

## 5.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addresses potential impacts of the project on population, housing, and employment and provides an overview of current population estimates, projected population growth, current housing, employment trends, and the regulatory setting. The following analysis of the potential environmental impacts related to population and housing is derived from the following sources available for review at the City of Redding Development Services Department, Planning Division:

- City of Redding. *2000 – 2020 General Plan*. October 2000.
- City of Redding. *2014 – 2019 Housing Element*. May 2014.
- Shasta County. *2009 – 2014 Housing Element*. March 2011.
- Shasta County. *2014 – 2019 Draft Housing Element*. September 2018.
- Shasta County. *General Plan*. September 2004.
- Shasta Regional Transportation Agency. *2015 Regional Transportation Plan*. June 2015.

### 5.11.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located west of Interstate 5 (I-5), southwest of the intersection Cypress Avenue and Hartnell Avenue, in close proximity to the Sacramento River to the west. The undeveloped 10.55-acre proposed project site is situated immediately west of Hartnell Avenue, between Cypress Avenue and Parkview Avenue (South).

### REGIONAL AND LOCAL POPULATION TRENDS

The City of Redding is the largest incorporated city in Shasta County and primary economic driver in the region. The City of Redding represents the largest urbanized population center north of Sacramento in the State of California. The City encompasses approximately 61.17 square miles. As shown in Table 5.11-1, SHASTA COUNTY POPULATION TRENDS, the population in the City of Redding increased by 1.6 percent from 2010 to 2018, and the population of Shasta County increased 0.6 percent. The cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake are included in Table 5.11-1 for comparison of the other incorporated cities located in Shasta County.

**Table 5.11-1  
SHASTA COUNTY POPULATION TRENDS**

Area	2010	2017	2018	2017-2018 Percent Change	2010-2018 Percent Change
City of Anderson	9,932	10,240	10,263	0.2%	3.3%
City of Redding	89,861	91,221	91,357	0.1%	1.6%
City of Shasta Lake	10,164	10,134	10,143	0.1%	-0.2%
Shasta County (Unincorporated)	67,226	66,553	66,508	-0.1%	-1.0%
Shasta County (Total County)	177,223	178,148	178,271	0.1%	0.6%

Source: California Department of Finance. *Table E-1, City/County Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change; Table E-5, City/County Population Housing Estimates (2010 – 2018)*. May 1, 2018.

According to the Shasta Regional Transportation Agency's *2015 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)* for Shasta County, population in the County is anticipated to grow at a rate of 0.8 percent per year, with an estimated population of 214,364 persons in Shasta County by 2035. The population for the City of Redding is estimated to increase to 111,002 persons by 2035 (SRTA, 2015).

**REGIONAL AND LOCAL HOUSING TRENDS**

As shown in Table 5.11-2, SHASTA COUNTY HOUSING TRENDS, the housing units in the City of Redding increased by 0.3 percent between 2010 and 2018, and the housing units of Shasta County increased by 2.0 percent. A year-over-year comparison (2017-2018) shows that housing units in the City of Redding grew by 0.3 percent and 0.2 percent for Shasta County. The cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake are included in Table 5.11-2 for comparison of the other incorporated cities located in Shasta County.

**Table 5.11-2  
SHASTA COUNTY HOUSING TRENDS**

Area	2010	2017	2018	2017-2018 Percent Change	2010-2018 Percent Change
City of Anderson	4,211	4,421	4,442	0.4%	5.0%
City of Redding	38,679	39,557	39,679	0.3%	0.3%
City of Shasta Lake	4,209	4,209	4,241	0.7%	0.8%
Shasta County (Unincorporated)	30,214	30,350	30,383	0.1%	0.6%
Shasta County (Total County)	77,313	78,537	78,745	0.2%	2.0%

Source: California Department of Finance. *Table E-5, City/County Population Housing Estimates (2010 – 2018)*. May 1, 2018.

The U.S. Census Bureau defines a “household” as any group of people occupying a housing unit. This may include single persons living alone, families related through marriage or blood, or unrelated persons sharing living quarters. Persons living in retirement or convalescent homes, dormitories, or other group living situations are not considered households. Household characteristics are important indicators of the type and size of housing needed in a community. The number of persons per household in the City of Redding in 2010 was 2.43; currently the estimated persons per household is 2.38 (DOF, 2018).

