

## 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

This section analyzes the socioeconomic conditions within Napa County. Within this section are discussions on the population characteristics, housing, and employment opportunities within the Planning Area. Population data relies on several resources including: 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census data and U.S. Census Bureau, 2005 Population Estimates; The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) 2003 and 2005 projection data; population projections prepared by Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA), 2006; the Napa County Baseline Data Report (BDR), 2005; and the State Income Limits for 2006 from the State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development. Multiple data sources from different years were used for this analysis in order to present existing population trends and to develop reasonable housing and employment projections for each alternative.

### 4.3.1 EXISTING SETTING

#### DEMOGRAPHICS

#### Population Trends

Population growth in Napa County over the last 10 to 15 years has been similar to growth in the state as a whole. **Table 4.3-1** shows the growth of Napa County (including the incorporated cities/town) and the State of California. According to the U.S. Census, between 1990 and 2000, Napa County had a 12.2% growth rate and the State grew at a rate of 13.8%. The U.S. Census conducted population estimates, which are based on present and past population with assistance from the Federal State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates (FSCPE). These estimates are used as survey controls and in monitoring recent demographic changes. The U.S. Census Bureau, 2005 Population Estimates show that Napa County grew at a rate slightly higher than the State of California at 6.8% in the County versus the 6.6% of the State.

**TABLE 4.3-1  
POPULATION ESTIMATES FOR CALIFORNIA AND NAPA COUNTY COMPARED**

Jurisdiction	1990	2000	% Growth between 1990 and 2000	2005 Population Estimates	% Growth between 1990 and 2005	% Growth between 2000 and 2005
Napa County <sup>1</sup>	110,765	124,270	12.2%	134,100	21.1%	7.9%
State of California	29,760,021	33,871,648	13.8%	35,800,000	20.3%	5.7%

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2005 Population Estimates, Census 2000, 1990 Census. ABAG Projections 2005. California DOF, August 2006.*

<sup>1</sup>Napa County population estimates include cities and towns.

**Table 4.3-2** below reflects the county's growth from 2000-2005. As shown in **Table 4.3-2**, the greatest growth within Napa County is within the incorporated cities. Growth directed within the incorporated cities is consistent with existing General Plan policies. Between 1990 and 2000, the County population as a whole grew by more than 13,500; the unincorporated area experienced a 2.2% decline, losing 633 people. This population decline was primarily the result of the incorporation of American Canyon in 1992. Recent data provided by ABAG projections; however, shows the unincorporated area growing at approximately a 1% rate between 2001 and 2004.

As noted in the BDR (2005), between 1990 and 2000, Napa County experienced growth with an overall 12% increase in population and 10% increase in households, translating to an overall

## 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

---

annual growth rate of approximately 1.1% countywide. The greatest population growth occurred in American Canyon, with an approximate 26% increase in population over the past decade.<sup>1</sup> The second largest increase in population occurred in the City of St. Helena with a 19% increase. Both Yountville and the unincorporated area lost population during this same period, though the unincorporated area's loss was primarily due to the annexation of developed unincorporated islands within the City.

Although the rate of growth expressed as a percentage was highest in American Canyon, the City of Napa experienced the highest absolute amount of growth with a population increase of just under 4,015 people over the 10-year period—a number representing almost 45% of the total growth in the County.

**TABLE 4.3-2**  
**NAPA COUNTY POPULATION TRENDS BY JURISDICTION**

Jurisdiction	2000	2005	% Growth between 2000 and 2005
American Canyon	9,774	14,200	45.3%
Calistoga	5,190	5,200	0.2%
Napa	72,585	76,600	5.5%
St. Helena	5,950	6,100	2.5%
Yountville	3,297	3,400	3.1%
Unincorporated Napa County	27,483	28,600	4.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>124,279</b>	<b>134,100</b>	<b>7.9%</b>

Source: ABAG Projections 2005 and Napa County, BDR 2005.

### Housing Allocations in the County

California Government Code Section 65584 requires all counties and cities to meet their respective "fair share" of housing needs of the region. **Table 4.3-3** presents current quantified housing objectives during the 2000-2007 housing cycle for different income levels throughout Napa County as established in each jurisdiction's Housing Element based on a Memorandum of Understanding between the County and the City of Napa, and another Memorandum of Understanding between the County and the City of American Canyon.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: This area became an incorporated city within this historical time frame. The census data for the subregion of American Canyon in 1990 and the incorporated region in 2000 may not include equivalent areas.

