

Chapter 25 Population and Housing

25.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the environmental setting, methods of analysis, and impact analysis for the population and housing in the study area. The study area for population and housing consists of Colusa, Glenn, and Yolo Counties because they are where Project facilities would be located. Tehama County is not included in the study area because the sole Project activity occurring in that county is the installation of two pumps in an existing facility. The pump installation would not displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of new housing because no housing is present at RBPP. The installation of two new pumps would not alter the population of Tehama County because of the limited number of construction workers that would be required to complete the work. Chapter 32, *Other Required Analyses*, contains the CEQA-required growth-inducing discussion that addresses indirect growth associated with water supply.

Tables 25-1a and 25-1b summarize the CEQA determinations and NEPA conclusions for construction and operation impacts, respectively, between alternatives described in the impact analysis.

Table 25-1a. Summary of Construction Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Population and Housing Resources

Alternative	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact POP-1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly			
No Project	NI/NE	-	NI/NE
Alternative 1	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 2	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Impact POP-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere			
No Project	NI/NE	-	NI/NE
Alternative 1	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 2	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE

Notes:

NI = CEQA no impact

LTS = CEQA less-than-significant impact

NE = NEPA no effect or no adverse effect

Table 25-1b. Summary of Operations Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Population and Housing Resources

Alternative	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact POP-1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly			
No Project	NI/NE	-	NI/NE
Alternative 1	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 2	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Impact POP-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere			
No Project	NI/NE	-	NI/NE
Alternative 1	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 2	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE

Notes:

NI = CEQA no impact

LTS = CEQA less-than-significant impact

NE = NEPA no effect or no adverse effect

25.2 Environmental Setting

Table 25-2 lists the existing and projected population of the study area. As of January 1, 2020, the total population of Colusa, Glenn, and Yolo Counties represented less than 1% of the population of California.

Table 25-2. Current and Projected Populations of Colusa, Glenn, and Yolo Counties

County	2020 Population	Projected Population (2030)	Percent Increase
Colusa County	21,902	23,671	7.4%
Glenn County	29,400	30,476	3.5%
Yolo County	221,705	237,591	6.6%
Study Area Total	273,007	291,738	6.4%

Sources: California Department of Finance 2020a, 2020b

The unincorporated community of Sites is in Colusa County and contains approximately 20 houses, 25 barns, and 40 other structures (e.g., sheds, silos, and pumphouses). On the basis of the estimated 2.88 persons per household in Colusa County, approximately 69 people are presumed to be living in Sites (California Department of Finance 2020a). The unincorporated community of Lodoga is also in Colusa County and has a population of 168 (United States Census Bureau 2019).

Table 25-3 shows the housing units, vacancy rates, and persons per household for the three counties in the study area. Housing units in the study area represent less than 1% of the housing units in the state.

Table 25-3. Housing Units in the Study Area

County	Total Housing Units	Percent Vacant	Persons per Household
Colusa County	8,227	8.7%	2.88
Glenn County	11,334	7.9%	2.79
Yolo County	78,377	3.8%	2.77
Study Area Total	97,938	6.8%	2.81

Source: California Department of Finance 2020a

Local governments, including counties, are required to identify future housing needs to meet demand within their jurisdictions through the preparation of a Regional Housing Needs Allocation and the preparation of a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (California Department of Housing and Community Development 2020). These are typically developed when local governments opt to update the housing elements of their general plans (every 5 or 8 years) (California Department of Housing and Community Development 2020). The projected housing needs for the counties in the study area are:

- 1,235 houses in Colusa County between 2018 and 2028 (Colusa County 2019)
- 1,890 houses in Yolo County between 2013 and 2021 (Yolo County 2018)
- 661 houses in Glenn County between 2018 and 2029 (Glenn County 2020)

25.3 Methods of Analysis

This evaluation of population and housing is based on professional standards and on information cited throughout the chapter. Potential impacts on population and housing were identified and assessed based on the environmental setting of the study area and the magnitude, intensity, and duration of activities related to the construction and operation of the Project. As described in Chapter 3, *Environmental Analysis*, the alternatives may be discussed together in the impact analysis, particularly with respect to Alternatives 1 and 3. This is because Alternatives 1 and 3 include the same facilities.

25.3.1. Thresholds of Significance

An impact on population and housing would be considered significant if the Project would:

- Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

25.4 Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

Impact POP-1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly

No Project

Substantial unplanned population growth would not occur under the No Project Alternative because Project facilities would not be constructed or operated. Unplanned population growth is not expected in the study area because the associated county governments would be expected to follow State of California requirements to prepare general plans and plan for population growth. Future population growth would be related to the planning efforts and broader economic conditions of the counties in the study area and the state and would not be associated with construction or operation of Project facilities.

