

CHAPTER 16 – POPULATION AND HOUSING, SOCIOECONOMICS, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

This chapter provides an overview of the existing social and economic conditions, demographics, and the characteristics of minority and low-income populations in the Planning Area that are relevant for the analysis of environmental justice, and presents the potential effects of each Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) alternative on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice within the Planning Area.

An evaluation of population and housing focuses on the potential for projects and actions to remove or displace existing housing and the availability of, and demand for, housing relative to the size of the population.

Socioeconomics considers how the economic changes resulting from a project or action affect the human population in the area, such as changes in the number or type of jobs or changes in tax generation affecting the provision of government services.

As described in Sections 16.1.1 and 16.1.2, the core of an environmental justice analysis determines whether a project or an action would result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations. The adverse effects can be physical or economic.

16.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This section describes the regulatory and environmental setting for population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice.

16.1.1 Regulatory Framework

There are several federal, state, and local agency requirements that apply to the evaluation of population and housing, socioeconomics, and/or environmental justice. This section summarizes the statutes, regulations, policies, and agency planning documents that are relevant to the approval, issuance of permits, or implementation of the alternatives analyzed in this EIS/EIR. To the extent possible, the analyses or studies required by these regulations and policies are integrated into the environmental effects analyses presented in Section 16.2 (40 CFR 1502.25).

16.1.1.1 Federal

National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations require an effects analysis to consider social and economic effects, whether those effects are direct, indirect, or cumulative (40 CFR 1508.8). However, social and economic effects by themselves do not require preparation of an

EIS document. An EIS is prepared to analyze the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment. When economic or social effects are interrelated to natural or physical environmental effects, then an EIS must discuss all of those effects on the human environment (40 CFR 1508.14). Therefore, if a lead agency determines that there may be a sufficient effect on the physical or natural environment that an EIS is the proper NEPA document to prepare, then social and economic effects must be quantified and analyzed if the social and economic effects may be interrelated to the effects on the natural or physical environment.

Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

President Clinton signed Executive Order 12898 (Clinton 1994) to underscore that provisions of existing environmental and civil rights statutes can help ensure that all communities and persons of the nation live in a safe and healthy environment. Under Executive Order 12898, each federal agency must identify and address, as appropriate and as required by NEPA, any disproportionately high and adverse human health, economic, social, and environmental effects of its programs, policies, or actions on minority or low-income populations. Each federal agency must make achieving environmental justice part of its mission.

The document *Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act* (CEQ 1997) defined the terms minority and low-income to include:

- **A minority** is defined as individual(s) who are members of the following population groups: American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian or Pacific Islander; Black, not of Hispanic origin; or Hispanic. However, individuals of Hispanic background can also identify themselves as any racial group because Hispanic is an ethnicity based on a shared language, Spanish—not a racial identity.
- **Low-income populations** in an affected area are identified with the annual poverty thresholds from the U.S. Census Bureau's *Current Population Reports, Series P-60 on Income and Poverty* (CEQ 1997). The *Current Population Reports, Series P-60 on Income and Poverty* is an annual report prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau. The most recent report was published in 2016 (Proctor et al. 2016). The report, among other data, identifies income levels for individuals and different-sized families, and if the individual or family earns below that level, they are considered in poverty. The Council on Environmental Quality identifies that these poverty thresholds should be used to define low-income populations.

Environmental Compliance Memorandum 95-3 (ECM 95-3) describes federal agency responsibilities under the Department of the Interior environmental justice policy. ECM 95-3 states: "Therefore, henceforth all environmental documents should specifically analyze and

evaluate the impacts of any proposed projects, actions or decisions on minority and low-income populations and communities, as well as the equity of the distribution of benefits and risks of those decisions.” In addition, ECM 95-3 also states: “If a federal action is expected to have either an insignificant impact or no impact on minority/low-income populations, the NEPA document prepared for the action, under the scoping section in an environmental impact statement, should specifically state that the proposed project or action was considered during scoping and/or planning and is expected to have either insignificant impact or no impact, direct or indirect, with reasons given.”

16.1.1.2 State

California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines require analysis of a proposed project’s potential effects on population growth and housing supply. However, CEQA does not require a discussion of socioeconomic effects except where they would result in physical changes, and states that economic or social effects “shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15131).

16.1.1.3 Local

Sacramento County 2030 General Plan

The *Sacramento County 2030 General Plan (Sacramento County General Plan)* (Sacramento County 2011) includes goals, objectives, and policies related to socioeconomic and environmental justice. Applicable policies include the following:

Policy CI-23: Consider the transit needs of senior, disabled, low-income, and transit-dependent persons in making recommendations regarding transit services.

Policy LU-45: Mix affordable housing units with market rate units to the extent feasible, as opposed to building segregated affordable housing developments.

Policy ED-1: Achieve complete communities that have enough land capacity to accommodate the development of general commercial, industrial, and office uses which support community needs in all areas of the County.

Policy ED-8: Create plans for new growth areas with a mix of land uses, including a balance of residential and employment (jobs-housing balance) as well as providing for neighborhood-oriented services and diverse commercial amenities to serve a broader portion of the population.

Policy ED-10: Revitalize distressed and aging commercial corridors by developing mixed-use centers and urban villages along corridors to improve community quality of life, optimize economic development, balance land uses, and foster the opportunity to accommodate a portion of the anticipated future growth.

Policy ED-19: Support and encourage the maintenance and growth of commercial agricultural businesses in Sacramento County.

Policy ED-29: Strive to further the County’s economic base through cooperative efforts of local businesses and agencies.

Policy ED-34: Identify and attract industries that are consistent with the County’s goal of economic vitality and providing a high quality of life.

Policy ED-36: Pursue new developments and businesses that add to the County’s economic base, particularly those that generate sales tax and property tax revenue.

Policy ED-37: Assist local firms in the trade and service sectors to expand their existing markets.

Policy ED-38: Identify and recruit new firms that supply or otherwise support businesses already located in the Sacramento area.

2030 Galt General Plan

The *2030 Galt General Plan* (Galt General Plan) (Galt 2009a) includes goals, objectives, and policies related to socioeconomics and environmental justice. Applicable policies include the following:

Policy LU-10.1: Environmental Justice. The City shall ensure the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of land use and environmental laws, regulations, and policies. The City shall ensure that no part of the community suffers disproportionately from adverse human health or environmental effects, and all people live in clean, healthy, and sustainable communities.

Policy LU-10.2: Equal Public Participation. The City shall ensure that all community residents have an opportunity for public participation in the decision-making process.

Policy LU-10.3: Equitable Distribution of New Public Facilities and Services. The City shall plan for the equitable distribution of new public facilities and services that increase and enhance the community's quality of life.

