4 LAND USE FORECASTS AND DEVELOPMENT ESTIMATES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of current and projected levels of population, housing, and employment in El Dorado County for each of the equal-weight alternatives. Data on the county's existing demographic characteristics are based on information obtained from the California Department of Finance (DOF), the California Employment Development Department (EDD), and the U.S. Census Bureau. The firm of Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) was retained to develop residential and nonresidential land use forecasts in support of the General Plan process. Specifically, EPS estimated future levels of housing and employment in the County (excluding the Lake Tahoe Basin) through the planning horizon (2025) and ultimately to theoretical buildout for all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. EDAW's senior economist provided peer review of EPS's work.

4.2 USE OF FORECASTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The land use forecasts are an integral part of the General Plan EIR analysis, particularly the forecasts for the planning horizon year (2025). These forecasts provide the foundation for much of the environmental analysis by estimating the extent and location of future development within El Dorado County. To estimate the level of development at buildout, all land uses designated on the land use map for each alternative were assumed to be developed to maximum densities permitted, subject to any restrictions on subdivision applicable to that alternative. However, full buildout is not expected to occur by 2025 for any of the alternatives. For 2025 forecasts, future development was projected based on future population estimates and assumptions as to how that growth would be allocated throughout the County based on various factors and development constraints. These forecasts are broken down into 13 market areas (see Table 3-5) because the precise location of future development cannot be predicted. The forecasts are further broken down by traffic analysis zone (TAZ) to provide the main input for the traffic modeling prepared for the EIR. The 2025 and buildout development forecasts serve as the basis for determining impacts associated with the proposed general plan alternatives. The EIR analyzes the locations where the land use forecasts project development to occur in the context of known environmental resources. The forecasts themselves do not take into account policies proposed in each alternative that may affect the extent, location or design of future development. These policies are considered in conjunction with the forecasts to fully analyze potential environmental impacts.

4.3 SUMMARY OF HISTORICAL AND EXISTING POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT LEVELS

4.3.1 POPULATION

Until recently, El Dorado County was characterized as a rural county, with two incorporated cities, Placerville (County seat) and South Lake Tahoe, representing the two most dense population centers. However, recent growth patterns have changed the absolute level and distribution pattern of the county's population base. This is particularly evident on the county's west slope with the continuing development of several large-scale master-planned communities and commercial projects near the Sacramento County line. Table 4-1 illustrates historical population levels over a three-decade timeframe.

Table 4-1
Historic and Current Population Levels in El Dorado County

Area	1970	1980	1990	2000	2002
Unincorporated	25,496	58,392	96,123	123,080	129,396
Placerville	5,416	6,739	8,286	9,610	10,239
South Lake Tahoe	12,921	20,681	21,586	23,609	23,950
Total	43,833	85,812	125,995	156,299	163,585

Source: California Department of Finance 2002a, 2002b

Based on 2000 U.S. Census data, El Dorado was the ninth fastest growing county in the state over the previous decade. Between 1990 and 2000, El Dorado County's population increased by 24.1%. The addition of more than 30,000 new residents over that 10-year period brought the county's total population to 156,299 persons. Placerville grew by 16% between 1990 and 2000 and had a total of 9,610 residents in 2000. South Lake Tahoe, the largest city in the county, had 23,609 residents in 2000, a 9.4% increase since 1990.

The Department of Finance estimates El Dorado County's population in 2002 to be 163,585, nearly double the population in 1980. Overall, the county grew at an average annual rate of 3.0% between 1980 and 2002. Average growth rates in the county have been declining over time, with growth rates during the 1980s averaging 3.9% compared to 2.2% during the 1990s.

This decrease in growth rates is due in part to the increase in total population numbers.[1] The decrease also reflects the uncertainty surrounding land use planning in the county in the 1990s and the restrictions on discretionary approvals imposed on the county as a result of the Writ, or may be the result of many other factors such as housing prices and increased traffic. Over the past 3 years (2000–2002), the annual growth rate has been approximately 2.3%.

Patterns of population growth have changed over time, demonstrating distinct differences between unincorporated and incorporated areas and the county as a whole. DOF has estimated the population in the unincorporated areas of the county in 2002 to be 129,396, or 79% of the county's total population. This proportion has increased from 56% in 1970, 68% in 1980, and 76% in 1990. This shift in the distribution of population is a result of the continuing trend of rapid residential development on the county's west slope, particularly in unincorporated areas near the Sacramento County line (e.g., El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park). Differences in historical growth rates between unincorporated areas and the county as a whole further support this trend. Specifically, the rate of population growth in the unincorporated areas consistently outpaced population growth in the entire county between 1980 and 2002, although annual growth rates in unincorporated areas have declined from approximately 5.1% in the 1980s to 2.5% in the 2000s.