Significance Determination

The No Project Alternative would not induce substantial unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly, because no Project facilities would be constructed or operated and the county governments would continue to plan for population growth within their jurisdictions in accordance with existing requirements.

Alternatives 1 and 3

Construction

The construction of Alternatives 1 and 3 would not induce substantial unplanned population growth directly or indirectly. Construction would require approximately 1,650 construction personnel at the peak of construction depending on the facility being constructed. This estimate represents approximately 0.6% of the total population in the study area. Given the percentage of construction jobs in relation to the general population, construction would not result in substantial unplanned population growth. It is anticipated that most of the construction labor force would commute to the work sites from the surrounding areas including Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties, and some may come from the greater Sacramento region (AECOM and Engineering Solutions 2021). These construction workers would generally commute 1–2 hours (Jacobs, Geosyntec, and Vanderwell 2021). Because most of the general construction labor force is expected to commute, these workers would not need to relocate and would therefore not cause an unplanned increase the population or the need for housing. Some construction activities may require workers with specialized skills, necessitating construction workers to travel from greater distances (e.g., the greater Northern California region). It is anticipated these construction workers would use hotels/motels for overnight lodging or potentially rentals for limited periods of time and would not move to the study area permanently because they reside in other locations. There would be available temporary housing through hotels or rentals given the 7% vacancy rate in Colusa, Glenn, and Yolo Counties and a 5% target vacancy rate generally considered optimal for normal turnover and renter mobility (Colusa County Community Development Department 2020). Most rentals are available in Colusa or Williams (Colusa County Community Development Department 2020). In addition, there are also recreational vehicle (RV) and mobile home parks that would provide temporary accommodations for construction workers.

Considering the availability of rental housing, RV or mobile parks, and hotels, the temporary accommodation required for construction workers would be provided by existing facilities and would not result in unplanned population growth.

Operation

The operation of Alternative 1 or 3 would not directly induce substantial unplanned population growth. Alternative 1 or 3 would require an estimated 30 permanent employees to conduct visual inspections and perform various maintenance activities on different facilities during the operation of Sites Reservoir. It is anticipated this small number of permanent employees would come from existing local communities, such as Willows or Williams in Glenn or Colusa Counties, as these communities are close to the Sites Reservoir location. Permanent employees would not be required to relocate to the community of Maxwell. Furthermore, at the time of preparation of this RDEIR/SDEIS permanent housing options in Maxwell were limited (Realtor.com 2021; Zillow 2021; Redfin 2021).

The operation of Alternatives 1 and 3 would not indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth. Neither the realignment of Sites Lodoga Road (which includes the new bridge to the unincorporated community of Lodoga), nor the realignment of Huffmaster Road, would induce unplanned growth in the region. Both are realignments of existing roads and would simply provide access to the same communities that already are provided by the existing roads.

CEQA Significance Determination and Mitigation Measures

Construction of Alternative 1 or 3 would not result in substantial unplanned population growth because the estimated construction labor force would be relatively small, most of the labor force is anticipated to commute from the surrounding areas, and construction workers are not expected to permanently relocate to the study area. Operation of Alternative 1 or 3 would not result in substantial unplanned population growth because existing roads are being realigned to continue current connectivity. Therefore, these impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Conclusion

Construction and operation effects would be the same as described above for CEQA. Construction and operation of Alternative 1 or 3 would not directly or indirectly result in substantial unplanned population growth as compared to the No Project Alternative. There would be no adverse effect.

Alternative 2

Construction of Sites Reservoir and the bridge is projected to take longer for Alternatives 1 and 3 than construction of the Sites Reservoir and realignment of Huffmaster Road and construction of the South Road under Alternative 2. The construction of Dunnigan Pipeline under Alternative 2 would require a slightly longer construction period than under Alternatives 1 and 3. The number of construction workers would be approximately the same between all alternatives. Therefore, even with timing differences, the construction impacts on population and housing under Alternative 2 would be the same as described above for Alternatives 1 and 3. Operation effects on population and housing under Alternative 2 would also be the same as those for Alternatives 1

and 3 because realignment of South Road would provide access to the same communities as already provided by existing roads.

CEQA Significance Determination and Mitigation Measures

The impact determination for construction and operation of Alternative 2 would be the same as for Alternatives 1 and 3. Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Conclusion

Construction and operation effects would be the same as described above for CEQA. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not directly or indirectly result in substantial unplanned population growth as compared to the No Project Alternative. There would be no adverse effect.

Impact POP-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

No Project

The No Project Alternative would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing because the Project would not be built. Housing needs in the study area would be related to the planning efforts and broad economic conditions of the counties and the state and not associated with construction or operation of Project facilities.

Significance Determination

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no impacts and no effects on substantial numbers of existing people or housing in the unincorporated community of Sites from displacement because the Project would not be built.

