF) population and housing estimates for cities, counties and the state (DOF 2014, 2015a, 2015b); and
- ▲ U.S. Census Bureau's 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

### 10.1.2 Definitions

A General Plan by definition guides and directs growth in a community or region by providing a plan for accommodating future increased population, housing, and other development. The Housing Element is one of the seven mandated elements of the general plan and works to ensure local governments adequately plan to meet existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Unlike the other mandatory general plan elements, the housing element is required to be updated every 8 years for the Sacramento region, and is subject to detailed statutory requirements and mandatory review by a State agency (Department of Housing and Community Development). The Housing Element identifies the community's goals, policies, and standards designed to address housing supply and affordability needs, ensure equal access to housing, reduce housing constraints, work to preserve existing housing opportunities, and promote energy conservation in housing.

## 10.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

### 10.2.1 Environmental Setting

#### POPULATION

As of January 2015, 87 percent of Yolo County's population of 209,393 residents resided in the four incorporated cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Sacramento (DOF 2015a [Table 10-1]). The average annual growth rate for the county as a whole from 2010 to 2015 was 0.84 percent. The unincorporated county had an average annual growth rate of 1.97 percent (2,494 persons), which, in terms of percentage growth, was higher than any of the cities. West Sacramento's average annual growth rate was 1.02 percent (2,528 persons), the highest among the cities. The City of Davis had the lowest average annual growth rate at 0.34 percent (1,135 persons).

The Department of Finance estimates that the county's population will grow at an average annual rate of 0.79 percent from 2010 to 2060, with a 2060 population of 298,451 (DOF 2014).

**Table 10-1 Yolo County Population and Annual Growth Estimates for 2010 – 2015**

Area/Jurisdiction	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average Annual Growth (percent)
<b>Incorporated Cities</b>							
Davis	65,622	65,419	65,465	66,101	66,802	66,757	0.34
West Sacramento	48,744	49,051	49,606	50,157	50,908	51,272	1.02
Winters	6,624	6,608	6,878	6,922	6,970	6,954	0.98
Woodland	55,468	55,346	55,996	56,569	57,307	57,525	0.73
<b>Unincorporated County</b>	24,391	24,647	26,260	26,630	26,259	26,885	1.97
<b>County Total</b>	<b>200,849</b>	<b>201,071</b>	<b>204,205</b>	<b>206,379</b>	<b>208,246</b>	<b>209,393</b>	<b>0.84</b>

Source: DOF 2015a

#### HOUSING

As shown in Table 10-2, housing in Yolo County is characterized by a majority of single-family homes (i.e. 49,582) and fewer multi-unit buildings (i.e. 22,116). According to DOF 2015 estimates, single-family detached homes in the county's four incorporated cities comprise approximately 57% percent of the county's total housing. Woodland has the greatest number of single-family detached homes in the county with 12, 818 units (Table 10-2). West Sacramento has the greatest number of mobile homes in the county, comprising approximately 43% percent of the county's total mobile home units. Mobile homes are an important source of affordable housing in Yolo County. Approximately 10 percent of total housing units within Yolo County are located within the unincorporated portion of the county.

Vacancy rates, which are a good indicator of the demand for housing, are relatively low in the county, but vary depending on location. The DOF 2015 estimates indicate that the vacancy rates for the incorporated cities range from approximately 3.4 percent in Davis to 6.3 percent in West Sacramento (Table 10-2). Vacancy rates in the unincorporated county are approximately 9.4 percent. Generally, a vacancy rate of 5 percent is considered to be an indicator of a relatively balanced housing market with sufficient availability and options for residents.

**Table 10-2 Estimated Housing Types, Vacancy and Household Size for Yolo County (2015)**

Incorporated Cities	Housing Type					Occupancy			
	Single Units		Multiple Units		Other	Total Housing Units	Occupied	Vacancy Rate (percent)	Persons per House-hold
	Detached	Attached	2 - 4	5+	Mobile Homes				
Davis	12,318	2,271	3,165	7,822	487	26,063	25,174	3.4	2.59
West Sacramento	12,144	1,015	1,257	3,344	1,508	19,268	18,048	6.3	2.82
Winters	1,715	109	183	276	88	2,371	2,259	4.7	3.08
Woodland	12,818	1,135	1,673	3,997	537	20,160	19,142	5.0	2.96
<b>Unincorporated County</b>	5,856	201	275	124	913	7,369	6,677	9.4	2.87
<b>County Total</b>	44,851	4,731	6,553	15,563	3,533	75,231	71,300	5.2	2.79
<b>California Total</b>	8,066,626	975,132	1,121,287	3,191,257	560,407	13,914,715	12,830,035	7.8	2.95

Note: Any UC Davis campus housing included in the Department of Finance data is attributed to the unincorporated county.