4.3.2 HOUSING

The housing stock in El Dorado County is diverse. Many rural areas are characterized by low-density residential uses, with both new and older homes. Common types of rural residential development in the county include "ranchettes," which are typically found in areas with relatively gentle topography, and cabins located at higher elevations that provide seasonal access to remote areas of the county. These cabin-type structures represent many of the vacation homes that are prevalent throughout the county. By contrast, the western reaches of the county are developing rapidly with several master-planned communities and other larger-scale residential developments. Some of these developments have been approved through Development Agreements (DAs) adopted prior to the Writ, and thus are not subject to the Writ's restrictions on residential development. These developments offer newer, upscale production homes that typically attract new residents who commute to Sacramento and beyond.

[1] Growth rates are a comparison between existing population and new population. The lower the existing population, the higher the growth rate with a fixed number of new people. For example, adding 100 people to a population of 1,000 is a growth rate of 10%. If 200 people are added to a population of 10,000, the growth rate is only 2%. Thus, as population grows in the county, a lower growth rate may not represent fewer new people; indeed, the growth rate can go down over time if the population is growing by greater absolute numbers.

Home prices in western El Dorado County tend to be higher than those in other communities within the Sacramento region. Market research indicates that the average price per square foot in western El Dorado County is $137.34 compared to $115.28 in Sacramento County in 2001 (EPS 2002a). The housing stock in the county's two incorporated cities, Placerville and South Lake Tahoe, consists predominantly of older homes, reflecting historic development patterns, the fact that these areas are approaching buildout, and, for South Lake Tahoe, substantial growth restrictions in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Table 4-2 presents the quantity and vacancy rate of the county's housing stock since 1990.

Table 4-2
Housing Stock (1990–2002)

Area	1990		1995		2000		2002	
	Units	Vacancy [1,2] (percent)	Units	Vacancy [1] (percent)	Units	Vacancy [1] (percent)	Units	Vacancy [1] (percent)
Unincorporated	43,855	20.5	49,596	20.0	53,031	14.2	55,234	14.2
Placerville	3,530	4.8	3,778	4.8	4,242	5.7	4,484	5.7
South Lake Tahoe	14,066	38.7	14,367	38.7	14,005	32.8	14,073	32.8
Total Units and Average Vacancy	61,451	23.8	67,741	23.2	71,278	17.3	73,791	17.2

[1] Numbers are approximate due to rounding
[2] 79% of vacant units in unincorporated areas are classified as seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.

Sources: California Department of Finance 2000, 2002b; U.S. Census Bureau (2000 Census)

The 2002 housing stock in El Dorado County is estimated to be 73,791 units, with nearly 75% of this stock being located in unincorporated areas; this percentage increased from 71% in 1990. The overall vacancy rate in the county is 17.2%; it is slightly less, 14.2%, in unincorporated areas. Vacancy rates have decreased over time in unincorporated areas and South Lake Tahoe, but have increased in Placerville. The relatively high vacancy rate in the county is due, in part, to the fact that the housing stock includes a substantial number of seasonal vacation homes. Data on housing stock by type indicate that single-family residences, including mobile homes, are the predominant type of housing in the county, accounting for approximately 87% of the total housing stock in 2000; the remaining 13% is made up of multifamily housing (California Department of Finance 2000).

4.3.3 EMPLOYMENT

The characteristics of the employment base in El Dorado County have changed significantly in recent years. Over the last 20 to 30 years, the jobs offered in the county were mainly limited to resident-serving (including government) and tourism-based businesses, with the latter being

located primarily en route to and within the Lake Tahoe Basin. However, the continuing development of the El Dorado Hills Business Park in western El Dorado County is beginning to transform this pattern. The business park represents a significant job center that not only employs local residents, but also attracts employees from outside the county. It also serves as a source of professional-level job opportunities. These trends are expected to continue as the business park continues to develop. Table 4-3 presents data on employment by industry and characterizes the type of employment opportunities offered in El Dorado County. Labor force and unemployment data for the county are presented in Table 4-4.