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3

Construction and Operation

The construction of the Sites Reservoir would permanently displace the residents of the unincorporated community of Sites and demolish approximately 24 houses within the inundation area. Demolition would take place within the inundation area once all property owner negotiations were completed. The displacement would affect an estimated population of 69 people, which represents less than 1% of the total population of the study area. While it is unknown where residents would choose to relocate, if they stayed within the three-county study area it would represent less than 1% of the existing housing stock in the study area. Property owners would be compensated through their relocation either under state and federal regulations or eminent domain protocols. Given the number of people displaced compared to the total population of the study area and the amount of affected housing, the existing and planned housing stock could absorb this displacement and construction of replacement housing would not be needed.

Construction and operation of other Alternative 1, 2, or 3 facilities would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing because these facilities would either be located within

existing facility footprints or immediately adjacent to existing facilities (e.g., RBPP, GCID Main Canal diversion and system upgrades, TC Canal intake), would be installed underground (i.e., Funks pipelines, TRR East or West pipelines, Dunnigan Pipeline), or would be located in areas where there are currently no houses or people (e.g., TRR East or West, Huffmaster Road realignment, South Road, CBD outlet, and Sacramento River discharge).

CEQA Significance Determination and Mitigation Measures

Construction and operation of Alternative 1, 2, or 3 would not result in substantial displacement of existing people or housing and would not necessitate the construction of extensive replacement housing elsewhere because of the number of people displaced compared to the total population of the study area and the existing and planned housing stock available to absorb the displacement. Construction and operation of other facilities would not result in substantial displacement of people or housing because of the lack of people and housing within the construction footprint or because of the location of the facilities (i.e., underground or within or immediately adjacent to existing facilities). Therefore, these impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Conclusion

Construction and operation effects would be the same as described above for CEQA. Construction and operation of Alternative 1, 2 or 3 would not result in substantial displacement of existing people or housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as compared to the No Project Alternative. There would be no adverse effect.

25.5 References

25.5.1. Printed References

- AECOM and Engineering Solutions. 2021. Constructability Analysis for the Conveyance Facilities Task Order No. 2, Task HR53 – Draft [memorandum]. February 22. Prepared by Michael Forrest, P.E., G.E.; Dan Hertel. Prepared for Sites Project Authority.
- California Department of Housing and Community Development. 2020. Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Housing Elements Website. Available: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/index.shtml> Accessed: October 22, 2020.
- California Department of Finance. 2020a. *Forecasting. Demographics. Estimates. E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2010-2020, with 2010 Census Benchmark*. Last revised: May 2020. Available: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/> Accessed: October 14, 2020.
- California Department of Finance. 2020b. *Projections: P-1 State Population Projections, Total Population by County (1-year increments)*. Last revised: No date. Available:

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Projections/> Accessed: October 14, 2020.

Colusa County. 2019. County of Colusa Housing Element Update Power Point. February 22. Available at: <https://www.countyofcolusa.org/DocumentCenter/View/10758/Final-Stakeholders-mtg-presentation-2-21-19?bidId=> Accessed: October 22, 2020.

Colusa County Community Development Department. 2020. *Colusa County Housing Element Update, 2020-2028*. Board of Supervisors Approved: June 30, 2020. Available: <https://www.countyofcolusa.org/DocumentCenter/View/13433/2020-to-2028-Colusa-County-Housing-Element-Update---Approved?bidId=> Accessed: July 7, 2021.

Glenn County. 2020. Final Regional Housing Need Determination. Available: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/glenn-county-regional-housing-needs-determination-for-the-sixth-housing-element-update.pdf> Accessed: October 22, 2020.

Jacobs, Geosyntec, and Vanderwell. 2021. Constructability Analysis for the Conveyance Facilities Task Order No. 2 – Draft [memorandum]. March 24. Prepared by Jeff Smith, P.E.; Isabell Barrios; Brian Martinez, P.E.; Derek Morly, P.E.; Larry Fishman, P.E. Prepared for Sites Project Authority.

Realtor.com. 2021. Maxwell Housing Search. Available at: https://www.realtor.com/realestateandhomes-search/Maxwell_CA Accessed: July 10, 2021.

Redfin. 2021. Maxwell Housing Search. Available: <https://www.redfin.com/city/33715/CA/Maxwell>. Accessed: July 10, 2021.

United States Census Bureau. 2019. Lodoga CDP, California. Available: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=1600000US0642230> Accessed: April 14, 2021.

Yolo County. 2018. Yolo County General Plan Annual Progress Report. Available: <https://www.yolocounty.org/home/showdocument?id=60315> Accessed: October 22, 2020.

Zillow. 2021. Maxwell Housing Search. Available: https://www.zillow.com/homes/for_sale/maxwell-california_rb/ Accessed: July 10, 2021.