Policy LU-10.4: Location of Industrial Facilities. The City shall provide for the location of industrial facilities and uses that pose a significant hazard to human health and safety in a manner that seeks to avoid proximity to schools or residential dwellings.

Policy ED-4.1: Business Retention and Expansion (BRE) Priority. The City should prioritize local business retention by focusing BRE resources on retaining and expanding those businesses that already serve as significant sources for jobs and/or tax revenue for the City.

Policy C-5.3: ADA Compliance. The City shall consider the transit needs of senior, disabled, minority, low-income, and transit-dependent persons in making decisions regarding transit services and in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Rancho Cordova General Plan

The *Rancho Cordova General Plan* (Rancho Cordova General Plan) (Rancho Cordova 2006a) includes goals, objectives, and policies related to the socioeconomics and environmental justice. Applicable policies include the following:

Policy H.1.1: Improve the City's jobs-housing balance through ensuring that housing development in Rancho Cordova provides opportunities for all income levels in order to serve the full range of available and projected jobs in the City.

Policy H.2.1: Encourage private investment to increase property values and resale prices.

Policy H.2.7: Preserve housing units at risk of losing affordability status for units that are subsidized with federal, state, or local funds.

Policy H.7.4: Require non-residential development to provide for the affordable housing needs generated or contributed to by their development.

Policy ED.1.5: Heavy industrial uses should include transitions in intensity, buffers, or other methods to reduce potential impacts on residential uses. Buffers may include land designated for other uses, such as light industry, commercial, or open spaces. The ten-acre minimum parcel size shall apply until the land is zoned to an M-1, M-2, MP, or GC designation.

Policy ED.1.8: Provide a variety of housing types in Rancho Cordova to support a diverse economy, including workforce housing, move-up housing, and executive housing.

Policy ED.7.1: Provide support that makes it attractive and profitable for private sector developers to produce infill development. At the same time, encourage infill development that is attractive to potential residents and beneficial to existing residents.

Policy ED.8.1: Increase the number of jobs that go to Rancho Cordova residents by coordinating economic development efforts with employment placements.

16.1.2 Population and Socioeconomic Conditions in the Planning Area

Information on existing population and socioeconomic conditions in this section is based primarily on data published by the U.S. Census Bureau. The U.S. Census Bureau compiles data by county, city, and census tract. A census tract is a permanent geographic area, typically smaller than a city or county, recognized by the U.S. Census Bureau, to allow the collection and analysis of census data at a more refined geographic scale. Once established, census tract boundaries are rarely changed to support the comparison of census data collected in each tract over time. Census tracts that overlap with the Planning Area are shown in Figure 16-1.

The Planning Area is a geographic boundary unique to this EIS/EIR (see Section 1.1.1). The census tracts used by the Census Bureau do not directly correspond to the boundaries of the Planning Area. Therefore, census tract data was used for tracts that are completely, or mostly, within the Planning Area boundary (see Figure 16-1). Because the census tract boundaries do not exactly correspond to the Planning Area boundary, the population and socioeconomic data provided for the Planning Area should be considered as an estimate based on the best available information.

16.1.2.1 Resident Population Size

All of Sacramento County (County) has approximately 1.4 million residents (Table 16-1). The Planning Area portion of the County has approximately 240,000 residents, with most of those individuals living in unincorporated County areas and the other portion in Galt and Rancho Cordova (Table 16-1).

Table 16-1. Existing Populations of the Project Proponents and Inside the Planning Area

Project Proponents with Jurisdiction	Population
Sacramento County	1,435,207
Galt	23,997
Rancho Cordova	66,027
Total for Planning Area*	242,133

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013a

* Planning Area population was estimated using data from census tracts that were located completely or mostly within the Planning Area and includes Galt and Rancho Cordova and portions of unincorporated Sacramento County.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

16.1.2.2 Race and Ethnicity

The term “race” refers to the race categories used by the Census Bureau when collecting data on the U.S. population. The seven race categories used by the Census Bureau are identified in Table 16-2. The Census Bureau also provides individuals the opportunity to identify as Hispanic or Latino, which is an ethnicity or ethnic identity and not a race. A person of any race may also identify as Hispanic or Latino. Hispanic or Latino persons are those of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin. The term “minority” is defined in Section 16.1.1.1. Persons of any race identified by the Census Bureau except for “white alone,” and persons identifying as Hispanic or Latino ethnicity are considered a minority. Minorities currently comprise 64.5% of the overall population in the Planning Area, a higher proportion of minority residents relative to the total population in all of Sacramento County (53.1%) (U.S. Census Bureau 2013a). In addition, the Planning Area has a higher proportion of minority residents relative to the overall populations than Galt and Rancho Cordova (48.9% and 47.9%, respectively).

Because individuals can identify as both a race and by Hispanic or Latino ethnicity when providing information to the Census Bureau, there is the potential to count one individual two times when compiling minority population data. In order to show minority populations without double-counting those who identify as both Hispanic or Latino ethnicity and as a particular race on census questionnaires, Table 16-2 shows the percentage of the Planning Area population that identifies themselves as either Hispanic or Latino of any race, or identifies themselves as one or more races not of Hispanic or Latino origin, but does not record any individuals in more than one category.

Within the Planning Area, there is no distinct racial or ethnic majority. In individual census tracts in the Planning Area, 13 out of 52 census tracts have a white majority (not shaded in Table 16-3). Two census tracts have a majority of Hispanic or Latino peoples (shaded in dark grey in Table 16-3). All other census tracts do not have more than 50% of any one racial or ethnic group. Forty census tracts would be considered as minority populations under Executive Order 12898 as “the cumulative percentage of minorities within the affected community is greater than 50 percent.” These 40 census tracts are shaded grey in Table 16-3, and as shown in Figure 16-1, are located within Rancho Cordova, portions of Galt, the unincorporated County between the City of Sacramento and Elk Grove, and the area directly south of Elk Grove.

16.1.2.3 Income and Poverty

In 2013, the most recent year for which data is available from the Census Bureau, the nationwide poverty threshold (sometimes referred to as the “poverty line”) for a family/household of four people was \$23,834 (U.S. Census Bureau 2013 b). The median

household income in the County as a whole is well above the poverty line at \$55,064; however, 13.4% of families and 17.6% of individuals live below the nationwide poverty line. Most census tracts in the Planning Area have median household incomes above the poverty line. There are two census tracts in the Planning Area with a median household income below the four-person poverty threshold (shaded green in Table 16-4). These are located in unincorporated Sacramento County, near its boundary with the City of Sacramento (see Figure 16-1). These census tracts are also locations where minorities make up more than 50% of the population.