The total number of jobs in the county was estimated to be 45,300 in 2001. The predominant industry in the county is the services sector, which accounts for approximately one-third (33.5%) of the County's job base. Other significant industries include retail trade (21.9%), consisting mainly of jobs in eating and drinking establishments, and the government sector (20.1%).

Table 4-3
Employment by Industry in El Dorado County (2001) [1]

Industry	2001	
	Jobs [2]	Percent
Agriculture	300	0.7
Construction and Mining	4,600	10.2
Manufacturing	2,500	5.5
Transportation and Public Utilities	1,300	2.9
Retail Trade	9,600	21.2
Wholesale Trade	1,000	2.2
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	2,000	4.4
Services	14,800	32.7
Government	9,200	20.3
TOTAL	45,300	100

[1] Includes incorporated cities and the Lake Tahoe Basin

[2] Numbers may not add up due to rounding

Source: EDD 2002a

Table 4-4
Labor Force Estimates in El Dorado County [1,2]

Area	1990		2000		2001	
	Labor Force	Unemployment Rate (percent)	Labor Force	Unemployment Rate (percent)	Labor Force	Unemployment Rate (percent)
Unincorporated	47,010	3.7	60,440	3.2	61,870	3.3
Placerville	3,710	6.5	4,750	5.7	4,850	5.6
South Lake Tahoe	13,280	6.0	17,010	5.3	17,380	5.1
Total	64,000	4.4	82,200	3.9	84,100	3.8

[1] Includes incorporated cities and the Lake Tahoe Basin

[2] Labor force and unemployment rates represent annual averages

Source: EDD 2002b

The county's labor force is defined as those residents who are employed or actively seeking work. Recent data estimate the county labor force to be 84,100 residents in 2001, with a countywide unemployment rate of 3.8%. Roughly 74% of the labor force reside in unincorporated areas of the County; this statistic has fluctuated minimally since 1990. The average annual growth rate of the county's labor force, for both unincorporated areas and the county as a whole, has been 2.3% between 1990 and 2002. The current unemployment rate for residents living in the unincorporated county is 3.3%, slightly lower than the county as a whole at 3.8% and substantially lower than the cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe at 5.6% and 5.1%, respectively.

The relationship between the labor force and jobs in the county suggests a jobs-housing imbalance. In 2001, 45,300 jobs were located in the County, but the labor force was significantly higher at 84,100. Because there are approximately 38,800 more workers in the county than there are jobs, a substantial portion the county labor force commutes out of the county to work.

4.4 DEMOGRAPHIC PROJECTIONS

Projections of population, housing, and employment data can be useful in the land use planning process. By providing insight into the county's future characteristics, these data allow decision-makers to make informed decisions today. However, imperfection is inherent in long-term forecasts regardless of methodology and expertise. As a result, long-range planning needs to remain flexible. Several sources of demographic forecast data are available. This subsection describes the various data sources and presents the results of the land use forecasts prepared for the General Plan process.

4.4.1 DATA SOURCES

Two public sources of demographic forecast data are available for El Dorado County: the DOF and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG).

The DOF develops two types of demographic projection data. First, the DOF publishes interim county population projections, which represent an update of the baseline population projections produced by the DOF in 1998. These data provide population projections for the years 2005, 2010, 2015, and 2020. Second, the DOF publishes county population projections with age, sex, and racial/ethnic detail through the year 2040 in 10-year increments.

SACOG also prepares projection data for its six-county region, which includes El Dorado County, as well as Sacramento, Placer, Yolo, Sutter, and Yuba counties. These data focus on population, employment, housing, and school enrollment through the year 2025. SACOG projections exclude the Lake Tahoe Basin.

4.4.2 FORECASTS BY ECONOMIC AND PLANNING SYSTEMS, INC.

In an effort to develop data specific to El Dorado County, EPS was retained to develop land use forecasts in support of the General Plan process. The objective of the forecasts is to predict how El Dorado County will develop, in terms of both residential and nonresidential growth, through the General Plan planning horizon (2025) and beyond. These forecasts focus on the west slope region of the county, which excludes the Lake Tahoe Basin. These data are believed to be more accurate than the public sources described above, which typically do not consider local factors. EPS has prepared a comprehensive report and three subsequent memoranda, which together represent the General Plan land use forecasts (see Appendix B).

Generally, the development projections are based on three factors: a parcel inventory, development potential (based on land use maps), and market demand. This section describes the methodology used in developing the land use forecasts, including assumptions that were made for forecasting purposes, and presents an overview of major findings.