The majority of the housing stock in the City of Redding consists of single-family residences. In Shasta County, residents are more likely to own their own home when compared to California on a whole (SRTA, 2015). As seen in Table 5.11-3, HOUSING CHARACTERISTIC BY HOUSING TYPE, it is estimated that 25 percent of housing units in the City of Redding are multi-family, compared to 16 percent in Shasta County. Single-family housing units are estimated to be 68 percent in the City of Redding and 72 percent in Shasta County. The City currently maintains a 5.5 percent housing vacancy rate while Shasta County maintains an 8.1 percent vacancy rate according to the California Department of Finance (refer to Table 5.11-3, below).

**Table 5.11-3  
HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS BY HOUSING TYPE**

Housing Type	Number of Units	
	City of Redding	Shasta County
Single-Family	27,116	57,355
Multi-Family	10,043	12,631
Mobile Homes	2,525	8,759
<b>Total</b>	<b>39,679</b>	<b>78,745</b>
Occupied	37,482	72,331
Vacancy Rate	5.5%	8.1%

Source: California Department of Finance. *Table E-5, City/County Population Housing Estimates (2018)*. May 1, 2018.

**REGIONAL AND LOCAL EMPLOYMENT TRENDS**

According to the California Employment Development Department (EDD), Labor Market Information Division, the March 2018 employment/unemployment rates for Shasta County and the City of Redding

are shown in Table 5.11-4, SHASTA COUNTY LABOR FORCE DATA. Redding’s 4.8% unemployment rate is the lowest of all incorporated cities in Shasta County.

**Table 5.11-4  
SHASTA COUNTY LABOR FORCE DATA**

Area	Total Labor Force	Employment		Unemployment Rate
		Employed Persons	Unemployed Persons	
Redding	39,400	37,500	1,900	4.8%
Anderson	4,200	3,900	300	6.7%
Shasta Lake	4,100	3,800	300	6.8%
Shasta County	73,900	69,700	4,200	5.7%

Source: California Employment Development Department. *Monthly Labor Force Data for Counties*. April 2018.

Shasta County’s economy has several mature industries, including government, leisure and hospitality, trade, transportation and utilities, and construction. Growth industries in the County include education and health services, as well as an emerging surveying and mapping services industry. Shasta County industries showing declining growth trends include financial activities, information, manufacturing, professional and business services and natural resources (SRTA, 2015). Several industries provide employment opportunities in Shasta County. Table 5.11-5, INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT – REDDING METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA, summarizes the industries in Shasta County and the percent of the labor force employed in each industry employs based on the California Employment Development Department (EDD), Labor Market Information Division, which is the most recent available data.

**Table 5.11-5  
INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT – REDDING METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA**

Industry	Employment	Percent of Labor Force
<b>TOTAL INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>66,400</b>	<b>89.8%</b>
<b>Farm</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
<b>Non Farm</b>	<b>65,900</b>	<b>89.2%</b>
Mining, Logging and Construction	3,000	4.1%
Manufacturing	2,600	3.5%
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	13,200	17.9%
Information	600	0.8%
Financial Activities	2,700	3.7%
Professional and Business Services	6,900	9.3%
Educational Services, Health Care, and Social Assistance	14,700	19.9%
Leisure and Hospitality	6,400	8.7%
Other Services	2,300	3.1%
Government	13,500	18.3%

Notes:

1. Data not adjusted for seasonality. Data may not add due to rounding.
2. Labor force data revised month to month.

Source: California Employment Development Department. *Redding MSA (Shasta County) Industry Employment and Labor Force*. April 2018.

According to the EDD, most people employed in the Redding MSA in 2018 were employed in educational services, health care and social assistance services (19.9 percent). As noted in the Table 5.11-6, INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT – CITY OF REDDING, the City of Redding’s top three employers, as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau (2012), were health care and social assistance, retail trade, and accommodation and food services.