Source: DOF 2015b

In 2014, the median home value of owner-occupied units in Yolo County as a whole was \$317,700 (U.S. Census 2014). However, housing prices can vary considerably across communities in Yolo County. In 2014, the median value of owner-occupied units in the incorporated cities ranged from \$248,000 for a home in the City of West Sacramento to \$532,800 for a home in City of Davis (Table 10-3). The median home value in the city of Davis is the highest in the region and surpassed the median home value of \$371,400 for California as a whole.

**Table 10-3 Median Housing Prices of Owner-Occupied Units**

Community	Median Home Value (2014)
Davis	\$532,800
Woodland	\$254,200
Winters	\$262,700
West Sacramento	\$248,000
Yolo County	\$317,700
Sacramento County	\$236,500
California	\$371,400

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate

## 10.2.2 Regulatory Setting

### FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

There are no federal laws or regulations related to housing and population relevant to the analysis of impacts from the Proposed Action and alternatives.

## STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

### California Government Code Section 65302(c)

The state of California requires all general plans to include a Housing Element. Housing elements must be updated at least every eight years. The Housing Elements for Yolo County and each city within the county are summarized below in the discussion of *Local Laws and Regulations*.

### California Government Code Section 65584

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) requires development of Regional Housing Needs Plans (RHNPs) by regional council of governments (COG). RHNPs assign a share of a region's housing construction need to each city and county. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) determines fair-share portions of State allocations for Yolo County, which are included in SACOG's RHNP (SACOG 2012).

## LOCAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

### Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Regional Housing Needs Plan

Based on the regional determination provided by HCD, a COG must develop both a RHNP and a Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). These state-mandated documents allocate a "projected share" of the regional housing needs to each of the cities and counties in a COG. The RHNA establishes the total number of housing units that each city and county must plan for within an eight-year planning period. Based on the adopted RHNA, each city and county must update the Housing Element of its general plan to demonstrate how the jurisdiction will meet the expected growth in housing need over this period of time. An RHNP further refines the housing needs analysis by allocating to the cities and counties their "fair share" of the region's projected housing need based on household income group over a 7.5-year planning period covered by the plan. The RHNP provides an opportunity for fair distribution of housing among cities and counties for a mix of housing affordable to all economic segments. The housing allocation targets are goals for each community to accommodate through appropriate planning policies and land use regulations.

The RHNP for the SACOG Region assigns the allocations to cities and counties in the six-county Sacramento region, including Yolo County and its cities. The SACOG RHNP adopted in 2012 covers the planning period from January 1, 2013 to October 31, 2021 (SACOG 2012).

### Yolo County Housing Element

The Yolo County 2013-2021 Housing Element was adopted in October 2013 and addresses the statewide housing goal of "attaining decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family" (Yolo 2013: HO-2). The Housing Element identifies the community's goals and policies relative to the improvement, development, and maintenance of housing in Yolo County. The following goal and policy related to housing are relevant to the analysis of the HCP/NCCP:

**Goal HO-1 Housing Mix.** Provide housing to meet the social and economic needs of each community, including both existing and future residents, as well as employers.

- ▲ **Policy HO-1.2.** Ensure that amendments to the General Plan do not result in a net loss of zoned land upon which the inventory for meeting the County's RHNA allocation relies. Promote live/work uses, such as home occupations, employee housing, and caretaker accommodations.

### City of Davis Housing Element

The City of Davis 2013-2021 Housing Element (City of Davis 2014) contains various goals with associated standards, policies, and actions, designed to address the City's housing supply and affordability needs, ensure equal access to housing, reduce housing constraints, work to preserve existing housing

opportunities, and promote energy conservation in housing. The following goal and policy related to housing are relevant to the analysis of the HCP/NCCP:

**Goal HOUSING 1.** Promote an adequate supply of housing for people of all ages, income, lifestyles, and types of households consistent with General Plan policies and goals.