Range of Alternatives Analyzed

EPS developed quantitative forecasts for the four equal-weight alternatives. Land use forecasts for these four alternatives were based on the land use map and project description for each alternative. In the case of the No Project alternative, the forecast takes into account the provisions of the Writ. Consistent methodology was applied for all alternatives.

Geographic Area of Analysis

Because of its large size and varied terrain and economic characteristics, El Dorado County is relatively heterogeneous. Therefore, EPS used the concept of "market areas" to isolate the various subregions within the county. The market area concept is based largely on methodology used by SACOG in its delineation of Regional Analysis Districts (RADs). Fourteen market areas have been defined for El Dorado County (see Exhibit 4-1) (a complete description of these market areas is presented in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing, of this EIR):

1. El Dorado Hills
2. Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue
3. Diamond Springs
4. Placerville/Camino
5. Coloma/Gold Hill
6. Pollock Pines
7. Pleasant Valley
8. Latrobe
9. Somerset
10. Cool/Pilot Hill
11. Georgetown/Garden Valley
12. Tahoe [2]
13. American River
14. Mosquito

The land use forecasts were further refined from the Market Area level to the TAZ level. TAZs refer to geographic areas within Market Areas that reflect homogenous traffic behavior and patterns. The county is organized into 276 TAZs, nine of which are located in the Lake Tahoe Basin (see Exhibit 4-1). Land use information at the TAZ level is necessary for the traffic analysis conducted for the environmental review process.

[2] The Tahoe Market Area was excluded from the General Plan economic analysis in part due to the County's limited planning role within that region, and also to be consistent with the SACOG growth forecasts, which exclude the Lake Tahoe region. Therefore, the land use forecasts prepared by EPS represent the county's west slope and its subregions only. The impacts of growth in the Tahoe Basin are discussed in Chapter 5.14.

Exhibit 4-1

FOLD OUT

B & W

Base Year for Forecasting Purposes

For the purposes of the land use forecasts, data from 1999 is used as the base year for existing development in the study region because this was the best data available at the time the EIR was prepared (2000 Census data were not fully available for use in the analysis). The 1999 data allowed the County to consider detailed information on residential and non-residential conditions as of 1999 based on market research developed by EPS. The forecasts also take into account the County Assessor database (2001), which was used to define the future development potential of parcels in the county. The land use forecasts show the incremental change in residential (i.e., households) and non-residential (i.e., jobs) land use between 1999 and 2025/Buildout. For the purposes of the General Plan EIR, project baseline is defined as August 2001, the date that the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released. Thus, some amount of the forecasted development may have already occurred in the time between the 1999 forecasting base year and the 2001 baseline. This does not affect the analysis of impacts at 2025 and buildout, would include that increment by definition as a part of the level of development forecast for those horizons. The difference between existing and future conditions may be slightly less than described in the impact analysis, however, given the development that has occurred since the 1999 base year.

2025 Planning Horizon vs. Buildout

The impacts of each of the four equal weight alternatives were analyzed in two ways: the impacts expected in 2025 and the impacts expected at full buildout. The planning horizon for each of the alternatives is 2025. The EIR analyzed the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts that would occur through the year 2025 using each alternative's projected growth during that time period. As discussed above, the projected amount of growth expected in each alternative by 2025 was developed by EPS using economic forecasting.

In addition, the EIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts each of the equal weight alternatives would have if every parcel in the County was developed to the maximum density and intensity allowed under that alternative. This analysis is called the "buildout" analysis. The buildout analysis does not consider any particular timeframe, since the date that any of the alternatives might be fully built out is unknown. According to the forecasting done by EPS, none of the alternatives would approach full build out within the next 20 years. Indeed, it is not expected that any of the alternatives will reach this theoretical "full buildout", because many parcels will develop at lower densities than allowed due to site-specific constraints, economic factors, market forces, and regulatory restrictions such as general plan policies, County ordinances implementing the general plan, and regulatory requirements imposed by state and federal agencies. In addition, it is possible that the general plan will be amended to

reflect changing conditions increases as time passes, especially beyond the 2025 horizon year. However, the alternatives do differ substantially with respect to the amount of the maximum amount development permitted given their land use maps and differing restrictions on subdivision. Although these differences are not expected to be fully realized by 2025 due to limits on market demand, it is possible that growth in the County could occur more rapidly than forecasted, particularly at the market area level. The buildout analysis gives the reader an ability to compare the worst case scenario under each of the alternatives.