Table 16-2. Race and Ethnicity Population Ratios for the Project Proponent Jurisdictions and Inside the Planning Area (2013)

Place	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	Asian Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races
Sacramento County	21.8%	47.9%	9.7%	0.5%	14.4%	1.0%	0.3%	4.5%
Galt	19.2%	51.1%	2.7%	0.3%	1.4%	0.7%	0.3%	1.2%
Rancho Cordova	42.3%	52.1%	10.1%	0.3%	12.0%	0.9%	0.2%	5.2%
Planning Area*	28.0%	36.5%	10.7%	0.5%	19.0%	1.1%	0.3%	4.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013a

* Planning Area population was estimated using data per census tracts that were completely or mostly within the Planning Area and includes Galt and Rancho Cordova and portions of unincorporated Sacramento County.

Table 16-3. 2013 Race and Ethnicity Population Ratios by Planning Area Census Tract

Census Tract	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	Asian Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	Percent Minority (non-white)
44.02	58.6%	13.2%	10.3%	0.0%	12.3%	0.0%	0.5%	5.1%	87%
45.02	45.6%	19.0%	11.2%	0.0%	15.0%	6.4%	0.5%	2.2%	81%
46.01	47.4%	21.6%	9.5%	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	78%
46.02	48.9%	26.5%	13.1%	0.5%	6.6%	1.2%	0.4%	2.7%	74%
47.01	50.5%	14.4%	13.1%	0.8%	19.6%	0.3%	0.0%	1.3%	86%
47.02	46.4%	15.6%	13.2%	0.0%	18.1%	0.6%	0.0%	6.2%	84%
48.02	33.0%	20.7%	11.1%	0.1%	29.3%	0.7%	0.0%	5.2%	79%
49.04	33.8%	31.9%	11.1%	0.2%	18.2%	0.2%	0.3%	4.4%	68%
50.01	37.4%	13.9%	13.1%	0.7%	27.1%	2.2%	0.0%	5.6%	86%
50.02	25.0%	29.6%	19.4%	1.9%	15.9%	3.2%	0.0%	4.9%	70%
51.01	29.2%	25.7%	17.7%	0.0%	23.1%	1.4%	0.0%	2.9%	74%
51.02	29.2%	30.9%	10.3%	1.7%	22.5%	0.0%	0.1%	5.3%	69%

Table 16-3. 2013 Race and Ethnicity Population Ratios by Planning Area Census Tract

Census Tract	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	Asian Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	Percent Minority (non-white)
86	7.8%	75.6%	5.9%	2.2%	4.1%	0.0%	0.9%	3.5%	24%
87.04	16.0%	37.9%	6.2%	0.3%	35.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	62%
87.05	12.4%	46.1%	8.4%	0.0%	23.3%	0.8%	1.0%	7.9%	54%
88.01	17.7%	42.9%	11.0%	0.3%	19.6%	2.8%	0.0%	5.7%	57%
90.04	18.9%	51.7%	16.1%	1.7%	6.1%	2.0%	0.2%	3.3%	48%
90.05	13.5%	53.6%	14.1%	1.8%	11.2%	0.6%	0.0%	5.1%	46%
90.07	28.8%	38.2%	22.0%	0.7%	7.6%	0.0%	0.2%	2.6%	62%
90.1	16.6%	38.9%	15.3%	0.0%	22.3%	1.4%	0.0%	5.5%	61%
90.11	12.7%	43.1%	3.3%	0.4%	36.2%	1.8%	0.3%	2.2%	57%
91.03	17.8%	48.2%	17.8%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	52%
91.08	13.9%	56.8%	8.2%	0.0%	13.2%	0.3%	0.0%	7.5%	43%
91.09	14.7%	53.3%	12.2%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	0.3%	10.9%	47%
91.1	26.4%	24.9%	35.9%	0.4%	5.6%	0.7%	3.4%	2.8%	75%
91.11	37.7%	35.2%	7.0%	0.0%	16.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	65%
91.12	25.7%	47.5%	12.0%	0.0%	11.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	52%
92.01	22.1%	41.9%	3.3%	1.1%	24.5%	1.5%	0.0%	5.6%	58%
93.11	24.0%	31.2%	8.0%	1.6%	32.4%	0.1%	0.1%	2.6%	69%
93.12	18.0%	32.6%	14.4%	0.4%	31.7%	0.5%	0.1%	2.3%	67%
93.16	13.7%	16.6%	11.6%	1.6%	46.7%	0.5%	0.0%	9.3%	83%
93.17	21.1%	30.8%	18.3%	0.1%	21.7%	0.0%	1.5%	6.2%	69%
93.18	25.6%	18.0%	13.3%	2.8%	26.3%	8.3%	0.0%	5.7%	82%
93.19	23.1%	10.4%	13.2%	0.0%	42.0%	2.5%	0.0%	8.8%	90%
93.2	34.9%	15.1%	10.8%	0.0%	30.2%	2.7%	0.2%	6.0%	85%
93.21	20.8%	25.3%	14.5%	0.3%	32.8%	2.2%	0.0%	4.1%	75%
93.25	10.3%	79.3%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21%

Table 16-3. 2013 Race and Ethnicity Population Ratios by Planning Area Census Tract

Census Tract	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	Asian Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	Percent Minority (non-white)
93.26	12.5%	45.1%	5.8%	0.0%	32.4%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	55%
93.29	33.4%	20.8%	23.3%	0.4%	19.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	79%
93.3	18.7%	41.7%	7.2%	0.2%	30.2%	0.0%	1.4%	0.6%	58%
94.03	28.9%	63.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.2%	0.6%	0.5%	36%
94.04	15.3%	71.9%	0.6%	0.8%	6.4%	0.0%	1.0%	4.1%	28%
94.06	13.5%	79.1%	3.1%	0.2%	2.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.3%	21%
94.07	42.6%	51.4%	1.4%	0.1%	1.2%	1.4%	0.5%	1.3%	49%
94.08	26.7%	62.2%	5.5%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.3%	38%
95.01	61.7%	36.3%	0.1%	0.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	64%
95.02	30.9%	60.7%	5.8%	0.4%	1.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.0%	39%
95.03	46.4%	47.9%	0.1%	1.4%	2.2%	0.8%	0.0%	1.2%	52%
95.04	40.9%	57.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	42%
96.18	19.1%	32.2%	11.0%	0.0%	26.6%	6.1%	0.0%	5.0%	68%
96.35	18.9%	23.9%	20.6%	0.0%	31.7%	1.5%	0.0%	3.4%	76%
96.38	25.2%	36.5%	20.2%	0.9%	14.3%	0.2%	0.0%	2.7%	64%
99	41.7%	44.7%	0.0%	1.2%	9.7%	0.1%	0.5%	2.2%	55%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013a

Notes: Grey shading = Minority population under Executive Order 12898 as “the cumulative percentage of minorities within the affected community is greater than 50%”

Dark grey shading = majority of Hispanic or Latino peoples

No shading = White majority

* Planning Area population was estimated using data per census tracts that were completely or mostly within the Planning Area and includes Galt and Rancho Cordova and portions of unincorporated Sacramento County.