**Table 5.11-6  
INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT – CITY OF REDDING**

Industry	Employment	Percent of Labor Force
Manufacturing	757	1.9%
Wholesale Trade	1,223	3.1%
Retail Trade	7,061	17.9%
Transportation and Warehousing	692	1.7%
Information	662	1.6%
Finance and Insurance	1,717	4.3%
Real Estate, Rental, and Leasing	550	1.3%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	1,659	4.2%
Administrative and Support, Waste Management Services	2,815	7.1%
Educational Services	287	0.8%
Health Care and Social Assistance	9,221	23.4%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	500 - 999	1.2% - 2.5%
Accommodation and Food Services	4,374	11.1%
Other Services	1,336	3.3%

Note:

1. Percent of Labor Force based on current (2018) labor force of 39,400.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. *American Fact Finder –2012 Economic Census of the United States*. 2012.

Shasta County employment projections from 2014 to 2024 by industry type are shown in Table 5.11-7, INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS – REDDING METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA, which is the most recent available data. The top three fastest growing occupations from 2014 to 2024 are projected to be in personal care and service, healthcare support occupations, and computer and mathematical occupations (EDD, 2016).

**Table 5.11-7  
INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS – REDDING METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA**

Industry	Annual Average Employment		Employment Change 2014-2024		Annual Average Percent Change
	2014	2024	Numerical	Percentage	
<b>TOTAL EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>67,400</b>	<b>77,300</b>	<b>9,900</b>	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
<b>Self Employed</b>	<b>4,200</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>
<b>Private Household Workers</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>
<b>Farm</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
<b>Non Farm</b>	<b>62,200</b>	<b>71,100</b>	<b>8,900</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
Mining, Logging and Construction	2,800	3,600	800	28.6%	2.9%
Manufacturing	2,300	2,600	300	13.0%	1.3%
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	12,100	13,500	1,300	10.7%	1.1%
Information	700	700	0	0.0%	0.0%
Financial Activities	2,600	2,800	200	7.7%	0.8%
Professional and Business Services	6,000	6,800	800	13.3%	1.3%
Educational Services, Health Care, and Social Assistance	14,100	16,900	2,800	19.9%	2.0%
Leisure and Hospitality	6,600	7,500	900	13.6%	1.4%
Other Services	2,400	2,800	400	16.7%	1.7%
Government	12,600	13,900	1,300	10.3%	1.0%

Source: California Employment Development Department. *2014-2024 Industry Employment Projections Redding Metropolitan Statistical Area*. December 2016.

According to Table 5.11-7, Shasta County’s employment is estimated to reach 77,300 by 2024, an increase of 14.7 percent over a 10-year projection period. Most of this growth will be in education services, health care, and social assistance; trade, transportation, and utilities; and professional and business services.

## 5.11.2 REGULATORY SETTING

This section summarizes the laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards that are applicable to the project. The following is a description of State and local environmental laws and policies that are relevant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process.

### STATE

#### State of California Housing Element Law

State law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan for future growth. This plan must include a housing element that identifies housing needs for all economic segments and provides opportunities for housing development to meet that need. At the State level, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) estimates the relative shares of California's projected population growth that could occur in each county in the State based on Department of Finance (DOF) population projections and economic projections. Where there is a regional planning agency, the HCD provides information regarding the regional housing need to the regional agency. These agencies allocate "fair-share" housing need to cities and counties within their planning jurisdiction. The HCD oversees the process to ensure that the regional planning agencies distribute their share of the State's projected housing need. The HCD creates the projections for the Shasta County region and allocates to each city and the County their fair-share housing allocation by income category.

State Housing Element Law also requires the analysis of a variety of factors that influence the access to and availability of housing. Housing for Persons with Special Needs is an important component to the City of Redding Housing Policy. State Law guidance includes, but is not explicitly limited to; SB 2 (Zoning for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing); SB 520 (analysis of constraints on development of housing for persons with disabilities); and, SB 812 (Housing for persons with developmental disabilities). The rigorous analysis, as contained in the City's HCD-certified Housing Element, describe the polices, program and actions to address the challenges to providing housing opportunity to special needs populations including person w/Extremely-Low Income (<30% of the County Median Family Income and Low Income (up to 50% of County Median Family Income). This may include homeless, low income individuals and families, female-headed households, persons with disabilities or self-care limitations, addiction recovery, developmental disabilities, elderly and other as defined by the State of California. State Housing Law requires the City of Redding provide an inventory of sites available to accommodate the future growth need and to provide an inventory of site available to accommodate special needs groups, such as those identified above.