Forecasting Assumptions

The land use forecast analysis relies on several assumptions guiding the methodology used to develop estimates of residential and nonresidential growth associated with the General Plan. The key assumptions, applied equally to each alternative, are presented below (for more detailed information regarding these assumptions, please refer to Appendix B):

< **No Initial Consideration of General Plan Policies.** The land use forecasts are based strictly on the General Plan land use map(s) and (with respect to the No Project and Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" alternatives) applicable limits on new subdivision, and do not reflect the effect of all existing or proposed general plan policies, such as those governing habitat protection or traffic level of service. These policies have the potential to affect the cost, extent, and location of future development. While not considered in the forecasts, these policies are analyzed in the relevant impact sections of this EIR.

< **Development of Existing Commitments.** "Existing commitments" consist of parcels for which a building permit had been issued, a tentative map had been approved, or a development agreement had been executed before the Writ was issued. All four alternatives assume the development of existing commitments by 2025. Existing commitments total 14,565 dwelling units.

< **Remaining Capacity.** "Remaining capacity" refers to the development potential in the County other than existing commitments. Remaining capacity includes vacant parcels that are not part of existing commitments, under-utilized parcels (i.e., developed parcels that could be further subdivided and developed), and potential second units. Second units were assumed to add 3.6% more dwelling units to the single-family estimate for each alternative, based on five years of historic data in the county.

< **Excluded parcels.** Parcels excluded from the land use forecasts include fully developed parcels; residential parcels less than 1,815 square feet (considered too small to be developed in accordance with modern building standards, including fire

setbacks); and parcels that are considered undevelopable based on their assessor's code (e.g., greenbelts, mineral rights, public or utility-owned property, cemeteries, privately-owned roads, and parcels coded as Timber Preserve, Agricultural Preserve, Restricted Land Use, Interest Tax parcels (i.e. tax parcels that are not land), or Public Utility).

< **Nonjurisdictional Parcels.** With the exception of parcels within the city of Placerville, nonjurisdictional parcels on the county's west slope are unlikely to be developed by the year 2025 and were excluded from the analysis. Public lands (e.g., National Forest land) represent most nonjurisdictional parcels. These parcels were given county land use designations on the General Plan land use map(s) to provide planning direction in case the property becomes subject to County jurisdiction as a result of an ownership change (e.g., land exchange between a private party and the U.S. Forest Service), but they are not expected to contribute to the County's development potential.

< **Slope Constraints.** The land use forecasts assumed that slopes greater than 25% represent a significant physical constraint to the development of high-density and multi-family density residential uses. In areas where slope constraints are present, the analysis assumed that these residential uses would develop at minimum, rather than maximum, densities allowed for that particular land use designation.

< **Unconstrained Residential Demand.** Based on population forecasts and an average household size of 2.63 persons, residential demand in El Dorado County was projected at 32,000 dwelling units through 2025. However, the rate of absorption of this demand differs for each alternative, and for some alternatives demand was not projected to be fully absorbed by 2025.

< **Non-Residential Demand.** Projected demand for jobs through 2025 was based on employment growth within the county as a result of new residential development assuming jobs-to-household factors that were based on SACOG data for El Dorado County (and modified for the No Project Alternative); evolving employment growth within the county as a result of regional economic growth, commute patterns along U.S. 50; and the pipeline supply of already approved projects. To provide a maximum development scenario, estimated non-residential capacity at buildout was based strictly on the amount of land designated for non-residential uses and was not reduced based on the number of projected households at buildout.

Forecast Results

The land use forecasts estimate the quantity of additional dwelling units and jobs that is expected to be generated by each equal-weight general plan alternative through the planning

horizon (2025) and the quantity of housing/jobs that could be accommodated through buildout. Population forecasts were derived based on housing projections. Refer to Table 3-2 for a detailed summary of population, housing, and employment projections on a countywide level.

Residential Development Estimates

Table 4-5 provides a summary of residential development estimates by Market Area. A summary of major findings related to residential growth is presented below.

< At buildout, under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus," Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan alternatives, there is total new capacity for approximately 41,652, 55,078, and 78,692 new dwelling units, respectively. Under the No Project alternative, total new residential development capacity is significantly less, approximately 29,520 units due to Writ constraints.

< At 2025, the projected demand for new housing is roughly 32,000 units. Neither the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus," Environmentally Constrained, nor the 1996 General Plan alternatives are capacity-constrained, in that each has the capacity, based on available land and land use designations, to accommodate this projected residential growth. However, the 29,520 units that could be made available under the No Project Alternative is insufficient to meet this expected demand.