- ▲ **Policy HOUSING 1.1.** Encourage a variety of housing types that meet the housing needs of an economically and socially diverse Davis.

### City of West Sacramento Housing Element

The City of West Sacramento 2013-2021 Housing Element Update (City of West Sacramento 2013) contains various goals that focus on adequate land for a balanced range of housing; maintenance, improvement, and rehabilitation of housing; energy efficiency; balance of employment and housing; adequate services for residential development; and equal housing opportunity. In addition, policies, implementation programs, and actions are included to help the City meet its housing goals. The following goal and policy related to housing are relevant to the analysis of the HCP/NCCP:

**Goal HE-1.** Adequate Land for A Balanced Range Of Housing (Encompasses Government Code Sections 65583(C)(1), (2), & (3))

- ▲ **Policy HE-P-1.2.** The City shall maintain an adequate supply of residential land in appropriate land use designations and zoning categories to accommodate the City's regional housing allocation under the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Regional Housing Needs Plan.

### City of Winters Housing Element

The City of Winters 2013-2021 Housing Element Update (City of Winters 2013) is based on seven strategic goals that would facilitate the provision of housing to meet the needs of all income levels. Policies, programs, and an action plan are provided to meet these strategic goals. The Housing Element also identifies and analyzes housing needs and the resources and constraints to meeting those needs. The following goal and policy related to housing are relevant to the analysis of the HCP/NCCP:

**Goal II.A.** To designate adequate land for a balanced range of housing types and densities for all economic segments of the community.

- ▲ **Policy II.A.2.** The City shall maintain an adequate supply of residential land in appropriate land use designations and zoning categories to accommodate the City's fair share of projected regional growth and have as a goal a residential vacancy rate of 5 percent.

### City of Woodland Housing Element

The City of Woodland 2013-2021 Housing Element Update (City of Woodland 2013) contains 4 goals designed to address development and maintenance of housing, equal opportunity in housing, and energy conservation and sustainable housing development. Each goal statement includes policy, implementation programs, the agency or department responsible for carrying out the program, and a timeframe for accomplishing the program. Several of the implementation programs also have quantified objectives.

The following goal and policy are relevant to this project:

**Goal 2.A.** To promote the provision of adequate housing for all persons in the City, including those with special housing needs and to emphasize the basic human need for housing as shelter.

- ▲ **Policy 2.A.2.** The city shall ensure sufficient land for residential development, consistent with the City's fair share obligation, that promotes efficient use of land and reduces significant environmental impacts.

## 10.3 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

### 10.3.1 Methodology and Significance Criteria

#### METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The evaluation of potential impacts to population and housing is based on a review of population and housing data, the Regional Housing Needs Plan, and the Housing Elements pertaining to the Plan Area described above in Sections 10.2.1, *Environmental Setting* and 10.2.2, *Regulatory Setting*. The impact analysis considers whether the Proposed Action and alternatives would induce substantial population growth or housing that could result in an adverse change in the physical environment beyond that which was addressed in planning documents within the Plan Area.

As described in Section 3.3, the issuance of ITPs by the Wildlife Agencies for take of 12 covered species associated with five categories of covered activities—together with subsequent adoption and implementation of the Plan by the Applicants consistent with the Permits—is the Proposed Action considered in this EIS/EIR. Issuance of permits by the Wildlife Agencies only provides compliance with the FESA and NCCPA.

All covered activities are subject to the approval authority of one or more of the Applicants with jurisdiction over such projects, and HCP/NCCP approval and permit issuance for take of covered species does not confer or imply approval from any entity other than the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to implement the covered activities. Rather, as part of the standard approval process, individual projects will be considered for further environmental analysis and generally will receive separate, project-level environmental analysis review under CEQA and, in some cases, NEPA for those projects involving federal Agencies.

The assessment of potential effects on population and housing in the Plan Area is based on the anticipated changes in land cover and land uses over 50 years, corresponding to the permit term under the Proposed Action.

Anticipated changes in land cover/land use for each alternative are described in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*. See Chapter 3, *Approach to the Analysis*, for a description of the methodology used across all resource chapters for the analysis of cumulative effects.

As described in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, the Conservancy has proposed a number of changes to the HCP/NCCP since the release of the Draft on June 1, 2017. These changes are described and Characterized in Section 2.3.2, *Alternative B – Proposed Action Alternative (Permit Issuance/Plan Implementation)*, of Chapter 2.