Each city and county must update its General Plan Housing Element on a regular basis. The Housing Element must identify potential sites that could accommodate the city's share of the regional housing need. Before adopting an update to its Housing Element, the city or county must submit a draft to the HCD for review. The department advises the local jurisdiction as to whether its housing element complies with the provisions of California housing element law (California Government Code Sections 65580-65589.8).

## Regional Housing Need Allocation Process

Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) is the State-mandated process to identify the total number of housing units (by affordability level) that each jurisdiction must accommodate in its housing element of the general plan. The housing need is determined for four broad household income categories:

- Very Low (households making less than 50 percent of median family income);
- Low (55 to 80 percent of median family income);
- Moderate (81 to 120 percent of median family income); and
- Above Moderate (more than 120 percent of median family income).

The HCD develops projections for Shasta County and allocates the fair share of the housing need to each incorporated city and the county. The City of Redding’s RHNA allocation for the 2014-2019 planning period is 1,175 units. Table 5.11-8, SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION 2014-2019 shows the RHNA allocation for Shasta County.

**Table 5.11-8  
SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION 2014- 2019 PLANNING PERIOD**

Area	Income Category				Total
	Very-Low	Low	Moderate	Above-Moderate	
Redding	287	181	205	502	1,175
Anderson	32	21	24	59	136
Shasta Lake	32	21	23	58	134
Unincorporated County	189	117	128	321	755
<b>Total</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>940</b>	<b>2,200</b>

Source: Shasta Regional Transportation Agency. 2015.

## Senate Bill 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy

SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) directs the California Air Resources Board to set regional targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in coordination with Assembly Bill (AB) 32, California’s Global Warming Act of 2006. SB 375 is designed to enhance existing regional planning efforts by coordinating regional transportation planning together with the RHNA in an effort to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light-duty trucks through the provision of incentivized land use strategies by willing local governments and development applicants. Under the SB 375 process, cities and counties maintain their existing authority over local planning and land use decisions.

Under SB 375, GHG reduction is addressed through the reduction of vehicle miles traveled by passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks through land use strategies and improved transportation opportunities implemented by local governments. This is done by; (1) connecting regional planning to regional transportation planning, (2) coordinating regional housing needs, (3) providing incentives for local governments to implement regional plans through funding opportunities, and (4) providing incentives to developers whose proposals are consistent with regional plans in order to receive streamlined California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) processing.

SB 375 is implemented through the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), which undertakes a planning program that sets forth a forecasted development pattern and GHG reduction policies and programs designed to reduce air emissions from passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks to

help meet GHG reduction targets. This SCS is a chapter of the 2015 RTP, which was approved on June 30, 2015.

**LOCAL**

**City of Redding General Plan**

The City of Redding *2000 – 2020 General Plan*, as amended, serves as the overall guiding policy document for land use, development, and environmental quality in the City of Redding. The *General Plan* includes policies, standards, implementation programs, quantified objectives (for housing), the General Plan Diagram, and circulation diagrams. The *General Plan* comprises a set of interrelated and internally consistent components (“elements”) specific to various attributes of either the physical or cultural environment. These elements are: Community Development and Design, Transportation, Natural Resources, Health and Safety, Noise, Housing, Recreation, Economic Development, Public Facilities and Services, and Air Quality.

The *General Plan* provides goals, policies, and implementation measures in order to reduce impacts of projects on population growth and housing. Applicable goals and policies relative to the proposed project site are listed in Table 5.11-9, CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE CITY OF REDDING GENERAL PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES FOR POPULATION AND HOUSING, followed by a brief explanation of how the proposed project complies with the goals and policies.