< Under all four alternatives, new residential development is concentrated in four Market Areas in the western portion of El Dorado County. This is due to the proximity to public services and the regional job base. The El Dorado Hills Market Area is expected to experience the largest growth.

< Because supply is constrained under the No Project Alternative by the Writ and by policy restricting residential subdivision in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative, 2025 absorption under these alternatives will be relatively slower than under the other two alternatives. The limitations on subdivision under these alternatives would restrict the availability of developable parcels in desirable and accessible locations and increase the costs of development, resulting in the absorption of less demand by 2025. However, because of this limited supply in more desirable locations, greater development pressures on the outlying market areas in the rural regions of the county will be expected.

Table 4-5
Summary of Residential Forecasts by Market Area[1]

		Existing Conditions [2]	No Project		Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus"		Environmentally Constrained		1996 General Plan	
			Total (New) Housing Units [3]							
Market #	Market Area		2025	Buildout [4]	2025	Buildout [4]	2025	Buildout [4]	2025	Buildout [4]
1	El Dorado Hills	5,805	18,909	19,010	20,632	20,823	22,542	24,591	22,068	26,328
			(13,104)	(13,205)	(14,827)	(15,018)	(16,737)	(18,786)	(16,263)	(20,523)
2	Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue	10,606	13,740	14,932	14,563	16,665	16,602	22,433	16,382	26,235
			(3,134)	(4,326)	(3,957)	(6,059)	(5,996)	(11,827)	(5,776)	(15,629)
3	Diamond Springs	4,874	5,374	5,912	5,758	6,835	7,200	10,350	8,080	16,778
			(500)	(1,038)	(884)	(1,961)	(2,326)	(5,476)	(3,206)	(11,904)
4	Placerville/Camino	7,581	8,966	9,190	9,506	9,960	9,898	10,646	9,469	11,141
			(1,385)	(1,609)	(1,925)	(2,379)	(2,317)	(3,065)	(1,888)	(3,560)
5	Coloma/Gold Hill	2,034	2,489	2,728	2,674	3,087	2,481	2,754	2,647	3,488
			(455)	(694)	(640)	(1,053)	(447)	(720)	(613)	(1,454)
6	Pollock Pines	4,176	4,616	5,309	4,723	6,360	5,109	6,894	5,000	8,104
			(440)	(1,133)	(547)	(2,184)	(933)	(2,718)	(824)	(3,928)
7	Pleasant Valley	2,606	3,086	3,687	3,214	4,467	3,018	3,524	3,245	4,941
			(480)	(1,081)	(608)	(1,861)	(412)	(918)	(639)	(2,335)
8	Latrobe	320	745	769	1,053	1,107	1,053	1,160	1,192	1,894
			(425)	(449)	(733)	(787)	(733)	(840)	(872)	(1,574)
9	Somerset	1,264	1,663	2,318	1,571	2,471	1,739	2,507	1,644	2,907
			(399)	(1,054)	(307)	(1,207)	(475)	(1,243)	(380)	(1,643)

Table 4-5
Summary of Residential Forecasts by Market Area[1]

			Existing Conditions [2]	No Project		Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus"		Environmentally Constrained		1996 General Plan	
				Total (New) Housing Units [3]							
Market #	Market Area			2025	Buildout [4]	2025	Buildout [4]	2025	Buildout [4]	2025	Buildout [4]
10	Cool/Pilot Hill	1,604		1,901	2,503	2,083	3,649	2,448	5,195	2,480	7,536
				(297)	(899)	(479)	(2,045)	(844)	(3,591)	(876)	(5,932)
11	Georgetown/Garden Valley	2,932		3,298	4,955	3,307	6,219	3,571	6,255	3,510	8,410
				(366)	(2,023)	(375)	(3,287)	(639)	(3,323)	(578)	(5,478)
13	American River	561		800	2,060	804	3,232	916	2,955	790	3,932
				(239)	(1,499)	(243)	(2,671)	(355)	(2,394)	(229)	(3,371)
14	Mosquito	344		554	854	658	1,484	420	521	691	1,705
				(210)	(510)	(314)	(1,140)	(76)	(177)	(347)	(1,361)
Total		**44,708**		**66,142**	**74,228**	**70,547**	**86,360**	**76,998**	**99,786**	**77,199**	**123,400**
				(21,434)	**(29,520)**	**(25,839)**	**(41,652)**	**(32,290)**	**(55,078)**	**(32,491)**	**(78,692)**

[1] Excludes Lake Tahoe Basin.