These proposed changes fall into several categories;

- ▲ Copy edits such as correction of spelling errors,
- ▲ Minor text clarifications and corrections such as providing or correcting cross references to other parts of the document,
- ▲ Minor numeric corrections, such as small adjustments to acreages of particular land cover types,
- ▲ Providing updated information since publication of the Draft HCP/NCCP such as including information from the City of Woodland General Plan Update 2035, which was adopted after the Draft HCP/NCCP was published,

- ▲ Clarifications or enhancements to particular plan elements such as new or updated Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs),
- ▲ Increased details on plan implementation such as providing additional information on the content of the Implementation Handbook, and
- ▲ Changes in assumptions regarding costs and funding to reflect updated information.

These proposed changes have been analyzed to determine whether they would result in any changes to the impact analysis or conclusions reached in the Draft EIS/EIR. This analysis is provided in Section 24.2, *Evaluation of Proposed Modifications to the Draft HCP/NCCP*. The analysis substantiates that the proposed changes to the HCP/NCCP do not alter the analysis or impact conclusions provided in the Draft EIS/EIR for population and housing. Therefore, no changes to the analysis provided below are merited.

## SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Effects would be significant if an alternative would result in the following:

- ▲ 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);
- ▲ displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- ▲ displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

## 10.3.2 Effects of Proposed Action and Alternatives

### ALTERNATIVE A—NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE (NO PERMIT/NO PLAN IMPLEMENTATION)

#### Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

As described previously in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, under the No Action Alternative (Alternative A), take associated with development would occur over the 50-year study period consistent with the local general plans and other applicable planning documents (e.g., community plans, specific plans, recreation plans). As also described in Chapter 2, for purposes of this analysis, development and related activities (e.g., operations and maintenance) under the No Action Alternative are considered using the same organizational categories identified in the Yolo HCP/NCCP; urban projects and activities; rural projects and activities, which includes rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities, agricultural economic development, and open space; and public and private operations and maintenance. Under the No Action Alternative, the Plan would not be approved and implemented and no Endangered Species Act authorizations would be issued by USFWS or CDFW related to the Plan. Endangered species permitting and mitigation would continue on an individual project-by-project basis. Urban projects and activities would be concentrated within the Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland. Rural projects and activities would primarily occur within and around the existing communities within the unincorporated county (primarily Elkhorn, Madison, Clarksburg, Dunnigan, Esparto, and Knights Landing). Activities associated with the rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities, agricultural economic development, and open space categories would occur in various locations in the unincorporated county. Public and private operations and maintenance activities would occur both in the incorporated cities and the unincorporated county.

Developments in rural and urban areas within the Plan Area would continue to occur under the No Action Alternative, and would result in population growth either directly (i.e. new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. road and infrastructure extensions), potentially resulting in the need for expanded and

additional homes and community services. However, population growth in the Plan Area has been estimated and planned for in the general plans, area plans, and SACOG's RHNP, and other applicable planning documents. Land use activities associated with the general plans would anticipate and accommodate the population growth. Existing housing and community services would continue to be available to residents. The development of new or expanded communities and services would continue, in part, in response to increased demand as a result of population growth, consistent with current local plans and policies. Environmental impacts associated with the construction of new development would be addressed on a project-by-project basis. Since new housing is a substantial component of planned development in rural and urban areas, if any housing or people were displaced by this development, there would be sufficient new housing stock available to accommodate these individuals and there would not be a direct need to construct replacement housing elsewhere. As discussed in city and county housing element goals and policies described above in Section 10.2.2, *Regulatory Setting*, the County and each city would maintain an adequate supply of residential land in appropriate land use designations and zoning categories to accommodate the regional housing allocation established in the SACOG RHNP.

Activities under the rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities category include improvements, replacements, and construction of new public services, infrastructure, and utilities outside of the incorporated cities and rural communities, such as roads, wet and dry utility infrastructure, landfills and related facilities, levees, airports, and ports. Although development under this category could induce growth through the generation of new jobs and the expansion of utilities and municipal services to new areas, the anticipated development is intended to provide increased community services, infrastructure, and utilities that serve planned land uses that are consistent with local general plans. These new facilities are responsive to planned population growth and are not generators of substantial new population growth. Although it is possible that small numbers of homes or people could be displaced by development included in the rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities category, because new housing is a substantial component of planned development in rural and urban areas (as described above), there would be sufficient new housing stock available to accommodate any displaced individuals and there would not be a direct need to construct replacement housing elsewhere.

