

7.9 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

This chapter focuses on the impacts to population, housing, and employment associated with the implementation of the alternatives carried forward for review under the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. In general, most impacts to population, housing, and employment are outside the USACE's statutory authority and responsibility under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The primary responsibility of evaluating and regulating impacts to population, housing, and employment resides with the local agencies such as cities and counties. As part of the NEPA review, the USACE is analyzing impacts on the environment associated with projects that receive authorizations under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

7.9.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The project alternatives would result in a significant impact on population, housing, or employment if it would:

- Exceed adopted regional or local population projections.
- Displace existing housing affecting a substantial number of people.

7.9.2 SAMP PROPOSED PERMITTING PROCEDURES

As discussed previously, the proposed RGP and LOP procedures have been developed for future participants and current participants in the SAMP. The future participants have not yet defined projects for permitting by the RGP or LOP procedures. For projects proposed by future participants that would be eligible for authorization by the maintenance RGP, impacts to population, housing, and employment would be minimal. Such activities would be associated with small maintenance projects, resulting in temporary impacts to a small area located in a mostly degraded landscape. Since there would be no change in population, housing, and employment from these maintenance activities, impacts are not expected under the RGP. For projects eligible for authorization by the LOP procedures, not enough is known about the project size and location or potential impacts to analyze potential impacts to population, housing, and employment. Such projects eligible for authorization by the LOP procedures will be subject to future NEPA review before a final permit decision can be made.

Current participants have analyzed their activities, including the SMWD Proposed Project, RMV Proposed Project, and alternatives that may have significant effects on the environment as noted in Chapter 6.0. Therefore, the authorization pursuant to the proposed permitting procedures may also have an effect on the environment per the thresholds of significance. These potential effects on population, housing, and employment and minimization/mitigation measures applicable to these potential effects are further discussed below.

7.9.3 SMWD PROPOSED PROJECT

The SMWD Proposed Project would not result in any impacts with regard to population, housing, and employment. The proposed reservoirs are designed to accommodate the projected population for the SMWD service area. No modifications of land uses are associated with the proposed reservoirs. They would not support substantially greater numbers of people, thereby encouraging development beyond the adopted population projections. The proposed facilities would not displace existing housing. The operation and maintenance activities would also not displace any housing or support development that would exceed local population projections.

7.9.4 ALTERNATIVE B-10 MODIFIED

7.9.4.1 Impacts

Exceed Adopted Regional and Local Population Projections

Orange County Projections (OCP)-2004

Alternative B-10 Modified would allow for the development of a maximum of 14,000 residential units. Of those 14,000 units, 7,020 would be single-family attached and detached units; 6,000 would be senior housing units (including both single-family units and apartments); and 980 units would be multi-family units. Population and employment projections were developed, using factors from the Center for Demographic Research (CDR) based on the approved land uses. Population projections were based on the number of proposed housing units, using a generation factor of 3.13 persons per single-family unit, 2.5 persons per multi-family unit, and 1.4 persons per senior unit. Employment projections were based the following generation factors:

- 2.3 jobs per 1,000 square feet of general and specialty retail uses;
- 3 jobs per 1,000 square feet of research and development/business park uses;
- 3.5 jobs per 1,000 square feet of office uses;
- 0.5 job per acre for golf courses;
- 0.11 job per students for elementary, middle, and high schools; and
- 0.9 job per room for resort hotel uses.

Based on this information, Alternative B-10 Modified has the potential to generate 32,823 new residents living within the RMV Planning Area and 16,508 jobs. This would not exceed OCP-2004 projections for the RMV Planning Area. Because exceedance of projections is the criteria for significance set forth in this chapter of the EIS, implementation of Alternative B-10 Modified would not have a significant impact. The shortfall of development compared to the OCP-2004 projections has been addressed through the evaluation of consistency with regional planning programs in Chapter 10.0, Consistency with Federal, Regional, and Local Plans and Programs. It should be noted that while implementation of Alternative B-10 Modified would result in fewer residences than projected in OCP-2004, it is closer to achieving regional projections than the status quo.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), adopted in November 2000, provided housing allocations for 1998 to 2005. Development associated with Alternative B-10 Modified would not be under construction within the timeframe covered by the 2000 RHNA allocation. The OCP-2004 projections did not assume housing development within the year 2000 to 2005 timeframe for the RMV Planning Area. Therefore, it would not have been assumed that proposed development within the RMV Planning Area would contribute to meeting the County's RHNA requirement. However, subsequent RHNA (post-2005 timeframe) allocations would have growth assumptions inclusive of development on the RMV Planning Area. The County is required to comply with the RHNA allocations and Alternative B-10 Modified would be responsible for contributing to the County's portions for regional housing. Alternative B-10 Modified would not conflict with the RHNA and no impact would occur related to RHNA.