[2] Based on 1999 base-year information used for the EPS development forecasts. A small portion of the projected increases in jobs is accounted for in development that has occurred in the County since 1999.

[3] Parenthetical represents net increase from"existing conditions".

[4] Buildout numbers include 2025 projections.

Sources: EPS 2002a, 2002b, 2002c

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be a projected absorption of an additional 21,434 new housing units countywide through 2025. This alternative would have capacity for an additional 8,086 new units between 2025 and buildout, for a total capacity of 29,520 new units. In terms of population, the west slope could accommodate an additional 53,610 persons between the base year (1999) and 2025 under the No Project Alternative. These projections are substantially lower than those under any of the other equal-weight alternatives.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative

The land use pattern associated with the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative corresponds to a 2025 housing unit absorption of 25,839 new units, accommodating 64,601 additional persons. Absorption is less than demand based on supply constraints associated with restrictions on residential subdivision. Between 2025 and buildout, this alternative would provide capacity for an additional 15,903 new housing units, which represents a total of 41,652 new units between the base year (1999) and buildout.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative

The projected 2025 population increase of 80,730 new persons would be accommodated by the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. In 2025, this alternative would provide for an additional 32,290 new housing units, and between 2025 and buildout, it would provide capacity for an additional 22,788 new units. This equates to a total of 55,078 new housing units between the base year (1999) and buildout.

1996 General Plan Alternative

Under 1996 General Plan Alternative, the projected 2025 population increase of 81,241 new persons would be accommodated with the development of 32,491 new housing units. At buildout, this alternative would provide capacity for an additional 46,201 new units; this equates to 78,692 new housing units between the base year (1999) and buildout. The 1996 General Plan Alternative would provide for a substantially greater amount of growth at buildout than the other project alternatives.

Estimates of Nonresidential (Commercial) Development

Table 4-6 summarizes estimated job growth by market area. A summary of major findings related to nonresidential growth is presented below.

Table 4-6
Summary of Nonresidential Forecasts by Market Area [1]

		Existing Conditions [2]	No Project		Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus"		Environmentally Constrained		1996 General Plan	
			Total (New) Jobs [3]							
Market #	Market Area		2025	Buildout[4]	2025	Buildout[4]	2025	Buildout[4]	2025	Buildout[4]
1	El Dorado Hills	4,999	30,254	40,739	28,788	40,846	31,850	34,025	31,092	40,846
			(25,255)	(35,740)	(23,789)	(35,847)	(26,851)	(29,026)	(26,093)	(35,847)
2	Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/ Rescue	5,395	9,256	25,492	9,480	25,818	11,606	20,986	11,374	25,818
			(3,861)	(20,097)	(4,085)	(20,423)	(6,211)	(15,591)	(5,979)	(20,423)
3	Diamond Springs	3,584	6,464	9,983	4,727	10,600	6,627	9,233	7,787	10,600
			(2,880)	(6,399)	(1,143)	(7,016)	(3,043)	(5,649)	(4,203)	(7,016)
4	Placerville / Camino	11,025	14,016	18,260	14,896	18,701	15,690	17,916	14,810	18,701
			(2,991)	(7,235)	(3,871)	(7,676)	(4,665)	(6,891)	(3,785)	(7,676)
5	Coloma / Gold Hill	640	748	2,572	797	2,572	752	737	791	2,572
			(108)	(1,932)	(157)	(1,932)	(112)	(97)	(151)	(1,932)
6	Pollock Pines	1,313	1,499	2,379	1,551	2,379	1,728	2,075	1,676	2,379
			(186)	(1,066)	(238)	(1,066)	(415)	(762)	(363)	(1,066)
7	Pleasant Valley	565	759	1,013	816	1,013	732	879	828	1,013
			(194)	(448)	(251)	(448)	(167)	(314)	(263)	(448)
8	Latrobe	137	217	3,709	280	3,709	281	2,196	307	3,709
			(80)	(3,572)	(143)	(3,572)	(144)	(2,059)	(170)	(3,572)
9	Somerset	334	511	1,632	471	1,632	547	806	501	1,632
			(177)	(1,298)	(137)	(1,298)	(213)	(472)	(167)	(1,298)

Table 4-6
Summary of Nonresidential Forecasts by Market Area [1]