Table 16-4. Income and Poverty Conditions for the Project Proponents and in each Planning Area Census Tract (2013)

Place/Census Tract	Median Household Income (\$)	Percent Families with Total Income Below Poverty Level	Percent Individuals Below Poverty Level
Sacramento County	55,064	13.4%	17.6%
Galt	57,100	14.4%	19.5%
Rancho Cordova	52,152	13.6%	17.8%
44.02	27,556	45.2%	50.2%
45.02	26,224	45.3%	47.2%
46.01	25,007	36.3%	40.8%
46.02	31,845	23.4%	31.5%
47.01	17,133	51.2%	59.4%
47.02	32,931	23.5%	29.0%
48.02	34,428	27.5%	40.5%
49.04	45,588	8.1%	14.1%
50.01	46,372	21.3%	24.7%
50.02	25,313	21.2%	30.4%
51.01	34,368	34.2%	35.1%
51.02	48,445	11.8%	14.8%
86	97,472	2.9%	4.2%
87.04	93,814	6.9%	8.7%
87.05	107,768	1.4%	5.0%
88.01	81,538	15.5%	17.3%
90.04	58,173	11.3%	14.0%
90.05	44,760	11.9%	19.0%
90.07	43,333	21.3%	29.8%
90.1	46,496	14.9%	21.4%
90.11	95,146	2.1%	3.9%
91.03	56,200	13.8%	14.8%
91.08	62,820	6.7%	9.5%
91.09	72,230	4.0%	10.1%
91.1	21,788	40.4%	41.7%
91.11	48,892	18.0%	20.1%

Table 16-4. Income and Poverty Conditions for the Project Proponents and in each Planning Area Census Tract (2013)

Place/Census Tract	Median Household Income (\$)	Percent Families with Total Income Below Poverty Level	Percent Individuals Below Poverty Level
91.12	62,140	16.3%	19.2%
92.01	42,650	22.2%	24.9%
93.11	73,932	9.8%	13.8%
93.12	66,964	11.9%	18.7%
93.16	60,417	11.9%	13.3%
93.17	66,816	12.5%	16.6%
93.18	62,132	15.1%	16.2%
93.19	53,154	14.1%	18.4%
93.2	47,650	15.4%	19.4%
93.21	69,969	12.3%	13.3%
93.25	71,690	1.7%	8.3%
93.26	111,170	1.9%	3.5%
93.29	61,625	13.9%	14.6%
93.3	85,365	5.6%	6.8%
94.03	76,176	15.7%	17.1%
94.04	79,643	15.5%	14.9%
94.06	87,844	1.6%	7.8%
94.07	66,809	12.9%	14.6%
94.08	77,361	3.0%	17.8%
95.01	44,958	19.8%	22.8%
95.02	66,726	8.3%	15.0%
95.03	39,504	15.4%	25.1%
95.04	50,167	25.0%	34.3%
96.18	77,276	8.2%	7.4%
96.35	93,347	2.7%	3.6%
96.38	70,605	4.6%	7.4%
99	60,833	8.7%	14.7%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013c

Note: Green shading = A median household income below the four-person poverty guideline

16.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

16.2.1 Methodology for Assessing Impacts of Each Alternative on Population and Housing, Socioeconomics, and Environmental Justice

The effects of each EIS/EIR alternative on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice are described and analyzed qualitatively, as discussed in Section 3.6. The projects and activities expected under each alternative, including expected or conceptual preserves, are described in Chapter 2.

The lead agencies determined that an appropriate geographic study scale for evaluating the effects on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice of each EIS/EIR alternative is the Planning Area as this is the location where physical changes in the environment resulting from the alternatives could affect these resources. However, as stated in Section 16.1.2, the available data used to support the analysis is sometimes presented for the County as a whole, or by census tract. Therefore, by necessity, the impact analysis considers the data using these geographic boundaries, which, in some cases, extends beyond the boundaries of the Planning Area.

Potential effects from each alternative were analyzed based on the best available information about types and locations of new urban development projects and activities. The impact analyses incorporate by reference relevant impact analyses from the three planning documents and the EIRs discussed Section 3.4.

Environmental justice effects are evaluated using the guidance, methodology, and definitions established by Executive Order 12898, and by the Council on Environmental Quality publications and guidance documents identified in Section 16.1.1. Topics considered under the environmental justice analysis include all the resource topics analyzed in this EIS/EIR (see Section 3.2).

The first step of an environmental justice analysis includes identifying areas where a minority or low-income population exists within the Planning Area. Using census tracts, which are the smallest geographic unit available for this kind of data, these areas were identified using the following criteria:

- The cumulative percentage of minorities within a census tract is greater than 50%; or
- The median household income for a census tract is below the national poverty line established by the Census Bureau (U.S. Census Bureau 2013b).

The second step of an environmental justice analysis requires the identification of a “high and adverse” human health, economic, social, and/or environmental effect. The Council on

Environmental Quality indicates that when determining whether the effects are high and adverse, federal agencies are to consider whether the risks or rates of impact on the human environment “are significant or above generally accepted norms” (CEQ 1997). Typically, a significant adverse effect identified in a NEPA document is treated as a high and adverse effect in an environmental justice analysis.

The final step of an environmental justice analysis requires a finding on whether a minority or low-income population is disproportionately affected by a high and adverse effect. A high and adverse effect is considered to disproportionately affect a minority or low-income population if the effect on that population appreciably exceeds the overall effect, risk of effect, or rate of effect to the general population (CEQ 1997).

Cumulative effects are analyzed consistent with the methodology described in Section 3.7 and consider whether the incremental effects of the alternative on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice would be significant (i.e., cumulatively considerable).

As discussed in Section 3.4, the EIR documents previously prepared for the General Plans of Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova (Galt 2009b; Rancho Cordova 2006b; Sacramento County 2010) analyzed direct and cumulative impacts of urban growth planned within each jurisdiction, including effects to population and housing. When the impact analysis or conclusions provided in these General Plan EIR documents were determined by the lead agencies to be appropriate for use in the analysis of the EIS/EIR alternatives, a brief summary or description of the incorporated information or analysis is provided below. As described further in Section 16.2.1.1, these EIRs, being CEQA documents, did not include an analysis of environmental justice. The evaluation of environmental justice is a NEPA requirement.