Activities under the agricultural economic development and open space category could result in relatively large facilities being constructed in a rural/agricultural area (e.g., processing plants). These projects would create new employment opportunities in the Plan Area, potentially bring new residents to the area, and possibly increase demand for housing and community services. Since 2000, the unemployment rate in Yolo County has ranged from 4% to 13.4%. As of May 2016, the unemployment rate in Yolo County was 5% and the National unemployment rate was 4.7% (U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS] 2016). Over the past 10 years, the county's unemployment rate has generally remained slightly above (i.e. one percent or less) the national unemployment rate (California Employment Development Department 2016; BLS 2016)). Given the moderate unemployment rate of Yolo County, it's anticipated that housing demand would not increase substantially through implementation of these types of projects because permanent positions could typically be filled by existing county residents and many of the remaining positions would be seasonal and would not be anticipated to generate large new permanent resident populations.

Further, the addition and expansion of planned housing and community services to accommodate anticipated growth in the Plan Area would reduce new demands on existing housing and community services, as well as provide housing opportunities for individuals that might be displaced (although unlikely) by implementation of development under the agricultural and economic development and open space category.

Under the public and private operations and maintenance development category, various operations and maintenance activities would be implemented as part of existing and planned land uses, facilities, and services in both urban and rural areas. Activities would include management, operations, rehabilitation, replacement, repair, and maintenance of facilities ranging from utilities, roadways, bridges, and industrial land uses to parks and open space. Most of these activities would be undertaken with existing personnel



and would not generate large numbers of new jobs or otherwise induce growth. Although these types of activities could generate disruptions for residents for limited periods of time, it is highly unlikely that homes or persons would be permanently displaced.

As the development and other activities described above are implemented under the No Action Alternative, impacts to threatened and endangered species and other biological resources would occur, requiring mitigation. Mitigation measures are likely to include on-site areas of preservation within a specific project site, and smaller, non-contiguous areas of preservation lands throughout Yolo County, or nearby sites outside the county with authorization from the permitting agencies. Generally, these required mitigation actions under the No Action Alternative would either retain lands in their existing condition (i.e., preserve habitat), or convert lands to a more natural state (i.e., habitat restoration or creation), which would not substantially increase the demand for housing or result in population growth within the Plan Area. Typically, locations with more than a few residences (i.e. subdivisions) are typically not suitable for habitat preservation, enhancement, restoration, or creation, or are prohibitively expensive for these activities relative to undeveloped lands. Therefore, it is not expected that substantial numbers of existing housing or people would be displaced as a result of mitigation for impacts to threatened and endangered species.

### **Cumulative Effects**

Expansion of development in urban and rural areas (i.e., Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland) over the past century has resulted in an increase in demand for housing to accommodate increased populations. The capacity to provide housing has typically increased as needed to meet demand.

Projects and activities included within the categories of urban and rural development would continue the trend of increasing the demand for housing and could combine other projects within the county to result in a larger cumulative increase in demand for housing. However, consistent with the general plan Housing Elements of Yolo County and the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland, further development of housing would occur as planned development proceeds under the No Action Alternative. It is anticipated that future development implemented under the No Action Alternative, as well as any other projects in the Plan Area, would comply with the policies set forth in city and county general plans. It is expected that compliance with general plan Housing Element policies, described above under Section 10.2.2, would direct future development of housing consistent with the demand for housing within each jurisdiction.

Multiple foreseeable future projects could each result in some displacement of housing or individuals, resulting in a cumulative demand for replacement housing. However, many of these projects would also provide new housing opportunities and as a result of the continued provision of housing addressed by the general plan Housing Elements, there would continue to be sufficient housing stock to make replacement housing available.

As identified above in the alternative specific impact discussion, required biological resources mitigation actions under the No Action Alternative would either retain lands in their existing condition (i.e., preserve habitat), or convert lands to a more natural state (i.e., habitat restoration or creation), which would have little to no effect on population and housing in the Plan Area either individually or cumulatively.