**Table 5.11-9  
CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE CITY OF REDDING GENERAL PLAN  
GOALS AND POLICIES FOR POPULATION AND HOUSING**

General Plan Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis
<p><u>GENERAL PLAN GOAL ED2</u> <i>FACILITATE THE RETENTION AND EXPANSION OF EXISTING BUSINESSES.</i></p>	
<p><b>Policy ED2A:</b> Identify and remedy any City impediment to the retention/expansion of existing businesses in Redding.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The site is being considered for development of the North State Pavilion Project, a health care facility, by Dignity Health Mercy Medical Center Redding. The proposed project is a wellness center for ambulatory medical offices and clinics distributed amongst three buildings totaling approximately 129,600 square feet with associated parking, landscaping and infrastructure on 10.55 acres of land.</p>
<p><u>GENERAL PLAN GOAL ED5</u> <i>MAINTAIN AND EXPAND REDDING’S INFLUENCE AS A REGIONAL RETAIL TRADE CENTER.</i></p>	
<p><b>Policy ED5F:</b> Support efforts to expand medical facilities and services in the community.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The primary objective of the proposed project is to provide for a “Wellness Center” where medical and mental health care professionals provide community residents and businesses centralized health services in one geographic location to improve overall physical and mental health.</p>

Source: City of Redding. *2000 – 2020 General Plan*. October 2000.

**Shasta County General Plan**

The Shasta County *General Plan*, as amended through September 2004, sets forth the general, long-range policies regarding how the community’s future development should occur. The Shasta County *General Plan* reflects a 20-year time period, from 2004 through 2025. The *General Plan* is comprised of a set of three element groups and includes both mandatory and optional elements. The three element groups are Public Safety, Resources, and Community Development. The *General Plan* provides objectives, policies, and implementation objectives in the Community Development Element Group,

which includes Economic Development and Housing, in order to reduce impacts of projects on population growth and housing. There are no applicable objectives or policies relative to the proposed project site in the *General Plan*.

### **City of Redding 2014-2019 Housing Element and Shasta County Housing 2009-2014 Element**

The Housing Element is one of seven state-mandated elements of the General Plan (California Government Code Sections 65580-65589.8). California law requires adequate planning so that local governments meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. The law acknowledges that for the private market to address housing needs and demand adequately, local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for housing development while not unduly constraining housing opportunity.

## **5.11.3 STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

### **SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

In accordance with State *CEQA Guidelines*, the effects of a project are evaluated to determine whether they would result in a significant adverse impact on the environment. An EIR is required to focus on these effects and offer mitigation measures to reduce or avoid any significant impacts that are identified. The criteria used to determine the significance of impacts may vary depending on the nature of the project. The following significance thresholds related to population and housing have been derived from Appendix G of the State *CEQA Guidelines*:

- *Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through the extension of roads or other infrastructure).* Refer to Impact 5.11-1, below.
- *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.* Refer to AREAS OF NO PROJECT IMPACT, below.
- *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.* Refer to AREAS OF NO PROJECT IMPACT, below.

Based on these standards, the effects of the proposed project have been categorized as either a less than significant impact or a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measures are recommended for potentially significant impacts. If a potentially significant impact cannot be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of mitigation, it is categorized as a significant and unavoidable impact.

### **AREAS OF NO PROJECT IMPACT**

In June 2018, the City conducted an Initial Study to determine significant effects of the proposed project. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the proposed project were found to not be significant because of the inability of a project of this scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. The effects determined not to be significant are not required to be included in primary analysis sections of the Draft EIR. As such, the following impacts

either are not applicable to the proposed project or are not reasonably foreseeable and are not addressed further within this section (refer to Section 10.0, EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT):

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

## 5.11.4 POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### METHODOLOGY

Research was conducted on demographic and housing conditions using existing documents and other information sources. The potential impacts of the proposed project were evaluated qualitatively by comparing the anticipated project effects on population and housing with existing conditions. Population, housing, and employment in the area were evaluated by reviewing the most current data available from the Department of Finance, California Employment Development Department, the Shasta Regional Transportation Agency, Shasta County, and the City's *2014-2019 Housing Element*. Further information in this section is based on, but not limited to, the City's *General Plan*. For the purposes of evaluating potential population and housing impacts, a factor of 2.38 persons per household, as established by the Department of Finance for the City of Redding (DOF, 2018), was used to determine the potential growth in population as a result of the proposed project.