16.2.1.1 Determination of Impact Significance

As discussed in Section 3.8.1, the criteria used to evaluate the significance of each alternative’s effects on population and housing, on socioeconomics, or on environmental justice are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, and on typical thresholds used to evaluate effects to population and housing in recent EIRs prepared by Sacramento County, and typical thresholds used to evaluate effects on socioeconomics and environmental justice in similar EIS/EIRs for habitat conservation plans. Based on these sources, a significant adverse effect could occur if the alternative would:

1. Displace substantial numbers of residences in the Planning Area;
2. Create a substantial demand for additional housing that could not be sustained within the Planning Area;
3. Substantially displace or disrupt businesses;
4. Substantially reduce property tax revenue;

5. Cause a disproportionately high and adverse human health, economic, social, or environmental impact on a minority population; or
6. Cause a disproportionately high and adverse human health, economic, social, or environmental impact on a low-income population.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines does not provide suggested criteria for evaluating a beneficial effect. The following criteria were developed by the lead agencies. A beneficial effect could occur if the alternative would:

1. Displace fewer residences in the Planning Area compared to a baseline environmental condition;
2. Alleviate or reduce an unsustainable housing demand within the Planning Area;
3. Displace fewer businesses, or result in less disruption to businesses compared to a baseline environmental condition;
4. Result in less of a reduction in property tax revenue, or increase property tax revenue, compared to a baseline environmental condition; or
5. Reduce or eliminate a disproportionately high and adverse human health, economic, social, or environmental impact on minority or low-income populations compared to a baseline environmental condition.

The impact analysis for the three EIS/EIR alternatives will consider the context, intensity, and severity of potential effects to population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice, and will present a determination of significance applicable to each of these criteria.

16.2.2 No Action/No Project Alternative

The No Action/No Project Alternative is described in Section 2.2.1 of Chapter 2.

16.2.2.1 Direct and Indirect Effects of the Alternative

Much of the future urban development included in the No Action/No Project Alternative is described in the General Plans of Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova (see Section 2.2.1).

Under the No Action/No Project Alternative, grazing land and farmland would be converted to developed land uses. These changes would be accompanied by a transition of jobs and tax revenues from grazing and farming uses to jobs and tax revenues from urban uses. Many of the activities would also result in temporary increases in construction-related employment. Although this is expected to result in an overall benefit to employment and tax revenues, there could be a decline in the businesses associated with agricultural activity.

Under the No Action/No Project Alternative individual urban development projects would continue to provide mitigation to offset effects to listed species, wetlands, and other regulated

natural resources. Mitigation for unavoidable effects to listed species, wetlands, and other regulated natural resources would continue to occur through purchasing credits at a mitigation or conservation bank approved by the applicable regulatory agencies (e.g., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), when project proponents pay into an existing Clean Water Act (CWA) 404 in-lieu fee program, provide on-site project proponent responsible mitigation, or provide off-site project proponent responsible mitigation (see Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2). The CWA 404 in-lieu fee program would need to meet the requirements of the 2008 CWA Compensatory Mitigation Rule. Once the program is established, the in-lieu fee program Implementing Entity would collect funds from project proponents when their projects result in fill of aquatic resources. The funds would then be used by the Implementing Entity to complete required compensatory mitigation (i.e., wetland re-establishment and establishment).

Biological mitigation activities expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative (described in more detail in Section 2.2) are expected to maintain existing land uses, such as continuing grazing or crop production on a mitigation preserve, consistent with existing wildlife habitat on the site. However, farmland could be purchased for a mitigation preserve and a portion converted to wetland or riparian habitat. The labor required to implement re-establishment/establishment of aquatic resources and aquatic habitat would have short-term economic value. However, once the farmland is converted to another land cover, the labor force needed to operate the remaining farmland could be reduced. Tax revenues could decline because farmland acres could be taken out of production. However, only a relatively small portion of existing farmland in the Planning Area would be taken out of production to support establishment of mitigation preserves. It is more likely that mitigation preserves would be established on properties with lower land values, such as grazing lands. Mitigation preserves for habitats such as vernal pools can continue to support grazing operations, and therefore maintain employment and tax revenues at similar levels and prevent socioeconomic effects.

As discussed in Section 16.1.2, minority individuals make up more than 50% of the total population in many portions of the County, especially within the Urban Development Area (UDA).¹ As seen on Figure 16-1, minority communities reside in the Planning Area within Rancho Cordova, portions of Galt, the unincorporated County between the City of Sacramento and Elk Grove, and the area directly south of Elk Grove. Only two census tracts have a median household income below the poverty line. These are also communities where minorities make up more than 50% of the population.

¹ As discussed in Section 1.1.1, the term Urban Development Area (UDA) is used by the EIS/EIR to discuss all lands where urban development Covered Activity projects or activities could occur under the action alternatives. Therefore, the term “UDA” means all lands within the County’s Urban Service Boundary that are also within the Planning Area (including lands within the Rancho Cordova city limits that are within the Planning Area), all lands within Galt’s city limits, and all lands within Galt’s sphere of influence (see Figure 1-1).

As explained in Section 2.2.2, the regulatory environment of the No Action/No Project Alternative is expected to restrict the ability of local agencies to permit approximately 1,900 acres of future urban development in the Mather Core Recovery Area (MCRA), and this future development would be shifted or displaced to one or more of the areas of undeveloped land outside of the Urban Service Boundary (USB). This development would occur in areas not currently considered as low-income or minority.

Although some urban development would be shifted or displaced from the MCRA to other locations under the No Action/No Project Alternative, the alternative includes a sufficient amount of urban development and associated infrastructure to meet the development objectives ultimately planned/contemplated in the adopted general plans of Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova. Therefore, implementation of the No Action/No Project Alternative would not be an impediment to meeting current or future residential development needs.

The No Action/No Project Alternative could have various adverse effects on human health and the environment, as identified in the No Action/No Project Alternative impact discussions in Chapters 4 through 15 of this EIS/EIR. As discussed in Section 16.2.1, resource topics considered under this environmental justice analysis includes all the resource topics analyzed in this EIS/EIR (see Section 3.2). New urban development is planned for areas that intersect where minority and low-income populations reside and with that development comes both the potential for effects on human health and the environment as well as beneficial effects resulting from the proximity of urban services, parks, schools, employment opportunities, and transit. In addition, minority populations are spread across multiple locations in the planning area, indicating that minority populations are not concentrated in particular locations where they are disproportionately exposed to high and adverse human health, economic, social, and or environmental effects. Furthermore, the County and city general plans include policies that consider low-income and minority populations.