## **ALTERNATIVE B—PROPOSED ACTION (PERMIT ISSUANCE/PLAN IMPLEMENTATION)**

### **Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects**

The Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B) incorporates the same development-related activities identified for the No Action Alternative (urban projects and activities, rural projects and activities, and public and private operations and maintenance), with the HCP/NCCP providing a mechanism for the Wildlife Agencies to provide incidental take authorization for these lawfully undertaken covered activities. Population and housing impacts as a result of these activities would be the same as those described under the No Action Alternative.

Where the Proposed Action Alternative differs from the No Action Alternative is in the implementation of the Yolo HCP/NCCP, including its conservation strategy and neighboring landowner protection program. The following impact discussions focus on these elements of the HCP/NCCP that differ from the No Action Alternative. The primary result of the neighboring landowner protection program from a population and housing perspective, would be the general preservation of existing conditions on lands adjacent to Plan reserve system lands. The voluntary neighboring landowner protection program is described in more detail in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*. Since the program would not change the demand for or availability housing, promote population growth, or displace people or housing, it would not have an effect on populations and housing and is not evaluated further in the impact discussions below.

**Effect HP-1: Potential to induce substantial population growth in the Plan Area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).**

Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would involve natural resources conservation through the preservation of natural and seminatural landscapes and maintenance of ecological integrity of large habitat blocks. These activities would result in continuation of existing agricultural operations or the preservation of existing open space. The conservation strategy included in the Proposed Action Alternative also provides for habitat enhancement, where existing habitat conditions and values to covered species would be improved in an area, and habitat restoration and creation where an existing natural or seminatural land cover type would be converted to a different natural land cover type (e.g., restoration of riparian habitat on land that once supported riparian habitat, but currently contains annual grassland vegetation).

These activities would not include new homes or infrastructure that could promote population growth. Implementation of the conservation strategy would result in the creation of a small number of employment opportunities to establish, manage, and monitor reserves and implement habitat enhancement, restoration, and creation efforts. As indicated in the HCP/NCCP in Chapter 8, *Costs and Funding*, much of this work is expected to be implemented by contractors, local partners, and others. There would not be large numbers of permanent Conservancy staff hired to implement the HCP/NCCP. Existing employees and businesses within the county and the region would be able to accommodate work efforts and any increased employment demand. If a small number of new employees were to relocate to the Plan Area, available housing stock (see vacancy rates in Table 10-2) would be able to accommodate the minor increase in demand.

**NEPA Level of Significance:** As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact **than significant**. Both implementation of biological resources mitigation under the No Action Alternative and implementation of the conservation strategy under the Proposed Action Alternative would result in little, if any, population growth.

**CEQA Level of Significance:** As compared to Existing Conditions, this impact is **less than significant**. Overall, with implementation of the conservation strategy included in the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be little, if any, population growth.

*No mitigation is required.*

**Effect HP-2: Potential to displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.**

The potential to displace homes and people associated with development-related covered activities under the Proposed Action would be the same as described above for the various development categories under the No Action Alternative.

**NEPA Level of Significance:** As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **less than significant**. Implementation of the various elements of the HCP/NCCP conservation strategy would primarily involve the preservation and enhancement of existing land covers and habitat restoration/creation in some areas. Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would have very low to no potential to displace any existing homes because covered activities would involve either placing easements on existing agricultural lands or restoring habitat in undeveloped areas. In addition, locations with more than a few residential dwellings (e.g. subdivisions) are typically not suitable for habitat preservation, enhancement, restoration, or creation, or are prohibitively expensive for these activities relative to undeveloped lands. Therefore, it is not

expected that substantial numbers of existing housing or people would be displaced as a result of implementation of the conservation strategy. This is the same conclusion as for mitigation for impacts to threatened and endangered species under the No Action Alternative.

**CEQA Level of Significance:** As compared to Existing Conditions, this impact is **less than significant**. Potential effects from establishment and management of a reserve system under the Proposed Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse effects related to the displacement of people or housing and need for replacement housing.

*No mitigation is required.*

## Cumulative Effects

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area resulting from past and present projects is described above for the No Action Alternative and remains the same for the Proposed Action Alternative.

As described above, implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not directly or indirectly place additional demands on housing, induce population growth, or displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people in the Plan Area. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not result in a considerable adverse contribution to any combined effects of past, current, and probable future projects on population and housing. In terms of cumulative impacts, the Proposed Action Alternative would be the same as the No Action Alternative.