Jobs/Housing Balance

Based on the jobs projected for the RMV Planning Area, Alternative B-10 Modified would generate approximately 16,509 jobs, resulting in a jobs-to-housing ratio of 1.18. This ratio means that Alternative B-10 Modified would be housing rich, which is consistent with the current trends in southern Orange County. However, of the 14,000 dwelling units proposed, 6,000 units would be age-restricted units (i.e., one resident must be aged 55 or older), resulting in a lower ratio. Based on national labor force participation rates (U.S. Census Bureau), it has been assumed that approximately 32 percent of the senior residents (aged 55 and older) continue to work. As a result of the reduced employment rates for residents of the 6,000 age-restricted units, the adjusted jobs/housing ratio for the RMV Planning Area would be approximately 1.7 jobs per household; therefore, this alternative would be jobs rich. This jobs-to-housing ratio would exceed SCAG's regional jobs/housing ratio of 1.33 for the Orange County Subregion projected for 2025. This alternative would be consistent with the jobs/housing balance goal; as a result, implementation of the B-10 Modified Alternative would not result in significant jobs/housing balance impacts.

Housing Displacement

Alternative B-10 Modified would displace 11 housing units. These housing units are owned by Rancho Mission Viejo and occupied by people affiliated with Rancho Mission Viejo. These residents would be relocated to comparable housing units by Rancho Mission Viejo prior to demolition of the existing units. Because of the small number of units affected, as well as relocation of the residents by Rancho Mission Viejo, the impact resulting from the displacement of housing would be less than significant.

7.9.4.2 Mitigation Program

The SAMP program and development projects that would be authorized by the SAMP would not result in any significant impacts related to population, housing, and employment. Alternative B-10 Modified would result in a small amount of housing displacement. However, the County of Orange, the local agency with land use jurisdiction over the RMV Planning Area, has adopted a mitigation program requiring evidence of relocation of any residents that would be displaced. These measures are listed below to provide the reader context of the mitigation program, although these measures would be implemented as part of the development project and would be the responsibility of the County of Orange for monitoring. No additional mitigation is required as part of the SAMP.

Project Design Features

- PDF 4.3-1 The Ranch Plan would provide a slightly higher jobs/housing ratio than SCAG's assumed ratio for Orange County. This would increase the overall jobs/housing balance for southern Orange County, which is currently below the SCAG ratio.
- PDF 4.3-2 Rancho Mission Viejo would relocate displaced residents prior to approval of demolition permits. Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 further supports this project design feature.

Mitigation Measures

MM 4.3-1 In conjunction with approval of an Area Plan for those portions of Planning Areas 1 and 3 where existing residential units would be displaced, the applicant shall provide evidence of relocation of any remaining residents.

7.9.4.3 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Based on the thresholds of significance, there would be no significant impacts associated to population, housing, or employment associated with the implementation of Alternative B-10 Modified.

7.9.5 ALTERNATIVE B-12

7.9.5.1 Impacts

Exceed Adopted Regional and Local Population Projections

OCP-2004

Alternative B-12 is very similar to Alternative B-10 Modified. It would allow for the development of a maximum of 14,000 residential units, with a similar mix of single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units. This alternative would provide a similar amount of employment uses (5.2 million square feet) as Alternative B-10 Modified.

Alternative B-12 has the potential to generate 32,823 new residents living within the RMV Planning Area (the same as Alternative B-10 Modified) and 16,508 jobs. This increase would not exceed OCP-2004 projections for the RMV Planning Area. As with Alternative B-10 Modified, there would be no significant impacts associated with implementation of this alternative.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The relationship of Alternative B-12 to the RHNA would be the same as Alternative B-10 Modified. This alternative would not conflict with the RHNA and no impact would occur related to RHNA.

Jobs/Housing Balance

Based on the employment-generating square footage proposed for the RMV Planning Area under the Alternative B-12 scenario, approximately 16,509 jobs would be generated. When the senior housing component is factored in, this alternative would have an adjusted jobs-to-housing ratio of 1.7 and would be considered jobs rich. Alternative B-12 would be over the SCAG target of a 1.33 jobs-to-housing ratio for the Orange County Subregion projected for 2025. The B-12 Alternative would be consistent with the jobs/housing balance goal. Therefore, no significant jobs/housing balance impacts are anticipated.

Housing Displacement

Alternative B-12 would displace 13 housing units. Similar to Alternative B-10 Modified, these residents would be relocated to comparable housing units by Rancho Mission Viejo prior to demolition of the existing units. Alternative B-12 has designated a 11-acre site in Planning Area 3 for relocation of displaced units. Because of the small number of units affected, as well

as relocation of the residents by Rancho Mission Viejo, the impact resulting from the displacement of housing would be less than significant.