Preserves and other activities that would be implemented to mitigate for the negative effects of urban development, typically do not negatively impact human populations. Mitigation preserves provide for natural areas that could have a beneficial effect on individuals living or working near a preserve. Beneficial effects of mitigation preserves could include recreation opportunities, visual relief from urban development, and enjoyment of nature. Benefits of trails and some other positive preserve externalities are discussed in Chapter 12. Under the No Action/No Project Alternative, some mitigation preserves would be included in the UDA as projects are developed and some projects would include on-site preserves as mitigation. This would provide a beneficial effect as these mitigation preserves would be created within the UDA where many of the low-income and minority communities reside. The locations of off-site preserves would be dependent on the type of habitat mitigation required and available land.

The potential effects related to population and housing were analyzed in the general plan EIRs for the County and the cities. As discussed in Section 16.2.1, the relevant conclusions from each of these general plan EIRs are summarized below and incorporated into the analysis of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

The impact analysis presented in the *Sacramento County General Plan Update Final EIR* (Sacramento County 2010), determined that within Sacramento County:

- Impacts associated with division or disruption of an established community and displacement of housing, were considered to be less than significant (Sacramento County 2010, pp. 1-2, 3-60, 3-61, 3-72, 3-76 to 3-78).²

The impact analysis presented in the *City of Galt General Plan Update: 2030 Final EIR* (Galt 2009b), determined that within Galt:

- Impacts to social or economic impacts were not found to have a physical impact on the environment nor would the changes in the environment result in adverse impacts on social or economic concerns (Galt 2009b, pp. 6-10 and 7-1).

The impact analysis presented in the *City of Rancho Cordova General Plan Final EIR* (Rancho Cordova 2006b), determined that within Rancho Cordova:

- Impacts potentially contributing to a substantial displacement of housing units or people as a result of implementation of the General Plan were found to be less than significant (Rancho Cordova 2006b, p. 4.3-14).

As discussed in Section 3.4, the three General Plan EIRs used different study periods—ending in 2030 (Galt 2009b), in 2030 (Rancho Cordova 2006b), and 2050 (Sacramento County 2010). However, the 50-year study period for this EIS/EIR ends in 2065 (Section 3.6.3). Therefore, additional urban development can be expected to occur within Galt, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento County in the years after each General Plan EIR study period ends, but before this EIS/EIR’s study period ends in 2065. Therefore, the impact analyses and conclusions incorporated from the three General Plan EIRs may not have considered all of the future urban development that is included in the project description of each EIS/EIR alternative. Consequently, when determining the significance of each impact described in the EIS/EIR, the lead agencies considered the impact analysis and the conclusions incorporated by reference

² The Sacramento County General Plan EIR analyzed development within a designated “Jackson Highway Corridor New Growth Area” that was not a part of the alternative ultimately selected by the County. However, the County is currently processing Master Plans in the Jackson Highway Corridor, so the referenced conclusions are relevant to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

from the General Plan EIRs, along with the effects of all urban development activities and projects that are included in the description of each EIS/EIR alternative.

The above EIRs, being CEQA documents, did not include an analysis of environmental justice and whether the general plans would result in a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority or low-income populations. Each of the general plans includes policies that would reduce effects to minority or low-income populations, such as considering low-income populations for transit and housing; providing for affordable housing units; ensuring most residential units are close to amenities; and reducing incompatibilities associated with land use, noise, air quality, and other potential conflicts. Galt included a specific section in the city's general plan to address fair treatment of all persons in the city with an emphasis on ensuring no part of the community "suffers disproportionately from adverse human health or environmental effects" (Galt 2009a, Land Use Element, p. LU-21).

The general plan EIRs also did not address tax revenue or business displacement. However, each of the general plans includes policies that would reduce negative effects to businesses and revenue, including protecting farmland and agricultural uses, addressing property and sales taxes, business retention and attraction, economic development, urban revitalization, and other relevant topics.

16.2.2.2 Cumulative Effects of the Alternative

Past and present urban development projects in Sacramento County and the Planning Area have resulted in the existing population and housing, socioeconomic, and environmental justice conditions described in Section 16.1.2. There are only two census tracts in the planning area identified as containing a low-income population. There are multiple census tracts supporting minority populations. These minority populations are spread across multiple locations in the planning area, indicating that minority populations are not concentrated in any particular location where they are disproportionately exposed to high and adverse human health, economic, social, and or environmental effects. These conditions indicate that there is not an existing significant adverse cumulative environmental justice impact in the Planning Area. There is also no indication of substantial displacements of housing or businesses or other adverse populations and housing effects.

The types of future reasonably foreseeable "other" projects, activities, and actions, described in Section 3.7.2, are similar to the types of past and present actions that have occurred in the Planning Area. The other reasonably foreseeable future actions in the Planning area (see Section 3.7.2) that were not included in the Section 2.2.2 description of the No Action/No Project Alternative include additional new urban development in the Elk Grove sphere of influence and in Rancho Murieta, development of the Wilton Rancheria Casino, master planned

developments inside the UDA named Rio Del Oro and Mather South, further rural residential development outside the UDA, continued urban development of cultivated agricultural lands, major infrastructure projects such as California High-Speed Rail and the California WaterFix, and expansion of the existing National Wild Refuge and the Cosumnes River Preserve (see Section 3.7.2). Population and housing effects from these foreseeable other projects were generally included in the analysis of impacts incorporated from the General Plan EIRs. These General Plan EIRs identified less-than-significant adverse effects related to population and housing. When considered together, the effects of the past, present, and foreseeable other projects on population and housing within this Planning Area are not a significant cumulative impact.

The regional scale analysis provided in the Sacramento Area Council of Governments *2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (the 2016 MTP/SCS) (SACOG 2016a) (described in Section 3.4.4) provides relevant information for evaluating the cumulative effects of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The 2016 MTP/SCS plans for future transportation projects while considering expected development and population growth in the region. The *Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (MTP/SCS EIR) (SACOG 2016b) found that there would be a less-than-significant effect from implementation of the MTP/SCS on population and housing.

Similar to the General Plan EIRs, the MTP/SCS EIR did not include an analysis on environmental justice or socioeconomics. However, the 2016 MTP/SCS itself did include an analysis of environmental justice (SACOG 2016a). Chapter 8 of the 2016 MTP/SCS discusses how low-income and minority residents were considered in the planning effort, and how the 2016 MTP/SCS would serve those residents. The 2016 MTP/SCS found that 62% of the low income and minority populations lived in transit priority areas and 82% of the jobs were in the transit priority areas, providing minority, and low-income residents with greater opportunities to live and/or work near quality transit and provides for more access to parks and higher education. This supports a conclusion that the combination of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects do not represent a significant cumulative effect on environmental justice.