		Existing Conditions [2]	No Project		Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus"		Environmentally Constrained		1996 General Plan	
			Total (New) Jobs [3]							
Market #	Market Area		2025	Buildout[4]	2025	Buildout[4]	2025	Buildout[4]	2025	Buildout[4]
10	Cool / Pilot Hill	364	572	2,514	699	2,783	963	2,666	986	2,783
			(208)	(2,150)	(335)	(2,419)	(599)	(2,302)	(622)	(2,419)
11	Georgetown / Garden Valley	1,274	1,409	5,309	1,414	5,877	1,520	5,700	1,495	5,877
			(135)	(4,035)	(140)	(4,603)	(246)	(4,426)	(221)	(4,603)
13	American River	772	798	945	798	945	817	892	798	945
			(26)	(173)	(26)	(173)	(45)	(120)	(26)	(173)
14	Mosquito	32	119	247	172	247	32	32	185	247
			(87)	(215)	(140)	(215)	(0)	(0)	(153)	(215)
Total		**30,434**	**66,622**	**114,794**	**64,889**	**117,122**	**73,145**	**98,143**	**72,630**	**117,122**
			(36,188)	**(84,360)**	**(34,455)**	**(86,688)**	**(42,711)**	**(67,709)**	**(42,196)**	**(86,688)**

[1] Excludes Lake Tahoe Basin.
[2] Based on 1999 base-year information used for the EPS development forecasts. A small portion of the projected increases in jobs is accounted for in development that has occurred in the County since 1999.
[3] Parenthetical represents net increase from"existing conditions".
[4] Buildout numbers include 2025 projections.

Sources: EPS 2002a, 2002b, 2002c

The development forecasts for the Environmentally Constrained and 1996 General Plan alternatives indicate that approximately 42,711 and 42,196 jobs, respectively, will be created in the county through the year 2025. Under the No Project and Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" alternatives, the 2025 demand projection is approximately 36,188 and 34,455 new jobs, respectively.

- Nonresidential development under all four alternatives is concentrated in Market Areas in the western parts of El Dorado County where additional household growth is driving growth in employment.
- Based on the amount of available land designated for employment-generating lands uses, the job capacity at buildout for all four alternatives is substantially higher than the 2025 job projections and is greater than would be expected based on the forecasted population at buildout. This is due to the fact that non-residential buildout forecasts do not correlate job growth to housing growth. Full utilization of designated non-residential capacity is not expected to occur, even at residential buildout, absent substantial importation of employees from outside the County.

No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would provide for 36,188 new jobs between 1999 and 2025. At buildout, the new job capacity would increase by 48,172, for a total of 84,360 new jobs between 1999 and buildout.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative

The Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative would provide for 34,455 new jobs between the base year and 2025. At buildout, the new job capacity would increase by 52,233, for a total of 86,688 new jobs between the base year and buildout.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative

The Environmentally Constrained Alternative would provide for 42,711 new jobs between the base year and 2025. This is the highest of all of the alternatives, slightly more than the jobs forecasted for the 1996 Alternative. Although this alternative is projected to have slightly less population in 2025 than the 1996 Alternative, the distribution of projected housing development would result in a greater concentration of new units in market areas with higher jobs-to-housing ratios, particularly the Placerville/Camino market area. However, at buildout, the new job capacity for this alternative would increase by 24,998 between 2025 and buildout,

for a total of 67,709, which is the lowest of all of the alternatives. This is due to a reduction in the allowable floor- area ratio (FAR) for Research and Development uses from 0.3 to 0.2.

1996 General Plan Alternative

The 1996 General Plan Alternative would provide for 42,196 new jobs between the base year and 2025. At buildout, the new job capacity would increase by 44,492 to 86,688.

4.5 PROJECTIONS OF POPULATION GROWTH AND HOUSING IN THE TAHOE BASIN

Population growth projections for the west slope vary by alternative. However, population growth in the Lake Tahoe Basin is constant for all of the alternatives. Based on projections by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), the El Dorado County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin is expected to grow at a rate of 0.4% per year between 2000 and 2010, from 31,514 to 32,793 persons (TRPA 2002). Assuming a constant growth rate through the year 2025, then the El Dorado County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin would add roughly 3,151 persons between 2000 and 2025. This reflects a substantially lower growth rate than that projected for the west slope, and results from restrictions imposed by TRPA regulations on the total amount of annual development in the Basin portion of the County. It is assumed that these or similar restrictions will remain in place through buildout of the basin.