In accordance with CEQA, the effects of a project are evaluated to determine if they would result in a significant adverse impact on the environment. Population and housing impacts are analyzed below according to topic. Mitigation measures directly correspond with an identified impact.

<b>IMPACT</b> 5.11-1	<b><i>Implementation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.</i></b>
-------------------------	--

**Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Impact Analysis:** The following discussion evaluates potential impacts to population and housing associated with short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the proposed project. Growth inducement and its associated environmental effects are discussed in Section 6.0, GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS.

#### **Short-Term Construction**

As discussed in Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION, the construction of the project is anticipated to take four years. At the height of construction, up to 40 construction workers would commute to the site on a daily basis. Construction workers are expected to travel to the project site from various locations throughout the local area and northern California, in general. The number of workers expected to relocate to the surrounding area would not be substantial since the project applicant has historically used local general contractors and construction trades for the development of their facilities. Because construction would be temporary, occurring over a relatively short period, it is not likely that it would

require substantial numbers of people to relocate to the City. Local impacts related to population growth during project construction would be *less than significant*.

### **Long-Term Operation**

As noted in Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION, the proposed project would require approximately 180 full time employees. Based on a 2.38 average household size for Redding, the addition of 180 full time employees would potentially increase the City of Redding population by 428 persons, assuming all employees would relocate from outside the local area with families. As seen in Table 5.11-4, the City of Redding currently has an unemployment rate of 4.8 percent, and a labor force of 39,400 and Shasta County as a whole currently has an unemployment rate of 8.1 percent, and a labor force of 73,900. The addition of 180 employees would represent an increase of 0.4 percent to the labor force for the City of Redding and an increase of less than 0.2 percent to the labor force for Shasta County.

*Population Growth.* Based on the most recent available data, the current population of the City of Redding is 91,357 and Shasta County is 178,271 (DOF, 2018). The potential increase of 428 residents would represent a 0.4 percent increase in the current population for the City and a 0.2 percent increase for the current population for the County as a whole. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed project would induce direct population growth in the City's population.

Potential growth inducing impacts are also assessed based on a project's consistency with adopted plans that have addressed growth management from a local and regional standpoint. The City of Redding's *General Plan* build-out population forecast is 210,292 persons (Redding, 2000). The proposed project would not cause the City's build-out population to be exceeded. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would induce *less than significant* population growth in the City with respect to *General Plan* forecasts.

The Shasta County *General Plan* build-out population forecast for unincorporated Shasta County is approximately 162,900 residents. The *General Plan* assumes that the unincorporated area of the County would continue to account for approximately 40 percent of the total County population (Shasta County, 2004). Based on the most recent available data, the current population of unincorporated Shasta County is 66,508 residents (DOF, 2018). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would induce *less than significant* population growth in the County with respect to *General Plan* forecasts.

The Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (SRTA) is the responsible agency for developing and adopting regional population forecasts for Shasta County. SRTA projects that the City's population will grow to approximately 111,002 residents by 2035 and the County's population will grow to approximately 214,364 residents by 2035 (SRTA, 2015). The proposed project would not cause SRTA's 2035 population forecast for the City or the County to be exceeded. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would induce *less than significant* population growth in the City and County with respect to regional forecasts.

*Housing.* As shown in Table 5.11-3 above, the City of Redding has an estimated 10,043 multi-family residences, and 27,116 single-family residences. The City of Redding has an overall vacancy rate of 5.5 percent. Shasta County has an estimated 12,631 multi-family residences and 57,355 single-family residences, with an overall vacancy rate of 8.1 percent.