**NEPA Level of Significance:** As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **less than significant**.

**CEQA Level of Significance:** As compared to Existing Conditions, this impact is **less than significant**.

## ALTERNATIVE C—REDUCED TAKE ALTERNATIVE

### Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

The Reduced Take Alternative (Alternative C) would include the same categories of covered activities as the Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B); however, under the Reduced Take Alternative, there are eight geographic areas designated for development under the Proposed Action, in which no activities that would result in take of covered species would be permitted. These locations are in the vicinity of Clarksburg, Davis, the Dunnigan area, Woodland, and West Sacramento (Figure 2-6) and cover a total of 1,335 acres. All other elements of the Plan (e.g., covered species, covered activities, Plan Area, conservation strategy, monitoring, funding) remain the same. See Section 2.3.3, *Alternative C-Reduced Take Alternative* for more information on this alternative.

Impacts to population and housing as a result of implementation of Alternative C would be similar to those discussed under the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. Specific effects on population and housing from not allowing activities that result in take in the eight designated areas would depend on various factors, including the type of development that would have occurred under the No Action Alternative or Proposed Action that would no longer be permitted. If these sites would have ultimately contained primarily residential uses, then the loss of potential future housing stock could be diverted to areas located outside of the designated areas. Similarly, if these sites would have ultimately supported primarily job generating land uses, the restriction on development of these uses within the designated areas could simply divert demand for employment opportunities to other locations. In either scenario, the Reduced Take Alternative would not induce substantial population growth in the county as a whole; however, if development originally planned in any of the eight areas were diverted to another location, this could induce substantial population growth in that community or area.

Not allowing new activities that result in take of covered species in the eight designated areas under this alternative would not, in and of itself, result in displacement of existing homes or residents. If any

development that is currently planned for any of these areas was diverted to another location, it is possible that homes or individuals at the new development locations could be displaced; however, to project the potential for such displacement to occur would require significant speculation and cannot be determined at this time.

**NEPA Level of Significance:** As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

**CEQA Level of Significance:** As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

Relative to population and housing issues, the effects of the conservation/mitigation actions among the alternatives would not appreciably differ. Overall, effects on housing and population under the Reduced Take Alternative would not be substantially different from those described for the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative. Although there is the potential for increased impacts related to population and housing if development that would have occurred in the reduced take areas were displaced to another location, to project the extent and nature of the impact would require significant speculation and cannot be determined at this time.

*No mitigation is required.*

### **Cumulative Effects**

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area is the same as described for the Proposed Action. The individual effects on population and housing under the Reduced Take Alternative would be comparable to those described for the Proposed Action Alternative. Overall, implementation of the Reduced Take Alternative, like the Proposed Action Alternative, would not result in a considerable contribution to existing significant cumulative impacts on population and housing.

**NEPA Level of Significance:** As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

**CEQA Level of Significance:** As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and **less than significant**.

## **ALTERNATIVE D—REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

### **Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects**

The Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative D) would include the same categories of covered activities as the Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B), but under the Reduced Development Alternative, development within a portion of the west side of the Dunnigan area, and the Elkhorn Specific Plan Area, would not be covered activities under the Yolo HCP/NCCP and therefore could not be provided incidental take authorization through the Plan. (See Chapter 2, Section 2.3.4, *Alternative D-Reduced Development Alternative* for more information on this alternative). Since the two areas that would not be covered by the HCP/NCCP could be developed some time in the future, the overall development scenario may ultimately not differ from the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative. Relative to population and housing issues, the effects of the conservation/mitigation actions among the alternatives also would not appreciably differ.

Overall, effects related to population and housing as a result of implementation of the Reduced Development Alternative would not be appreciably different from what is described for the Proposed Action or No Action Alternatives.

**NEPA Level of Significance:** As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

**CEQA Level of Significance:** As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

*No mitigation is required.*

### **Cumulative Effects**

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area resulting from past and present projects is described above for the No Action Alternative and remains the same for the Reduced Development Alternative. The individual effects on population and housing under the Reduced Development Alternative are not substantially different from those described for the Proposed Action Alternative. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in a considerable adverse contribution to the combined effects of past, current, and probable future projects on population and housing. The Reduced Development Alternative would make the same contribution to potential adverse cumulative effects compared to the No Action Alternative.

**NEPA Level of Significance:** As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

**CEQA Level of Significance:** As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

This page intentionally left blank.