**TABLE 4.3-3  
QUANTIFIED HOUSING OBJECTIVES FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, NAPA COUNTY JURISDICTIONS 2000-2007**

	Above Moderate	Moderate	Low Income	Very Low Income	Total
American Canyon	683	470	248	316	1,717
Calistoga	62	88	43	61	254
Napa	1,437	1,090	626	880	4,033
St. Helena	0	36	20	31	87
Yountville	231	36	36	27	329
Unincorporated Areas**	572	118	79	142	911
<b>Total units for all jurisdictions</b>	<b>7,331</b>				

Source: Napa County, BDR 2005.

\*The City of Napa's Housing Element combines the very-low, low, and moderate income categories

\*\*These numbers reflect new construction only and do not reflect other programs for the provision of housing for county residents

In order to gain a better understanding of the different income levels throughout the County that comprise the income sectors, The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) prepares the State Income Limits annually (i.e. the definition of low income, moderate income, etc.), based on the area median household income in the County. The 2006 moderate, low, and very low income limits for Napa County are as follows:

Moderate: \$90,000

Low Income: \$59,600

Very Low Income: \$37,500

### Household Trends and Demographics

#### Households

Table 4.3-4 below shows that between 2000 and 2005, the housing stock in the unincorporated area increased by 524 households while the County overall increased its housing stock by approximately 3,888.

**TABLE 4.3-4  
NAPA COUNTY HOUSEHOLDS 2000-2005**

Jurisdiction	2000	2005	% Change
American Canyon	3,209	4,710	46.8%
Calistoga	2,042	2,060	0.9%
Napa	26,978	28,750	6.6%
St. Helena	2,380	2,430	2.1%
Yountville	1,057	1,080	2.8%
Unincorporated Napa County	9,736	10,260	5.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>45,402</b>	<b>49,290</b>	<b>8.6%</b>

## 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

Source: ABAG Projections 2005.

### Household Size

Household size refers to the number of persons in a household. The average household size for unincorporated area is 2.56 persons per household, which is close to the 2.62 average for the County as a whole. **Table 4.3-5** illustrates the change in household size by jurisdiction from 2000 to 2005.

**TABLE 4.3-5  
NAPA COUNTY HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

Jurisdiction	2000	2005	% Change
American Canyon	3.00	2.97	-1.0%
Calistoga	2.51	2.48	-1.2%
Napa	2.64	2.60	-1.5%
St. Helena	2.48	2.45	-1.2%
Yountville	1.95	1.93	-1.0%
Unincorporated Napa County	2.59	2.56	-1.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Source: California DOF, E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates 1/1/2006.

### Household Income

On average, the household incomes for residents in the unincorporated area are almost 26% higher than those of the County's cities. According to the ABAG 2005, the mean household income for the unincorporated area was \$89,800 compared to \$76,600 Countywide. However, Calistoga and Napa's percentage increase in mean income was significantly higher than the percentage increase in the County, as illustrated in **Table 4.3-6**. According to HCD, the 2006 area wide median income for Napa County is \$75,000.

**TABLE 4.3-6  
NAPA COUNTY INCOME TRENDS 2000-2005**

Jurisdiction	2000	2005	% Growth
American Canyon	\$60,700	\$61,100	0.7%
Calistoga	\$59,000	\$61,000	3.4%
Napa	\$67,700	\$70,300	3.8%
St. Helena	\$85,100	\$86,700	1.9%
Yountville	\$76,300	\$78,000	2.2%
Unincorporated Napa County	\$83,600	\$89,800	7.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$76,100</b>	<b>\$76,600</b>	<b>0.7%</b>

Source: ABAG Projections 2005.

Household Tenure

Tenure describes the proportion of renters to owners. The majority of households in the County are owner occupied (67.1 percent). The renter rate in the County is 32.9 %. **Table 4.3-7** illustrates the ratio of owners versus renters in 2005.

**TABLE 4.3-7  
NAPA COUNTY HOUSEHOLD TENURE IN 2005**

Housing Units	Napa County	
Total Occupied	48,202	100.0%
Owner Occupied	32,323	67.1%
Renter Occupied	15,879	32.9%

*Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2005.*

Housing Units

According to the State Department of Finance, a total of 11,674 housing units existed in the unincorporated area in 2004, of which approximately 84% are single-family detached homes, which is 17% higher than the countywide average of single-family versus multi-family units (Housing Element, 2004). Approximately 46% of the total housing units were built before 1960. Of those units, 87% are considered to be in "good condition," 5% "fair," and 8% "dilapidated" (Housing Element, 2004).

Between 1990 and 2000, single-family housing construction accounted for 90% of total housing units constructed in the unincorporated area, and the share of multifamily units as a proportion of total housing stock in the unincorporated area decreased from 9% to 8%, a net loss of 488 units, with the loss of some units to annexations.