The addition of 180 full time staff members could potentially increase the demand for housing in the City of Redding. The new full time staff would either be permanent residents in the City of Redding, or in nearby unincorporated areas of Shasta County. As a result, the additional residents would live in either single-family or multi-family housing. As shown in Table 5.11-3 above, the City has an estimated 39,679 housing units (27,116 single-family units), with a vacancy rate of 5.5 percent and the County as a whole has an estimated 78,745 housing units (57,355 single-family units), with a vacancy rate of 8.1 percent.

Based on the City of Redding 2014-2019 Housing Element, the City anticipates housing growth of approximately 1,000 housing units in the 2014-2019 planning period. Additionally, based on the Vacant Residential Land Inventory (Table 10 in the 2014-2019 Housing Element), there is vacant land that is zoned to accommodate 21,217 dwelling units, which includes 12,170 dwelling units in single-family zoning districts and 12,791 in multi-family zoning districts. Based on the average of 2.38 persons per a household, the existing vacant land would accommodate 50,497 additional residents.

Based on the land inventory summary (Table IV-2) of the Shasta County 2009-2014 Housing Element, there is the potential for the development in unincorporated Shasta County of 7,636 dwelling units. Based on the average of 2.48 persons per household in unincorporated Shasta County, the existing vacant land would accommodate 18,937 additional residents (DOF, 2018).

The County has recently updated its unincorporated residential land inventory as part of its Draft 2014-2019 Housing Element Update (September 2018). Although the Draft 2014-2019 Housing Element has yet to be formally adopted by the County, the updated land inventory is considered to reflect the latest data relative to available residential land within unincorporated Shasta County and is included herein for informational purposes. Based on the land inventory summary (Table B-2), there is the potential for the development in unincorporated Shasta County of 6,850 dwelling units. Based on the average of 2.48 persons per household in unincorporated Shasta County, the existing vacant land would accommodate 16,988 additional residents (DOF, 2018). Therefore, based upon the land inventories compiled as part of the 2009-2014 Housing Element and Draft 2014-2019 Housing Element for Shasta County and the City's 2014-2019 Housing Element, the proposed project's impact to available housing stock within the City and unincorporated Shasta County is considered *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required. Impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The analysis of cumulative impacts focuses on those effects that, when combined together with other similar activities or projects could result in a large enough effect or impact that would be considered cumulatively significant. If the individual project's contribution is substantial enough, it may be considered cumulatively significant. In some instances, a project-specific impact may not combine with effects from other activities, in which case, the project's contribution to a cumulative effect would be less than considerable.

The geographic scope for population, housing, and employment includes approved and proposed development in the region as well as development anticipated by the City of Redding and Shasta County as identified in their respective general plans. Regional population, housing, and employment

demographics are detailed in Subsection 5.11.1, *Environmental Setting*. This geographic extent is appropriate to provide an assessment of population, housing, and employment in comparison of local and regional growth forecasts, which also accounts for planned or reasonably foreseeable development within the City and County.

---

<b>IMPACT</b>	<b><i>Development of the proposed project, along with approved and proposed development, would result in increased population and housing impacts in the City of Redding.</i></b>
<b>5.11-2</b>	

---

**Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Impact Analysis:** As mentioned above under Impact 5.11-1, implementation of the proposed project would result in a net increase in the City's residential population by approximately 428 residents and housing stock by up to 180 residential units. The proposed project would also generate an addition of 180 full time employees. The increase of 428 residents would represent less than a 1 percent increase in population for the City. Impacts in this regard would be *less than significant* and the proposed project's incremental contribution is not cumulatively considerable.

Growth within Shasta County and the City of Redding area has been accounted for in various local and regional plans and projections. As discussed above, the SRTA projects that the City's population will grow to approximately 111,002 residents by 2035 and the County's population will grow to approximately 214,364 residents by 2035 (SRTA, 2015). The proposed project would not cause SRTA's 2035 population forecast for the City or the County to be exceeded. In addition, the City has an estimated 39,679 housing units (27,116 single-family units), with a vacancy rate of 5.5 percent and the County as a whole has an estimated 78,745 housing units (57,355 single-family units), with a vacancy rate of 8.1 percent. Therefore, the project would not result in cumulative impacts to population and housing in Redding or Shasta County and population and housing impacts would be cumulatively *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required. Impacts would be cumulatively *less than significant*.