As discussed in Section 16.2.2.1, the incremental direct and indirect effects of the No Action/No Project Alternative would not have an adverse effect on population and housing, socioeconomics, or environmental justice. Therefore, when the incremental effects of the No Action/No Project Alternative are viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, current projects, and the effects of foreseeable other actions, the effects of the No Action/No Project Alternative would not cause, or make a considerable contribution, to a significant adverse cumulative effect on population and housing, socioeconomics, or environmental justice. The No Action/No Project Alternative would result in a **Less Than Significant Adverse Cumulative** effect to population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice.

16.2.3 Proposed Action/Proposed Project

16.2.3.1 Direct and Indirect Effects of the Alternative

As described in Section 2.3.3, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Covered Activities include types and intensities of urban development similar to those anticipated under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

Under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, urban development would not be shifted or displaced to areas outside of the current Sacramento County USB boundary (Figure 1-1). As described in Section 16.2.2.1, this displacement was shown to not have a negative effect on population and housing, socioeconomics, or environmental justice under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, impacts as a result of urban development Covered Activities under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, which do not include the shifted/displaced development, would be largely the same as those described for urban development under the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, like the No Action/No Project Alternative, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative includes a sufficient amount of urban development and associated infrastructure to meet the development objectives planned/contemplated in the adopted general plans of Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would not be an impediment to meeting current or future residential development needs. Because of the lack of significant adverse population and housing, socioeconomic, and environmental justice impacts from urban development under both the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative and the No Action/No Project Alternative, and the overall similarity in effects across both alternatives, there would be **No Impact** from the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative relative to the impacts expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

As discussed in Section 2.3.5, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would include the establishment of an interconnected SSHCP Preserve System in the Planning Area, which includes a comprehensive preserve management program that would be implemented in perpetuity. The Preserve System under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would be more contiguous and more connected than the mitigation preserves established under the project-by-project regulatory approval process of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The SSHCP Preserve System and Preserve management activities would not have substantial negative impacts on population and housing, socioeconomics, or environmental justice, similar to what was described for the No Action/No Project Alternative. Benefits provided by access to preserves by minority and low-income populations could be slightly greater under the No Action/No Project Alternative because more numerous but less connected preserves are expected to be located in the UDA, closer to census tracts with

minority or low-income populations. Because the large landscape-level preserves would occur outside the UDA under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, the benefits to minority and low-income populations could be slightly less because of greater distance between some preserves and these populations. However, this does not constitute a high and adverse effect on minority or low-income populations. Overall, because of the lack of significant adverse population and housing, socioeconomic, and environmental justice impacts from Preserve System establishment and operation under both the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative and the No Action/No Project Alternative, and the overall similarity in effects of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative and the No Action/No Project Alternative, there would be **No Impact** when comparing the urban development under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

16.2.3.2 Significance of Direct and Indirect Effects

In summary, when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would:

- Result in similar population and housing impacts;
- Result in similar socioeconomic impacts; and
- Result in similar environmental justice impacts.

Therefore, after considering the significance of effects from the Proposed Action/Proposed Alternative on population and housing, socioeconomic, and environmental justice, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would result in **No Impact** when compared to the impacts that would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

16.2.3.3 Cumulative Effects of the Alternative

The effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable other projects on population and housing, socioeconomic, and environmental justice were described in Section 16.2.2.2, and there is no significant adverse cumulative effect on these issue areas existing in Sacramento County or the Planning Area. As discussed in Section 16.2.2.2, the incremental effects of the No Action/No Project Alternative were determined to be less than significant (individually limited) and not cumulatively considerable, when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, other current projects, and the foreseeable other projects.

As identified in Sections 16.2.3.1 and 16.2.3.2, the incremental direct and indirect effects on population and housing, socioeconomic, and environmental justice under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative are similar to the incremental effects of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would result

in no impact when compared to the effects that would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition. Therefore, the incremental effects of Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative are individually limited, and do not result in a contribution to an existing cumulative effect. The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would result in **No Cumulative Impact** to population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice, compared to the effects under the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

16.2.4 Reduced Permit Term

The Reduced Permit Term Alternative would include the same types of new urban development and infrastructure projects and activities as those anticipated under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

Under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative, the core of the Preserve System located inside the UDA would be associated with the development of five large Master Plans, as discussed in Chapter 2 for the Reduced Permit Term Alternative and for the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative. Because the core of the Preserve System inside the UDA under both EIS/EIR action alternatives is associated with the same five large Master Plans, approximately 70% of the UDA preserves established under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would have similar sizes, boundaries, and locations as the UDA preserves established under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative. However, the shorter duration of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative—and the smaller amount of urban development and associated development fees collected by the Reduced Permit Term Alternative—would not allow the Habitat Conservation Plan’s (HCP’s) Implementing Entity to establish as many acres of new preserves in the Planning Area as would occur under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative’s 50-year permit term. Therefore, fewer new preserves would be established under the Conservation Strategy of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative. This difference would be especially pronounced outside the UDA.

As described in Section 2.4, the federal and state Environmental Species Act Incidental Take Permits and the CWA permit strategy for future SSHCP Covered Activities would be valid only during the 30-year permit term of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative, and the Reduced Permit Term Alternative’s Conservation Strategy would be implemented only during this 30-year term. The urban development Covered Activities and conservation strategies associated with the five Master Plans would be implemented inside the UDA during this 30-year period. However, the EIS/EIR uses a 50-year analysis study period to evaluate all alternatives (see Section 3.6.3), so the EIS/EIR study period extends beyond the end of the 30-year permit term for the Reduced Permit Term Alternative. Therefore, as described in Section 3.6.7.2, the EIS/EIR analysis of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative also considers future urban development that is not part of the project description of the

Reduced Permit Term Alternative, but is still expected to occur within the Planning Area after the end of the permit term (i.e., in Years 31–50 of the EIS/EIR Study Period).

As described in Section 3.6.7.2, project mitigation preserves established after the end of the 30-year Reduced Permit Term Alternative would be established under a project-by-project process for obtaining individual authorizations under the CWA, federal and state Environmental Species Acts, and Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code. Consequently, mitigation preserves established in Years 31–50 of the EIS/EIR study period would not be established using a regional, landscape-based approach that balances new urban development with the need for conservation, as would be provided by an HCP. Therefore, much of the Preserve System inside the UDA would be very similar under the two action alternatives, but the Preserve System outside the UDA would be substantially different between the Reduced Permit Term Alternative and the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative. Under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative, it is unlikely that mitigation preserves established outside the UDA would be contiguous or would be interconnected, and it is unlikely that a large, contiguous 10,500-acre landscape-size vernal pool preserve would be established in the southwestern portion of the Planning Area. Likewise, the No Action/No Project Alternative also would not result in contiguous, interconnected preserves outside the UDA, and would not establish a 10,500-acre vernal-pool preserve in the Planning Area. In these ways, the new mitigation preserves established outside the UDA under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative and the No Action/No Project Alternative would be similar.