There has been virtually no new construction of multi-family housing in the unincorporated area since 1992. As described in the Housing Element and noted in the BDR, there are several constraints on the County's ability to support high-density housing. Those constraints include lack of water delivery and sewage treatment infrastructure, rugged topography, and incompatible neighboring land uses. Additionally, unincorporated lands in the southern portion of the County located near urbanized zones are within the airport zone and are thus prohibited from being developed as housing due to concerns over safety and land use compatibility.

The current Housing Element includes a variety of approaches to maximize the availability of affordable units including the following:

- Encourage development of secondary units;
- Amend local ordinances to address constraints to farmworker housing
- Initiate a General Plan amendment (approved by voters in 2002) to reduce the minimum site size requirement in the Agricultural Resources and Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space General Plan designations whenever the parcel will be used for farm labor camps owned or operated by a governmental agency;
- Adopt a new Affordable Housing Combination District;

### 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

- Amend the County's Growth Management System Element to encourage greater use of Category 4 permits;
- Update inclusionary housing and in-lieu fees to provide additional revenues for affordable housing;
- Provide financial support (through housing trust fund dollars) to the development of affordable housing within incorporated cities;
- Provide funds for migrant farmworker facilities;
- Enter into transfer agreements with the cities so that a portion of the County's housing needs can be accommodated in the cities; and
- Implement policies of collaboration with the incorporated jurisdictions

#### Housing Unit Vacancy

Vacancy trends in housing are analyzed using a "vacancy rate," which established the relationship between housing supply and demand. For example, if the demand for housing is greater than the supply, then the vacancy rate is low and the price of housing will most likely increase. According to "Raising the Roof, California Housing Development Projections and Constraints, 1997-2020," written by the State Department of Housing and Community Development, the desirable vacancy rate in a community is considered to be 5%. Generally, when the vacancy rate drops below 5%, the demand for housing exceeds the supply of housing. Subsequently, prospective buyers and renters may experience an increase in housing costs.

As reported in the Housing Element, the 1990 Census recorded a vacancy rate of approximately 11% in the unincorporated areas of Napa County and a 6.5% rate for the County overall. The Census 2000 data shows an increase to 15% vacancy in the unincorporated area. The Housing Element suggests that this increase may be attributed to a rise in the number of recreational and/or vacation units in the County, which count in the Census as vacant. Adjusting for these units, the unincorporated area has a stable 4.8% vacancy rate in both 1990 and 2000. **Table 4.3-8** displays the 2006 housing vacancy statistics by jurisdiction. The table does not take into account the recreation and/or vacation units in the unincorporated areas.

**TABLE 4.3-8  
2006 HOUSING VACANCY STATUS**

Jurisdiction	Occupied Units	Vacant Units	Total Housing Units	Vacancy Rate
American Canyon	4,997	101	5,098	1.98%
Calistoga	2,096	211	2,307	9.15%
Napa	28,892	854	29,746	2.87%
St. Helena	2,425	333	2,758	12.07%
Yountville	1,048	129	1,177	7.90%
Unincorporated Napa County	10,125	1,730	11,855	14.59%
<b>Total</b>	<b>49,619</b>	<b>3,322</b>	<b>52,941</b>	<b>6.27%</b>

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, Demographic Reporting Unit, 2006.

Housing Price and Availability

For Sale Housing Cost

From the late 1990's to the early 2006 the residential real estate market sustained increasing prices resulting from low mortgage rates, decreasing home sales inventory, and a steadily growing labor market.

According to the Bay Area Real Estate Information System, the average home sale price for the entire County during the final quarter of 2006 was \$683,120. City of Napa average single family housing prices for 2006 for all single family units was \$725,878, \$628,271 for single family units consisting of three bedrooms and 2 bathrooms and \$535,340 for single-family units consisting of two bedrooms and 1 bathroom (Napa County MLS & Bay Area Real Estate Information System, 2006).

Rental Housing Cost

Although rental rates have not been outpacing inflation, lower income residents face significant affordability problems in the housing market. As reported in the County's Housing Element, most apartments in the County are in the City of Napa. Rental costs are reported below in **Table 4.3-9**.

**TABLE 4.3-9  
NAPA COUNTY RENTAL COSTS 2006  
AVERAGES FOR RENTAL UNITS IN NAPA COUNTY**

Unit Type	Square Feet	Monthly Rent	\$/SqFt
1 Bed/1 Bath	786	1,120	\$1.53
2 Bed/1 Bath	847	1,173	\$1.38
2 Bed/ 2 Bath	1,120	1,485	\$1.40
Median Over all units/all jurisdictions	880	1,220	\$1.39

Source: Online Apartment Listings, 2006.

**Employment**

According to the California Employment Development Department (EDD) the total number of jobs in Napa County was 66,840 in October 2006, of which more than 50% were in the City of Napa. The majority of jobs were in the manufacturing/wholesale and retail industries, and the smallest percentage is in the agricultural or mining industries. The EDD also lists a 3.0% unemployment rate overall in Napa County with the highest unemployment rates in the cities of American Canyon and Napa (5.1% and 3.2%), and the lowest in unincorporated community of Deer Park (0.6%). **Table 4.3-10** illustrates preliminary population labor statistics for Napa County as of October 2006.

## 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

**TABLE 4.3-10**  
**OCTOBER 2006 (PRELIMINARY) EMPLOYMENT OF NAPA COUNTY POPULATION**

Jurisdiction	Total Population in Labor Force	Employed	Unemployed
American Canyon	5,100	94.9%	5.1%
Angwin CDP	2,300	98.5%	1.5%
Calistoga	2,900	97.7%	2.3%
Deer Park CDP	1,000	99.4%	0.6%
Napa	41,800	96.8%	3.2%
St. Helena	3,400	97.0%	3.0%
Yountville	1,200	98.0%	1.9%
<b>Napa County Total</b>	<b>71,100</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>

Source: California EDD, October, 2006. CDP stands for census designated place.

### 4.3.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

#### REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS PLAN

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) allocates housing need figures for Bay Area Municipalities. The allocation comes after projection modeling based on current general plan policies and land use zonings. As described in the BDR, the allocations are based on "smart growth" assumptions in the modeling and aim to "shift development patterns from historical trends toward better jobs-housing balance, increased preservation of open space, and development of urban and transit accessible areas."

#### NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT

The purpose of this Housing Element is to adopt a comprehensive, long-term plan to address the housing needs in the unincorporated areas of Napa County. The Housing Element is Napa County's primary policy document regarding the development, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing for all economic segments of the population within its jurisdiction. Accordingly, this Housing Element identifies and analyzes the existing and projected housing needs of the County and states goals, policies, quantified objectives, and implementation programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. This Housing Element also identifies sites for housing development that are adequate to accommodate the County's allocation of the regional housing need. The policies, objective, and programs are classified into seven different categories as follows:

- 1) Rehabilitation
- 2) Affordability
- 3) Special Needs
- 4) Housing Development
- 5) Housing Location, Density, and Timing
- 6) Removal of Government Constraints
- 7) Energy and Water Conservation Policies

### LOCAL POLICIES

#### Measure A

Voters adopted the Napa County Slow Growth Initiative Measure A on November 4, 1980. This initiative ordinance for a slow growth general plan, reduction of costly urban sprawl, and the preservation of the County's unique character and agricultural lands resulted in the development of the Growth Management System Element of the current Napa County General Plan. It should be noted that Measure A expired in December 2000; however, the Napa County Board of Supervisors extended its intent and mandate through a Housing Allocation Program. For a full description of Measure A refer to Section 3.0 (Project Description).

#### Measure J

Measure J, the Agricultural Lands Preservation Initiative, enacted by a vote of the people on November 6, 1990, is intended to preserve the county's agricultural lands, which have a General Plan land use designation of Agricultural Resource (AR) or Agricultural, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS). Pursuant to the initiative and to resulting General Plan policies, any change to these land use map designations requires a vote of the people known as a Measure J vote. For a full description of Measure J refer to Section 3.0 (Project Description).

### 4.3.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131(a), economic or social effects of a project are not treated as significant effects on the environment. If the proposed project were to cause physical changes as a result of economic or social changes, then the physical effects (such as the destruction of habitat resulting from housing construction to accommodate increased population or the physical effects of displacing growth to other areas) could be considered significant. For purposes of this EIR, a population and housing impact would be considered significant if implementation of the project would result in any of the following:

- 1) Induce substantial growth or concentration of population in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure) such that significant physical environmental impacts would occur (Based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G). "Substantial" is defined here as exceeding the County's 1% population growth standard derived from the Housing Allocation Program (Measure A), or exceeding regional growth projections provided by ABAG.
- 2) Substantially alter the ratio or "balance" between housing and employment in the unincorporated area.
- 3) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere (Based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G).

#### METHODOLOGY

Napa County utilized several sources of data for this analysis, such as the Napa County Housing Element (which was updated in 2004 and contains research on demographic and housing conditions), the BDR, and the KMA Report (see **Appendix B**). Information was also obtained from

### 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

governmental agencies through their World Wide Web sites. Among these agencies were the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the California Department of Finance, projections by the Association of Bay Area Governments, and the California Employment Development Department.

Growth in housing and employment is expected to occur in Napa County and the region whether or not the Napa County General Plan Update is adopted. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) prepares projections of growth in the Bay Area as a whole and its member jurisdictions, typically on a biannual basis. These projections (most recently *Projections 2003 and Projections 2005*) generally represent the amount of growth that ABAG economists and planners believe is reasonable to expect by 2030 if existing land use policies (e.g. General Plans, zoning) remain intact and only programmed and funded improvements are made to the region's infrastructure. ABAG projections for the region, Napa County as a whole, and the County's individual jurisdictions, are presented in **Table 4.3-11**.

**TABLE 4.3-11  
ABAG 2030 PROJECTIONS FOR REGION, NAPA COUNTY AND INCORPORATED AREA**

	2003 Population Projections	2005 Population Projections	2003 Employment Projections	2005 Employment Projections	2003 Household Projections	2005 Household Projections
Bay Area Region	8,780,300	8,747,100	5,226,400	5,120,600	3,186,600	3,182,220
American Canyon	15,700	20,000	8,750	7,700	5,280	6,800
Calistoga	5,600	5,400	3,460	3,140	2,230	2,170
Napa	91,100	87,200	43,690	44,360	34,820	33,530
St. Helena	6,400	6,300	6,330	6,180	2,610	2,590
Yountville	3,600	3,600	2,650	2,980	1,230	1,250
Unincorporated Napa County	31,000	30,900	24,290	27,490	11,060	11,090
<b>County Total</b>	153,400	153,400	88,990	91,920	57,230	57,430

Source: ABAG Projections 2003, 2005.

As shown in **Table 4.3-11**, a small percentage of the population and employment increases projected to occur in the County by 2030 would occur in the area covered by the County's General Plan (i.e. the unincorporated area). In the ABAG projections population, housing and employment growth is expected to primarily occur within the incorporated urban areas. The cities of Napa and American Canyon are projected to absorb the majority of the projected growth. These cities are projected to grow the most because there is more land available for development and there is infrastructure (i.e. municipal sewer and water services).

To assess the impacts of the Napa County General Plan Update, the County retained its own economists to prepare adjusted growth projections for the EIR alternatives. Adjustments were made to reflect updated information since Projections 2005, as well as an assessment of the amount of land available in each alternative for housing and for job creation, likely demand

and absorption prior to 2030. (For more information on this methodology or the KMA projections, see their study in **Appendix B**). **Table 4.3-12**, compares the number of projected jobs and population for Alternatives A, B, and C, with ABAG Projections 2003 and 2005. It should be noted that none of these projections represent absolute build-out of the current General Plan or the Updated General Plan. Instead, they represent what is considered a reasonable estimate of the amount of growth by 2030 that could occur given the policy parameters under consideration. Projections are reasonable estimations of future conditions, however every effort was made to be conservative (i.e. to lean towards higher numbers) in order to over-state rather than under-state potential impacts related to population, housing, traffic, etc. In addition to these projections of dwelling units, the County has noted that one quarter (25%) of the new dwelling units being constructed could include second units or granny flats (Johnson 2006). Based on this trend, Alternatives A, B and C could generate as many as 560, 610 and 860 second units respectively by the year 2030. While included in the projections, second units are not subject to the provisions of the Housing Allocation Program.

**TABLE 4.3-12  
COMPARISON: PROJECTIONS OF EMPLOYMENT, POPULATION, AND HOUSEHOLD GROWTH  
IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY 2005-2030**

Alternative	KMA- ALT A	KMA- ALT B	KMA- ALT C	2003 ABAG	2005 ABAG
Total Growth of Area Units Non-residential Square Footage	16,014,000 s.f.	14,636,000 s.f.	12,990,000 s.f.	N/A	N/A
Total Job Growth	10,832	11,053	8,603	2,720	4,440
Total Growth of Residential Dwelling Units	2,235	3,885	7,635	825 <sup>2</sup>	890 <sup>2</sup>
Total Population Growth	5,013	9,029	18,063	2,300	2,500

<sup>2</sup> Translated to housing units using an overall Napa County occupancy rate, per Census 2000 of 94%  
Source: KMA, 2006. ABAG Projections 2000 and 2005.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Population, Housing and Employment Increases**

**Impact 4.3.1** Implementation of the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could result in substantial growth in population, housing or employment under the three alternatives that could be in excess of regional projections or the one percent per year housing unit standard set forth in the Napa County Housing Allocation Program. (Significant and Unavoidable – All Alternatives)

The proposed Napa County General Plan Update would largely retain existing land use patterns. However, as shown in **Table 4.3-12**, each of the three alternatives would result in varied developed conditions by the year 2030. Under all three alternatives, there could be localized increases in population and employment, most noticeably at the Pacific Coast/Boca and Napa Pipe sites, and within the designated urban and rural areas shown on the land use map (all alternatives).

As presented in **Table 4.3-12** above, the EIR alternative projections (KMA) are more conservative (larger) than the regional projections (ABAG). It is important to note that regional projections change over time and the EIR alternatives are designed to be more conservative because they

### 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

---

form the basis of environmental analysis. All of the alternatives would result in significant and unavoidable impacts because the estimate of employment, population, and housing units is substantially greater than the regional projections. The projection of dwelling unit creation would also exceed the one percent per year standard in Alternatives B and C. The differences between the alternatives are described below.

#### Alternative A

Alternative A would result in the lowest level of residential development occurring by 2030 of Alternatives A, B and C. The growth of residential dwelling units under Alternative A would remain below the 1% standard of the Housing Allocation Program. The projected 2,235 new dwelling units to be constructed by 2030, would occur at a rate of approximately 90 new units per year ( $2,235/25=89.4$ ). This rate may vary by year, depending on demand and other market conditions. However, approximately 90 new units per year would be sufficiently below the 114 new building permits allowed under the 1% threshold of the Housing Allocation Program. However, the population and employment growth under Alternative A would substantially exceed regional projections of ABAG. Therefore, this impact would be considered **significant**. The physical environmental impacts of this growth (land disturbance) and the potential effects of varied jobs/housing ratios (traffic patterns and volumes) are addressed in Sections 4.1 through 4.14 of this Draft EIR.

#### Alternative B

Alternative B would result in higher development conditions than Alternative A and could result in new dwelling unit growth that would exceed the 1% threshold of the Housing Allocation Program, as well as substantially exceed regional projections of ABAG. Under Alternative B, the projected 3,885 new dwelling units to be constructed by 2030, could occur at a rate of approximately 155 new units per year ( $3,885/25=155.4$ ). It shall be noted that the 2030 projections for each alternative do not specifically dictate that a certain number of units be built. Rather, the projections are conservative growth estimates based on development potential under specific land use designations and patterns under the General Plan Update.

Alternative B could exceed the 114 building permits per year allowed by the current Housing Allocation Program. However, some of the units constructed under this alternative could be Category 4 (affordable) permits. The Housing Allocation Program requires that at least 15% of the housing units permitted each year shall be for housing capable of purchase or rental by persons with average or below average income. Category 4 permits accommodate residents earning 120% of the median income. Unused Category 4 permits accumulate and can be issued to qualified applicants at any time, irrespective of annual limits. The County has currently accumulated approximately 500 unused Category 4 permits. Provision of these permits could help to offset the exceeded number of building permits under Alternative B. Market Rate permits are also allowed to accumulate and can be carried over for a period of three years and can also be issued to applicants at any time, irrespective of annual limits (Siegel, 2006). However, the number of market rate permits carried over is much less than the affordable permits. Therefore, these remaining permits would not offset the required permits as much as the accumulated Category 4 permits.

Similar to Alternative A, Alternative B is projected to result in population and employment growth in excess of regional projections, which is considered a **significant** impact. The physical environmental impacts of this growth (land disturbance) and the potential effects of varied jobs/housing ratios (traffic patterns and volumes) are addressed in Sections 4.1 through 4.14 of this Draft EIR.

Alternative C

Alternative C would result in higher development conditions than Alternatives A and B and would result in new dwelling unit growth that could exceed the 1% threshold of the current Housing Allocation Program, as well as substantially exceed regional projections of ABAG. Under Alternative C, the projected 7,635 new dwelling units to be constructed by 2030, could occur at a rate of approximately 305 new units per year ( $7,635/25=305.4$ ). It shall be noted that the 2030 projections for each alternative do not specifically dictate that a certain number of units be built. Rather, the projections are conservative growth estimates based on development potential under specific land use designations and patterns under the General Plan Update.

Alternative C could also exceed the 114 building permits per year allowed by the Housing Allocation Program as discussed above under Alternative B. As with Alternative B, some of the units constructed under these alternatives could be Category 4 (affordable) permits and would be subject to the provisions of such permits. Exceedence of regional growth projections and the one percent per year standard would be a **significant** impact.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would apply to Alternatives B and C, which could result in annual housing development in excess of the County's one percent standard:

**MM 4.3.1** To ensure that dwelling units are approved in excess of limits established by the County's growth management strategy only in those extraordinary circumstances where they are both necessary and desirable, the County shall adopt and implement a policy allowing certain multi-family residential project proposals, if they meet specific requirements, to proceed even if they would result in annual development in excess of the limits. These requirements shall include, but may not be limited to: (1) location in an area that is not designated for agricultural use; (2) execution of a development agreement specifying a phased development plan that would address impacts and infrastructure needs in advance of each phase; (3) making a substantial contribution to meeting the County's state-mandated housing needs; and (4) including a significant affordable housing component.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 4.3.1 would amend Growth Management System to develop specific criteria allowing the County Board of Supervisors to allow the 1% standard to be exceeded by the development (e.g., Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca sites under Alternatives B and C). However, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** for all alternatives because projected development would exceed regional projections Physical environmental impacts resulting from increases in population, housing and employment throughout the entire unincorporated area of the County are discussed throughout this document.

**Jobs-Housing Balance**

**Impact 4.3.2** Implementation of the proposed Napa County General Plan could alter the ratio or "balance" between housing and employment in the unincorporated area, substantially increasing commutes in or out of the county. (Less than Significant - Alternative B and C, Significant and Unavoidable - Alternative A)

### 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

---

**Table 4.3-13** presents the KMA projections for new jobs and dwelling units in the unincorporated areas of the County under each alternative. The table also adds the KMA projections to the existing (ABAG, 2005) number of jobs and dwelling units in the unincorporated areas of the County to present an expected ratio of jobs to housing in 2030. This projected future ratio is compared to the current ratio, as represented in ABAG data. According to ABAG, in 2005 the unincorporated area of Napa County had a jobs/housing balance of approximately two and a half jobs to one housing unit (2.5/1). New jobs projected under each alternative would be greater than the number of housing units projected. The imbalance resulting from Alternatives A would exceed the existing imbalance and would be considered significant. The impacts of each alternative are described further below.

#### Alternative A

As presented in **Table 4.3-13**, Alternative A would result in the highest ratio of jobs to housing. Under Alternative A, the job growth projected in the unincorporated area of the County would be the highest of all three alternatives with the lowest amount of new dwelling units. The projected job growth is nearly five times the number of new housing units. As a result, the projected ratio of jobs to housing in the unincorporated area would be approximately three to one (2.9/1). This would represent an increase from the existing ratio of 2.5/1.

As a result of the continued imbalance, workers would be required to live outside of the County and commute into the County for employment. In the absence of additional housing development, projected job growth would have an indirect effect on cities and neighboring counties, since a portion of the new workers would likely reside in urban areas in Napa, Solano, Sonoma and Contra Costa counties (based on the results of traffic model presented in later sections of this DEIR). Increased vehicle trips to and from the County would result in higher peak traffic volumes and congestion of County roadways. In addition to impacts on the County's transportation network, the increase in vehicle trips to and from the County would also result in impacts to air quality and noise as well as growth inducement on these communities outside of the County. While specific, physical environmental effects and related mitigations are discussed in later sections of this document, the jobs/housing imbalance itself is considered **significant** for Alternative A.

#### Alternative B

Under Alternative B, the projected job growth is nearly three times the number of new housing units. The resulting ratio of jobs to housing would be approximately two and a half to one (2.5/1). This would maintain the existing ratio of jobs to housing in the County, and thus would be considered **less than significant**. Nonetheless, as discussed under Alternative A, the continued imbalance would require workers to live outside of the County and commute into the County for employment. This would perpetuate current growth pressures in the cities and neighboring counties, as well as physical environmental effects (traffic congestion, air quality, etc.) which are considered in later sections of this document.

#### Alternative C

Under Alternative C, the projected job growth is nearly equal to the number of new housing units. The ratio of jobs to housing would be approximately two to one (1.8/1). Alternative C would result in a decrease in the ratio of jobs to housing from 2.5 to 1.8. Although an imbalance would continue, the new ratio would constitute a significant improvement from the existing imbalance, and this impact would be considered **less than significant**. While improving the jobs/housing ratio could decrease the amount of workers commuting into the County for work,

there would still be impacts to the County's transportation network, air quality and noise. These physical environmental effects and related mitigations are discussed in later sections of this document.

### Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure would apply to Alternative A, which would increase the imbalance or ratio between jobs and housing in the unincorporated County:

**MM 4.3.2** To ensure that job growth in the unincorporated County does not substantially out-pace dwelling unit production, the County shall adopt and implement a policy requiring new employment-generating development either to produce on- or off-site housing adequate to meet the demand for Napa County housing associated with the new employment, or to pay an in-lieu housing fee to assist the County with the development of subsidized housing for the neediest segment of the workforce.

Mitigation Measure MM 4.3.2 would help improve the balance of jobs to housing in the unincorporated areas of the County by requiring new employment-generating development either to produce on- or off-site housing adequate to meet the demand for Napa County housing associated with the new employment, or to pay an in-lieu housing fee to assist the County with the development of subsidized housing for the neediest segment of the workforce. Because it is unclear whether this mitigation measure would fully mitigate the imbalance of jobs to housing, this impact would be considered **significant and unavoidable**.

### 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

**TABLE 4.3-13  
PROJECTED RATIO OF JOBS TO HOUSING**

Alternative	Population Increase Unincorporated Areas (KMA) 2005-2030	Projected Dwelling Units, Unincorporated Areas (KMA) 2005 - 2030	Projected Jobs, Unincorporated Areas (KMA) 2005-2030	2030 Jobs in Unincorporated Napa County (KMA + ABAG Estimate for 2005 Jobs)	2030 Dwelling Units in Unincorporated Napa County (KMA + ABAG 2005 Dwelling Units*)	Projected Ratio of Total Jobs to Total Housing 2030. Unincorporated Napa County
A	5,013 persons	2,235 du	10,832	33,882	11,879 du	2.9/1
B	9,029 persons	3,885 du	11,053	34,103	13,529 du	2.5/1
C	18,063 persons	7,635 du	8,603	31,653	17,279 du	1.8/1

*ABAG Projections = Total Jobs in 2030. Total Jobs was used versus employed residents, because employed residents includes commuters and not jobs within the County.*

*\*Based on ABAG projections translated to housing units using an overall Napa County occupancy rate, per Census 2000 of 94%*

*Source: ABAG 2005, KMA 2006.*

### Displacement of a Substantial Number of Persons or Housing

**Impact 4.3.3**      **Implementation of the proposed Napa County General Plan Update would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people or housing. (Less Than Significant Impact – All Alternatives)**

Implementation of proposed General Plan Update under alternatives A, B and C would largely retain the existing land use pattern of the County and would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of persons or housing. The impacts of each alternative are described further below.

#### Alternative A

Implementation of Alternative A would retain the existing land use pattern of the County and would not introduce any new land use or other physical feature that would result in the displacement of existing residential communities. Thus, Alternative A's impact would be **less than significant**.

#### Alternative B

As noted in Section 3.0 (Project Description), Alternative B would involve some land use changes that would allow for additional development/ redevelopment (e.g., redesignation of Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca sites) within currently developed areas. None of these modifications to the 1983 General Plan would introduce any new land use or other physical feature that would result in the displacement of existing residential communities.

In addition to the proposed land use map shown in **Figure 3.0-5**, Alternative B would include roadway improvements (associated with the proposed General Plan Update Circulation Element), extension of recycled water to Coombsville and Carneros, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space (proposed Recreation and Open Space Element in the General Plan Update). These improvements are not expected to require the displacement of existing residential communities. In addition, potential residential property acquisitions would be required to comply with the California Relocation Assistance Act and potentially the Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program (for roadway improvement projects to state highway facilities) and the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act and Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low Income Populations) for projects involving federal funding. These provisions would ensure proper compensation and relocation of residences that may be displaced from implementation of Alternative B. Thus, Alternative B's impact would be **less than significant**.

#### Alternative C

As noted in Section 3.0 (Project Description), Alternative C would involve some additional land use changes beyond Alternative B that would allow for additional development/redevelopment (e.g., redesignation of Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca sites and establishment of a new Rural-Urban Limit adjacent to the City of American Canyon) within and adjacent to currently developed areas. None of these modifications to the 1983 General Plan would not introduce any new land use or other physical feature that would result in the displacement of existing residential communities.

Similar to Alternative B, Alternative C would also include roadway improvements (associated with the proposed General Plan Update Circulation Element), extension of recycled water to Coombsville and Carneros, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space

### 4.3 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

---

(proposed Recreation and Open Space Element in the General Plan Update). As identified under Alternative B, the provision of trails, open space and recreation opportunities and roadway/infrastructure improvements are not expected to require the displacement of existing residential communities. Thus, Alternative C's impact would be **less than significant**.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### REFERENCES

- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Projections 2002, 2003, 2005.
- Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. Alternatives Analysis. 2006
- Jones & Stokes/Edaw. 2005. Napa County Baseline Data Report, Version 1. November. (J&S 03559.03)Oakland, CA.
- Napa County General Plan Alternatives Charette Workbook, September 2005.
- Napa County. Napa County General Plan, Housing Element. Adopted September 2004.
- Seigel, Howard. Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department. Electronic Communication. September 13, 2006.
- State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2006, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2006.
- U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey. Site accessed January 11, 2007. Available at: < <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/>>.
- U.S. Census Bureau 2005 Population Estimates. [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov). Site accessed June 20, 2006.
- U.S. Census Bureau 1990 and 2000. [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov).
- 2006 Income Limits Memorandum. Department of Housing and Community Development: Division of Housing Policy Development. April 6, 2006. <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/state/inc2k6.pdf>. Site accessed, June 20, 2006.