7.9.5.2 Mitigation Program

Alternative B-12 would be subject to the same mitigation program as Alternative B-10 Modified. This program would be monitored by the County of Orange as the local jurisdiction with land use authority. No additional mitigation is required as part of the SAMP.

7.9.5.3 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Based on the thresholds of significance, there would be no significant impacts.

7.9.6 ALTERNATIVE A-4

7.9.6.1 Impacts

Exceed Adopted Regional and Local Population Projections

OCP-2004

Alternative A-4 would provide the same level of development as Alternative B-10 Modified. However, permits to authorize discharge or fill in Waters of the U.S. would be processed on a project-by-project basis instead of under the SAMP process. As such, the population and employment numbers would be the same. This alternative would still result in a shortfall of development compared to the OCP-2004 projections. However, Alternative A-4 would not result in exceedances of regional and local population projections and therefore would not have significant impacts.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Alternative A-4 would be able to meet future RHNA requirements as effectively as Alternative B-10 Modified or Alternative B-12. This alternative would not conflict with the RHNA and no impact would occur.

Jobs/Housing Balance

Alternative A-4 would have an adjusted jobs/housing ratio of approximately 1.7, meaning it would be considered jobs rich. This jobs-to-housing ratio would exceed SCAG's regional jobs/housing ratio of 1.33 for the Orange County Subregion projected for 2025. Because the Orange County Subregion is considered housing rich, implementation of development consistent with the A-4 development scenario would be consistent with the jobs/housing balance goal.

Housing Displacement

Alternative A-4 would displace 11 housing units. These housing units are owned by RMV and occupied by people affiliated with RMV. These residents would be relocated to comparable housing units by RMV prior to demolition of the existing units. Because of the small number of units affected, as well as relocation of the residents by RMV, the impact resulting from the displacement of housing would be less than significant.

7.9.6.2 Mitigation Program

Alternative A-4 would be subject to the same mitigation program as Alternative B-10 Modified. This program would be monitored by the County of Orange as the local jurisdiction with land use authority. No mitigation measures are required as part of the SAMP.

7.9.6.3 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Based on the thresholds of significance, there would be no significant impacts to population, housing, or employment associated with implementation of Alternative A-4.

7.9.7 ALTERNATIVE A-5

7.9.7.1 Impacts

Exceed Adopted Regional and Local Population Projections

OCP-2004

Alternative A-5 would allow for the development of 3,000 residential units. This alternative would provide limited employment opportunities. The only employment would be possible small services to support the residential uses (e.g., small markets and schools). The only employment use would be uses that can be implemented within a residential designation. Based on the generation factors identified for the other alternatives, Alternative A-5 has the potential to generate approximately 9,000 new residents living within the RMV Planning Area. This increase would not exceed OCP-2004 projections for the RMV Planning Area. As with Alternative B-10 Modified, there would be no significant impacts associated with implementation of this alternative.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The relationship of Alternative A-5 to the RHNA would be the same as Alternative B-10 Modified, in that no development would occur within the timeframe of the adopted RHNA. Since the allocations for future RHNA have not been made, it is not possible to determine the consistency of Alternative A-5 with future RHNA numbers; therefore. However, the limited number of housing units proposed with this alternative would severely limit the ability of the County to contribute to future RHNA allocation. It is possible that the County's contribution would be reduced accordingly. Therefore, the assessment of impact is based on the currently adopted RHNA numbers. Alternative A-5 is consistent with the adopted RHNA numbers.

Jobs/Housing Balance

This alternative does not provide a jobs/housing balance. As previously indicated, the only employment use would be uses that can be implemented within a residential designation. SCAG has adopted regional jobs/housing ratio of 1.33 for the Orange County Subregion. This alternative would be housing rich and not meet the jobs-to-housing ratio. This alternative on an individual basis would not meet the adopted jobs-to-housing ratio. It would continue the housing-rich trend in south Orange County. However, the SCAG jobs/housing ratio applies to the entire Orange County Subregion, which as a whole is jobs-rich. Therefore, there would not be a significant impact related to jobs/housing balance.

Housing Displacement

Alternative A-5 would not necessarily displace housing units. A comprehensive development plan has not been prepared for this alternative. With the overall low density associated with this alternative, there is likely that new housing would be developed surrounding existing housing. There would be no impact resulting from the displacement of housing.

7.9.7.2 Mitigation Program

No mitigation measures would be required for Alternative A-5.

7.9.7.3 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Based on the thresholds of significance, there would be no significant impacts.