16.2.4.1 Direct and Indirect Effects of the Alternative

The Reduced Permit Term Alternative includes types of urban development similar to those anticipated under the No Action/No Project Alternative. However, the Reduced Permit Term Alternative does not include the regulatory requirements within the MCRA portion of the UDA, as expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative (refer to Section 2.2.2). Therefore, future urban development within the MCRA under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would be implemented consistent with the Sacramento County and Rancho Cordova General Plans, without development being displaced or shifted to locations outside the USB. As described in Section 16.2.2.1 for the No Action/No Project Alternative (where urban development would be shifted or displaced outside the USB), and as described in Section 16.2.3.1 for the Proposed Action/Proposed Project (where all urban development occurs within the USB), the Reduced Permit Term Alternative is expected to have no significant adverse effects on population and housing, socioeconomics, or environmental justice. Because of the lack of significant adverse population and housing, socioeconomic, and environmental justice effects from urban development under both the Reduced Permit Term Alternative and the No Action/No Project Alternative, and the overall similarity in effects in both alternatives, there would be **No Impact**

of the Reduced Permit Term when comparing the impacts of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

The Reduced Permit Term Alternative includes a consolidated and interconnected Preserve System, which would be established during the 30-year permit term, and a comprehensive preserve management program to be implemented in perpetuity. The Preserve System established during the 30-year permit term under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would be smaller than the SSHCP Preserve System that would be established under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, especially outside the UDA. As described in Section 2.4.5, the interconnected Preserve System established during the 30-year permit term of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would remain intact. However, future mitigation required of new urban development implemented after the end of the permit term would not be established in an organized, consolidated manner, as would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

As described in Section 16.2.2.1 for the No Action/No Project Alternative, and in Section 16.2.3.1 for the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, the preserves established under both of these alternatives would not result in significant adverse effects on population and housing, on socioeconomics, or on environmental justice. Therefore, the Preserve System established under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative, which would reflect elements of both the No Action/No Project Alternative and the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternatives, also would not result in significant adverse effects on population and housing, socioeconomics, or environmental justice. Because the establishment and operation of preserves under Reduced Permit Term Alternative and under the No Action/No Project Alternative would not impact population and housing, socioeconomic, and environmental justice, there would be **No Impact** of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

16.2.4.2 Significance of Direct and Indirect Effects

In summary, when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition, the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would:

- Result in similar population and housing impacts;
- Result in similar socioeconomic impacts; and
- Result in similar environmental justice impacts.

Therefore, after considering the significance of impacts of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice, the Reduced Permit

Term Alternative would result in **No Impact**, when compared to the impacts that would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

16.2.4.3 Cumulative Effects of the Alternative

The effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable other projects on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice were described in Section 16.2.2.2, which determined that there is no significant adverse cumulative effects on these issue areas in Sacramento County or the Planning Area. As discussed, the incremental effects of the No Action/No Project Alternative were determined to be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable, when viewed in connection with the effects of the past, present, and foreseeable other projects.

As identified in Sections 16.2.4.1 and 16.2.4.2, the direct and indirect effects on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative are similar to the effects under the No Action/No Project Alternative. The similarities in direct and indirect effects are sufficient to conclude that the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would result in No Impact when compared to the impacts that would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition. Consequently, the incremental contribution of the Reduced Permit Term Alternative to cumulative effects on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice would also be similar to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, the Reduced Permit Term Alternative does not result in a cumulatively considerable (i.e., significant) contribution to cumulative impacts on population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice. The Reduced Permit Term Alternative would result in **No Cumulative Impact** to population and housing, socioeconomics, and environmental justice compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

16.3 REFERENCES CITED

CEQ (Council on Environmental Quality). 1997. *Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act*. Executive Office of the President. Washington, D.C. Accessed July 1, 2016. https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-02/documents/ej_guidance_nepa_ceq1297.pdf.

Clinton, W.J. 1994. Executive Order 12898 of February 11, 1994, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. Federal Register volume 59, pages 7,629–7,633.

Galt. 2009a. *2030 Galt General Plan*. Final. Prepared by Mintier Harnish, in association with ESA and Omni Means. Sacramento, California: Mintier Harnish. April 2009. <http://www.ci.galt.ca.us/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=9877>.

- Galt. 2009b. *Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 Galt General Plan. Final. SCH No. 2007082092*. Prepared by ESA, in association with Mintier Harnish, Applied Development Economics, and Omni Means. Sacramento, California: ESA. March 2009. Accessed June 29, 2016. http://www.saclafco.org/SphereofInfluenceInformation/Documents/galtsoi/sac_024063.pdf.
- Proctor, Bernadette D., Jessica L. Semega, and Melissa A. Kollar. 2016. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-256(RV), *Income and Poverty in the United States: 2015*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Rancho Cordova. 2006a. *Rancho Cordova General Plan*. Adopted June 26, 2006.
- Rancho Cordova. 2006b. *City of Rancho Cordova General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. SCH no. 2005022137. June 2006. <http://www.cityofranhocordova.org/Index.aspx?page=104#a3>.
- SACOG (Sacramento Area Council of Governments). 2016a. *2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy: Building a Sustainable System*. Adopted February 18, 2016. http://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/mtpscs_complete.pdf.
- SACOG. 2016b. *Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy*. SCH No. 2014062060. Sacramento, California: SACOG. January 2016. <http://www.sacog.org/general-information/final-2016-mtpscs-environmental-impact-report>.
- Sacramento County. 2010. *Final Environmental Impact Report: Sacramento County General Plan Update*. Control Number 2002-GPB-0105, SCH No. 2007082086. Sacramento, California: County of Sacramento Department of Environmental Review and Assessment. April 2010. <http://www.per.saccounty.net/EnvironmentalDocuments/Pages/SearchDocuments.aspx>.
- Sacramento County. 2011. *Sacramento County General Plan of 2005–2030*. Adopted November 9, 2011.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2013a. “DP05: ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates. 5-year Estimates. 2009–2013 5-Year American Community Survey” [data in table viewer]. Accessed November 6, 2015. <http://factfinder.census.gov/>.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2013b. Poverty Thresholds for 2013 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years. <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html>.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2013c. “DP03: Selected Economic Characteristics. 5-year Estimates. 2009–2013 5-Year American Community Survey” [data in table viewer]. Accessed November 6, 2015. <http://factfinder.census.gov/>.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK