

Chapter 5B. Population and Housing

INTRODUCTION

To provide the context on which potential impacts can be assessed, this chapter presents information on existing levels of population and housing found within the City's planning area. This information is based on data summaries from the California Department of Finance (DOF), the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), and the U.S. Census Bureau. Census data referenced in this chapter was obtained from the 1990 Census.

SETTING

Regional Setting

UC Davis

In the Fall Quarter of the 1998-1999 school year, approximately 24,020 students were enrolled at the UC Davis campus (25,092 including programs in Sacramento). UC Davis employed 9,241 persons (15,644 persons including student employees). In the Fall Quarter of the 1999-2000 school year, approximately 24,240 students were enrolled at the Davis campus. Current employment numbers are 10,080 persons (17,480 including student employees). UC Davis is a major contributor to Davis housing demand and a major employer in the City. UC Davis had a three-term average on campus enrollment of 22,339 in 1995-96. In April of that year, the University employed 9,944 persons (not counting student staff) on campus. UC Davis estimates that enrollment will increase to between 26,000 and 30,000 students by 2010-11 and employment will increase to between 12,120 and 13,983 persons. In the Fall Quarter of 1998-1999 school year, 21% of UC Davis students (undergraduate and graduate) lived in University housing, including the off-campus Cuarto complex on the north side of Russell Boulevard. In the Fall Quarter of the 1999-2000 school year, this percentage decreased to 20% due to remodeling of a portion of the Cuarto Complex.

Approximately 92% of all students live within the Davis planning area. The University's adopted policy under its 1994 Long Range Development Plan is to provide on-campus housing for 25% of its students. The City of Davis and the University entered into a Memorandum of Understanding in 1989 encouraging the University to house up to 35% of its students on campus to the extent that it is financially feasible.

Student enrollment increases by 2010-11 will add between 3,223 and 5,810 students to the Davis population (this excludes those students living on-campus or out-of-town). At current student occupancy rates, this would create a demand for between 1,240 and 2,235 housing units.

About 47% of UC Davis' employees live in Davis, at an average household size of 2.6 persons. When put into terms of population growth in Davis by 2010-11, this translates to between 930 and 1,728 new faculty and staff households living in Davis, adding approximately 2,420 to 4,492 new residents to the area in that period (Bay Area Economics 1997).

In combination, the University student and employee population increases account for a substantial portion of future growth in Davis. The University's contribution to Davis' population by 2010-11 is estimated to be between 5,643 and 10,302 people. The number of housing units necessary to accommodate this population would be between 2,170 and 3,963 (Bay Area Economics 1997).

Yolo County

Yolo County's estimated total 1998 population, including that within its incorporated cities, was 155,450. January 1999 population is estimated at 158,797 persons. Its year 2010 total population is estimated to be 194,177 (California Department of Finance 1998). The rate of population increase over that period is estimated to average about 1.6% per year. Because Yolo County itself maintains strict limits on residential development within agricultural areas (about 15% of its total residents live in the unincorporated area), most of this increase will occur within its incorporated cities.

The City of Davis, its Redevelopment Agency, and Yolo County maintain a redevelopment "pass through" agreement through which the County receives a portion of the Davis redevelopment agency's tax increment revenues in exchange for limiting development within the unincorporated portion of the City's planning area. The City in turn has agreed to maintain an average population growth rate of 1.78% per year through the 2010-11 fiscal year.

City of Woodland

The City of Woodland lies approximately 7 miles north of Davis. Its population was estimated to be 44,456 on January 1, 1998, and 45,600 on January 1, 1999. The City of Woodland adopted a new Woodland General Plan in February 1996. Under its 1996 General Plan, the City of Woodland anticipates growing to 66,000 people by 2020, with a planning area that would eventually cover approximately 10.2 square miles. The Woodland General Plan encourages in-fill development and reuse of under-utilized lands within the urban limit line.

City of West Sacramento

West Sacramento is located approximately 9 miles to the east of Davis, across the Yolo Causeway. Its population on January 1, 1998, was 30,200 and on January 1, 1999, was estimated to be 30,450 (California Department of Finance 1999). Under its 1988 General Plan, the City of West Sacramento anticipates growing to 79,900 people in 2010. Delays in development of the "Southport" area, and the loss of major development proposals along the Sacramento River as a result of the recession of the 1990s make this level of increase unlikely by 2010.

Solano County

Solano County's population in January 1998 was estimated to be 382,000 people and was estimated at 390,100 on January 1, 1999 (California Department of Finance 1999). The population is projected to be 479,136 by July 1, 2010 (California Department of Finance 1998). This would be a 2.8% annual rate of increase. Solano County also limits development outside of its cities' spheres of influence, so most of this increase can be expected to occur within the cities.

City of Dixon

Dixon is located in Solano County, approximately 7 miles southwest of Davis. Its population on January 1, 1998, was estimated at 14,400 and on January 1, 1999, was estimated to be 15,100 people (California Department of Finance 1999). The City of Dixon 1993 general plan projects a population of approximately 20,325 by the year 2010. The general plan contains policies encouraging the preservation of open space and agricultural land between Dixon and the City of Davis.

Davis Planning Area

The Davis Planning Area includes the incorporated City, the UC Davis campus, and unincorporated areas of Yolo and Solano Counties surrounding the City. The following information is for the City portion of the planning area, unless otherwise noted.

Population

The City's population on January 1, 1998, was 54,428 and on January 1, 1999, was estimated to be 56,018. The 1999 estimate represents a population increase of 17.3% since 1990 (an annual rate of approximately 1.9%). The increase from 1988 to 1999 was 2.93%. Davis houses about 36% of Yolo County's total population (California Department of Finance 1999).

According to the 1990 Census, the median age of City residents is 25.5, and 32% of residents are between the ages of 18 and 24. In contrast, the Yolo County median age is 28.9. The relatively young age of the population in Davis is attributable to the large proportion of residents who are attending UC Davis.

The projected population at the assumed buildout of the City under the existing General Plan in 2010 is 65,429. To reach this buildout population, the City would average a 1.3% annual growth rate for the years between 1999 and 2010. As a comparison, the 2010 projected population by SACOG for the City is 65,000 with an overall growth rate of 1.2%. Most of the population increase is expected to come from residents of new development areas.

Housing

As of January 1, 1999, the total number of housing units within the City limits is estimated at 22,199, 54% of which are single-family or mobile home units and 46% multifamily dwellings (Sacramento Area Council of Governments 1999). This is an increase of 2.0% from the 1998 estimate of 21,766 units. An estimated 1,700 additional housing units are located in the unincorporated portion of the planning area, for a total of 23,774 units in the entire planning area (California Department of Finance 1998). The County has a total of 59,561 housing units, of which 67.5% are single-family or mobile homes and 32.5% are multifamily or mobile home units (Sacramento Area Council of Governments 1999).

The 1990 Census found that 58.1% of the housing stock in the City is owner occupied, 40% is renter occupied, and 1.9% is vacant (City of Davis 1999). The person per household rate is currently 2.47 for the City and 2.65 for the County (California Department of Finance 1999).

Current residential vacancy rates are estimated to be 1.95% and 3.75% for the City and Yolo County, respectively (California Department of Finance 1998). Vacancy rates in the 4-6% range generally indicate a healthy housing market where new housing is being absorbed efficiently by the market. The City's vacancy rate reflects an undersupply of housing resulting in an imbalance between housing demand and supply.

Buildout (2010) of the existing General Plan would result in a total estimated housing stock of 26,779 housing units in the City. General Plan buildout is projected to approximate a Citywide housing mix of 58% single-family and 42% multifamily units, which is generally in compliance with the City goal of providing a variety of housing types for all people and is similar to the current housing mix (City of Davis 1997). The January 1998 housing supply was estimated at 45% single-family detached.

The planning area is characterized by large areas of new development and maintained older areas in which little or no housing rehabilitation is needed. A strong market exists in the community for housing. The UC Davis campus is largely a noncommuter campus with 92% of the students living in the planning area. Characterized by greater transiency and lower incomes than the nonstudent population, student households create a strong demand for multifamily housing.

Housing prices in the planning area are generally higher than those in the rest of the Sacramento Metropolitan Area, particularly those in the neighboring cities of Woodland and West Sacramento. A comparison of 1996 resale home data in the planning area and Woodland indicates a median sales price of \$197,000 in the planning area compared to \$128,000 in Woodland (Yolo County Board of Realtors 1996). The lowest-cost ownership housing units are mobile homes, which rent spaces in existing mobile home parks. The majority of existing mobile homes in the planning area are older.

The rental market in the planning area consists primarily of apartments but also includes condominiums, duplexes, and houses. The average 1996 rental rate for a two-bedroom unit was \$676 per month (Jones & Stokes Associates 1997). Rents in surrounding areas are somewhat lower. Average 1996 rent for a two-bedroom unit in the City of Sacramento ranged from \$480 to \$640 per month (Jones & Stokes Associates 1997). In the City of West Sacramento, the 1996 average range for rent for a two-bedroom unit was from \$425 to \$550 per month (Jones & Stokes Associates 1997).

Sites Being Studied

All of the sites being studied are currently undeveloped, and therefore, do not have any existing employment, housing, or population base to present. For each of the sites being studied, expected employment, housing, and population (as applicable to the land use being proposed) are shown on Table 5B-1.

Table 5B-1. Expected Employment, Housing, and Population by Site Being Studied

	Expected Employment ^a	Expected Housing Units	Expected Population ^c
Nishi/Gateway ^b	410	0	0
Covell Center Property	860	688	1,600
Signature	80	0 ^d	0
Mace Ranch Interior Retail	110	48	111
Under Second Street	590	0	0
Sutter-Davis Hospital	480	0	0
Oeste Campus	3,350	0	0
Davis Technology Campus	3,750	0	0
Intervening Lands	75	560	1,301

^a Expected employment estimates were calculated using employment ratios of square footage per employee from the Fiscal Impact Report for the Davis General Plan Update prepared by Bay Area Economics, November 1999.

^b Assumed at 50% of development approved in specific plan.

^c Assumes 1.95% vacancy rate and 2.37 persons per household.

^d The future land use of the Urban Reserve portion is not assumed here.

Regulatory Setting

City of Davis Affordable Housing Ordinance

The City adopted an ordinance (No. 1567) on June 20, 1990, known as the City of Davis Affordable Housing Ordinance, which established an affordable housing program for the City. This ordinance established affordability requirements for development of for-sale and rental housing to comply with the policies of the General Plan Housing Element.

Under the ordinance, the developer of residential for-sale units must make the equivalent of 25% of the units affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income households. The developer of multifamily rental housing must make at least 25% of the units affordable to low-income households, plus at least 10% of the units must be affordable to very low-income households. An alternative to this program includes a project-individualized affordable housing program that meets the same unit requirements. Developers often choose to dedicate land to the City or a non-profit housing developer (thereby reducing acquisition costs) rather than build affordable units themselves. Small projects may pay an “in-lieu” fee to the City, which will be used to finance affordable housing construction. The ordinance requires that an individualized program be generated by the developer and City staff, and that implementation of the program is conditioned on Planning Commission or City Council approval.

The Draft General Plan would maintain the existing affordability requirements for for-sale housing developments. The affordable housing requirements for rental projects would remain at 35% of total units, but the percentage of units affordable to very-low-income households would be increased from 10% to 25%.

City/County Pass-Through Agreement

Under California Redevelopment Law, the City of Davis Redevelopment Agency captures a portion of the property taxes within its project area that would otherwise go to Yolo County. In 1987, the City of Davis and Yolo County entered into an agreement whereby the City gives back (i.e., passes through) a portion of these taxes to Yolo County in exchange for the County not approving urban development within the City’s planning area. The agreement assigns the Redevelopment Agency pass through funds to the County, the County capital facilities fund, and the County Library. These payments amount to approximately \$600,000 per year and are expected to increase, possibly substantially, in future years.

The agreement provides that the County will refrain from approving new urban land uses within the City’s planning area. In exchange, the City has agreed to maintain a non-compounded, average population growth rate of 1.78% per year through the 2010-11 fiscal year. If the City does not maintain this rate, the County will lose the financial incentive to refrain from approving urban uses in the agricultural areas surrounding the City. Based on population assumptions existing in 1987, the City’s projected population will have to be at least 60,145 people by 2010 to satisfy the

agreement. To date, the City has averaged about 2.1% growth per year, exceeding the rate under the agreement, and had an estimated population of 56,018 people as of January 1, 1999.

The pass-through agreement will remain in effect for the life span of the City's redevelopment plan. The plan will terminate in November 2027, 40 years after adoption.

California Housing Element Law

The state requires each general plan to contain a housing element that describes the city's existing and projected housing demand and supply, as well as programs for providing housing for all income levels. The housing element must be updated every 5 years or as otherwise provided in state law. The draft housing element must be submitted to the State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) for its review. HCD will advise the city as to the draft's compliance with housing element law. If HCD finds that the draft-housing element does not comply with state law, the city may not adopt the element unless it explains why it is doing so in light of the alleged shortcomings. The most recent Housing Element for the City of Davis, covering the period from 1991 to 1996, was determined to be adequate by HCD. The City of Davis housing element is due for revision by June 30, 2002.

Under housing element law, HCD generates a regional housing share for each of the state's regions based on population projections, which it provides to each of the councils of government (COGs) around the state. With some exceptions for rural areas that have no COG, the COG (in Davis' case, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments) is responsible for dividing this regional share among the cities and counties within its area. Prior to the due date for the housing element revision, the COG will assign the city a fair-share housing number specifying the number of dwelling units (including very low-, low-, and market-rate units) that the city must plan for during the life of its housing element. Among many other requirements, the housing element must identify sites that will be available to meet its fair-share housing allocation.

For several years during the 1990s, the state deferred the deadlines for local jurisdictions to revise their housing elements. As a result, the Davis numbers were last prepared in the late 1980s for the 1991-1996 planning period. Because jurisdictions within SACOG are not required to update their general plan housing elements until June 30, 2002, SACOG has not yet prepared new numbers.

IMPACTS AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents an assessment of the potential impacts on population and housing levels. The number of housing units proposed and the associated population growth that would result from the various land use map alternatives are evaluated for consistency with General Plan growth management policies and regulatory requirements.

Population estimates have been developed for each of the land use alternatives and are shown in Table 5B-2. The total population estimated under Alternative 2 is 65,222, under Alternative 3 is 62,073, under Alternative 4 is 64,094, and under Alternative 5 is 65,458. Similar to the final land use plan, population estimates provided under each of the land use alternatives are meant to cover a comprehensive range of reasonable possibilities and are to be used to craft the final plan. The population estimates are fairly similar between the alternatives, and the alternatives are consistent with the population projected by the existing General Plan (65,429) and addressed in the plan's EIR, and SACOG's projection (65,000). Therefore, the projected increase in population under any of the four alternatives is considered to be less-than-significant. Population impacts are not discussed further in this EIR. Secondary impacts generated by population growth (traffic, noise, and public service impacts) are addressed in the appropriate topical sections of this EIR. Potential growth-inducement issues resulting from implementation of the General Plan update are more fully described in Chapter 7, "Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Required Analysis".

Table 5B-2. Probable Buildout of Housing Units and Population Estimates for the Land Use Map Alternatives

	Housing Units in City (All Units) ^a	Estimated Population in City (in All Units) ^a
January 1998 ^b	22,407	54,428
January 1999 ^b	22,850	56,018
2010—probable buildout of existing General Plan as adopted in 1987 ^c	28,039	65,429
2010 Alternative 2—probable buildout to 2010 using existing General Plan as amended through June 1999 ^d (includes 1,247 DU at Covell Center site)	26,779	65,222
2010 Alternative 3—reduced buildout ^d scenario (includes 0 DU at Covell Center site)	25,486	62,073
2010 Alternative 4—community expansion scenario with Oeste Campus ^d (includes 688 DUs at Covell Center site)	26,316	64,094
2010 Alternative 5—community expansion scenario with Davis Technology Campus ^d (includes 688 DUs at Covell Center site, 560 DUs at Intervening lands between City and PG&E).	26,876	65,458

^a Assumes three persons in group quarters are equivalent to a dwelling unit.

^b Based on California Department of Finance estimates for January 1999. Assumed 1.95% vacancy rate, 2.484 persons per household.

^c Per Table 1 of existing General Plan. Assumed 2.47% vacancy rate, 2.37 persons per household.

^d Assumes 1.95% vacancy rate, 2.484 persons per household.

Applicable Policies

The existing and proposed General Plans contain goals, policies, standards, and actions that are designed to reduce or eliminate potential environmental impacts that may be related the implementation of each plan. In evaluating the housing and population impacts associated with each alternative in the General Plan update, it is assumed that these goals, policies, standards, and actions will be implemented with all future projects. In this section, the following policies were applied to the assessment of potential impacts for Alternatives 3 through 5 (see policy descriptions below). For Alternative 2, the goals, policies, standards, and actions contained in the City's existing General Plan were assumed in the assessment of potential impacts. A comparison of the existing General Plan and General Plan update is contained in Chapter 3, "Project Description".

Goals and Policies Specific to Growth Management

The General Plan update includes goals, policies, and actions relating to growth management within the planning area. Specific goals, policies, and actions that affect the assessment of impacts include the following:

GOAL LU 1. Maintain Davis as a small, University-oriented City surrounded by and containing farmland, greenbelt, and natural habitats and reserves.

- **Policy LU 1.1.** Provide for limited growth to meet internal needs of households whose work or study activities are focused in Davis.
 - **Action LU 1.1d.** Maintain a growth management system that regulates the timing of residential growth in an orderly way considering the following: infrastructure, geographical phasing, local employment increases, jobs/housing balance, environmental resources, economic factors DJUSD school enrollment and sustainability.
 - **Action LU1.1e.** Create and maintain an effective growth management system designed to keep the population of the City below 64,000 and the number of single-family dwellings below 15,500 in 2010, which corresponds to a sustained 1.81% annually compounded growth rate from January 1, 1988 to January 1, 2010 and a sustained 1.4331% annually-compounded growth rated from January 1, 1996 to January 1, 2010.

Goals and Policies Specific to Land Use Categories

The General Plan update identifies goals, policies, standards, and actions relating to the various land use categories (e.g., residential, office, etc.). Specific policies that affect the assessment of impacts include the following:

- **Policy LU A.1.** A rezoning to increase the existing density in an existing developed neighborhood to a new density which is within the density range of the general plan land use category (for example, a rezoning from the R-1-6 district to a Planned Development district with a gross density of 7.99 units per acre inclusive of density bonus) may be approved only if such rezoning would not adversely impact the character of the existing neighborhood.
- **Policy LU A.2.** In in-fill projects, respect setback requirements, preserve existing greenbelts and greenstreets, and maintain the desirability of existing housing.
- **Policy LU A.4.** Require a mix of housing types, densities, prices and rents, and designs in each new development area.

Goals and Policies Specific to the Encouragement of In-Fill and Transit-Oriented Development

The General Plan update identifies goals, policies, standards, and actions that serve to promote in-fill transit oriented development. Specific goals, policies, and standards that affect the assessment of impacts include the following:

GOAL LU 2. Reduce reliance on the automobile through the development of in-fill and transit-oriented development.

- **Policy LU 2.1.** Encourage in-fill development, mixed uses, high-density housing and commercial land uses, and increased densities near transit as illustrated in Figure 12 of the General Plan update.
 - **Standard LU 2.1a.** The City shall attempt to maintain a housing mix that includes 50 percent single family detached.
 - **Standard LU 2.1b.** Development within 2 miles of rail stations and 1/4 mile of bus stops shall receive a density bonus over normally allowed residential densities.

Goals and Policies Specific to Housing

The General Plan update identifies goals, policies, standards, and actions relating to housing and housing-related issues (e.g., affordable housing). Specific goals, policies, standards, and actions that affect the assessment of impacts include the following:

GOAL HOUSING 1. Promote adequate housing opportunities for people of all ages, income, lifestyles and types of households.

- **Policy HOUSING 1.1.** Encourage a variety of housing types.
 - **Standard HOUSING 1.1a.** Affordable housing should include a range of unit sizes appropriate to meet Davis housing needs.
 - **Standard HOUSING 1.1b.** Each new development area should include a mix of housing types, densities, prices and rents, and designs.
- **Policy HOUSING 1.2.** Maintain an adequate supply of rental housing in Davis to meet the needs of all renters, including students.
- **Policy HOUSING 1.5.** Work in cooperation with UC Davis to encourage the provision of housing for UC Davis students.
 - **Action HOUSING 1.5b.** Support the provisions in the Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between the City of Davis and UC Davis in 1989, including by not limited to the following:
 1. The goal and intention of UC Davis to provide on-campus housing for 25% of the current (1988-1989) base student population of 21,000 and for 35% of the new student population; and
 2. The agreement that UC Davis' maximum and optimum three-term student population on the Davis campus is 26,000.
 - **Action HOUSING 1.5c.** Encourage apartment construction in step with UC Davis growth to meet student-housing needs.
- **Policy HOUSING 1.6.** Encourage the provision of housing for local employees.
 - **Action HOUSING 1.6b.** Create incentives to provide local housing for local employees.

GOAL HOUSING 2. Provide housing that is affordable for residents with low paying jobs, fixed incomes and pensions.

- **Policy HOUSING 2.1.** Strive to meet the identified 5-year need for housing and for housing affordability to extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households consistent with the provision of Davis' fair-share of regional housing needs and the demographics of internally generated growth.
- **Policy HOUSING 2.2.** Strive to ensure that required affordable housing is occupied by those of the greatest need.
 - **Action HOUSING 2.2a.** Permanently maintain the affordability of required affordable rental units for very low-, low-, or moderate-income households.

GOAL HOUSING 3. Disperse affordable and rental housing fairly throughout the City.

- **Policy HOUSING 3.1.** Maintain and periodically review the Affordable Housing Ordinance to require the inclusion of affordable housing in all new development areas to the extent feasible.
 - **Standard HOUSING 3.1a.** Twenty-five percent of all new for-sale units should be ownership or rental units affordable by low- and moderate-income households.
 - **Standard HOUSING 3.1b.** Continue to administer an affordable housing ordinance, which accomplishes the following:

Rental housing developments containing between 5 and 19 units inclusive shall provide, to the maximum extent feasible, 15 percent of the units to be affordable to low-income households (50-80 percent of the median income) and 10 percent of the units to be affordable to very-low-income households (less than 50 percent of the median income) for a total requirement of 25percent.

Rental housing developments containing 20 or more units shall provide, to the maximum extent feasible, 10 percent of the units to be affordable to low-income households and 25 percent of the units to be affordable to very-low-income households for a total requirement of 35 percent.

The City shall review the ordinance at least every two years to confirm its effectiveness.

GOAL HOUSING 4. Maintain Davis' housing stock in good condition.

Summary of Impacts Related to Land Use Map Alternatives

This chapter evaluates population and housing impacts related to the General Plan update, including the four land use map alternatives. For this evaluation, impacts have been assessed in three categories based on the aggregate impact of the particular alternative.

For the establishment of a new junior high school, this project was determined to not have the potential to result in a significant impact associated with population and housing. The proposed Signature site is located on undeveloped land that would not result in the displacement of housing or people. Further, the purpose of the project is to accommodate existing and projected enrollment demands for a junior high school. Therefore, direct impacts on population and housing related to the school site are not assessed further in this chapter. Growth-inducing impacts are discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, "School Site Alternatives".

Where the following discusses fair-share numbers, it is referring to the existing SACOG fair-share number of 2,346 dwelling units, including 1,003 units of above moderate-, 104 units of moderate-, and 1,203 units of low- and very low-income housing.

- **Impact PH-1. Inconsistency with General Plan Policies.** Alternatives 2 and 5 would result in similar increases in housing units. Alternative 4 would produce fewer units than Alternatives 2 or 5 because the Oeste Campus has no residential component. Alternative 3, by reducing current development potential, would result in the smallest increase of any alternative. Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 would result in potential inconsistencies with policies of the proposed plan by either providing insufficient housing to meet Davis' internally generated needs or exceeding the population limit under action (e) (Alternatives 4 and 5).

Table 5B-3. Summary of Population and Housing Impacts by Alternative

Project Impacts	Project Mitigations	Overall General Plan	Sites Being Studied								
			Nishi/Gateway	Covell Center	Signature Site	Mace Ranch	Under 2nd Street	Sutter-Davis	Oeste Campus	Davis Technology Intervening Lands	In-fill
Alternative 2. Buildout to 2010 Using Existing General Plan											
PH-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies	Not required	LS									
PH-2. Ability to Provide Housing to Meet Fair-Share Requirements	Not required	LS									
PH-3. Ability to Comply with the City/County Pass-through Agreement	Not required	NI									
Alternative 3. Reduced Buildout Scenario											
PH-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies	PH-2.1, -2.2, -2.3, -2.4	S									
PH-2. Ability to Provide Housing to Meet Fair-Share Requirements	PH-1.1 through -1.4, -2.1, -2.2	S									
PH-3. Ability to Comply with the City/County Pass-through Agreement	Not required	NI									
Alternative 4. Community Expansion Scenario with Oeste Campus											
PH-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies	PH-1.1, -1.2, -1.3, -1.4	S									
PH-2. Ability to Provide Housing to Meet Fair-Share Requirements	PH-1.1 through -1.4, -2.1, -2.2	S									
PH-3. Ability to Comply with the City/County Pass-through Agreement	Not required	NI									
Alternative 5. Community Expansion Scenario with Davis Technology Campus											
PH-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies	PH-1.1, -1.2, -1.3, -1.4	S									
PH-2. Ability to Provide Housing to Meet Fair-Share Requirements	PH-1.1 through -1.4, -2.1, -2.2	S									
PH-3. Ability to Comply with the City/County Pass-through Agreement	Not required	NI									
SU = Significant unavoidable S = Significant, but can be reduced to less than significant with mitigations included		LS = Less than significant NI = No impact N/A = None available									
The impacts illustrated by this table have been assessed at a program or aggregate level, rather than on a site-specific basis.											

- **Impact PH-2. Inability to Provide Housing to Meet Fair-Share Requirements.** Revised fair-share numbers will be released by SACOG sometime prior to June 2002. If the numbers are similar to those issued for the current planning period (2,346 total units and 1,203 very low- and low-income housing units), none of the four alternatives will produce housing sufficient to meet those projected needs. Further, the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance alone will not be able to require sufficient housing in new projects to meet the very low- and low-income need under any of the alternatives.
- **Impact: PH-3. Inability to Comply with the City/County Pass-through Agreement.** Each of the four alternatives will allow the City to meet its obligatory growth rate under the City's pass-through agreement with Yolo County when averaged over the planning period. Under the City/County agreement, the City must have a population of at least 60,145 persons by 2010. The estimated population under Alternative 2 would be 65,222; under Alternative 3, 62,073; under Alternative 4, 64,094; and under Alternative 5, 65,458. There is no impact under any of the alternatives.

Project Impacts

Impact PH-1. Inconsistency with General Plan Policies

Significance Criteria

- A significant impact would occur if the land use map alternative or one of its components is inconsistent with the text of the document.
- For Alternatives 3 through 5, a significant impact would occur if the policies, standards, and actions are internally inconsistent.
- For Alternatives 3 through 5, a significant impact would occur if the development of the plan results in a substantial jobs/housing imbalance in the community. A jobs/housing ratio of between 0.8:1 to 1.2:1 is determined to be acceptable.

A jobs/housing imbalance is not in itself an environmental impact. However, it can directly lead to air quality and traffic impacts resulting from in-commuting plus impacts on other communities. It is, therefore, an appropriate consideration in this EIR. In addition, a jobs/housing imbalance is generally considered to be a desirable planning goal.

Impacts of the proposed project related to General Plan consistency were assessed for internal consistency. Table 5B-4 provides an overview/ comparison of the level of impact associated

with the General Plan under the four land use map alternatives evaluated in this EIR. A more detailed discussion of each alternative is described below.

Table 5B-4. General Plan Policy Consistency under Each Land Use Map Alternative

Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential inability to comply with policies calling for meeting internal housing needs • Jobs/housing imbalance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential inability to comply with Policy LU 1.1 • Potentially inconsistent policy direction (LU A.1) • Jobs/housing imbalance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential inability to comply with Policy LU 1.1 • Potentially inconsistent policy direction (LU A.1) • Jobs/housing imbalance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential inability to comply with Policy LU 1.1 • Potentially inconsistent policy direction (LU A.1) • Jobs/housing imbalance

Alternative 2. Buildout to 2010 Using Existing General Plan. Implementation of Alternative 2 does not contain explicit conflicts between the map and applicable plans and policies. Development of the sites being studied (e.g., Nishi/Gateway, Covell Center Property, Mace Ranch interior retail, and Under Second Street) and other potential infill development achieve the policies outlined in the existing General Plan and land use diagram. Policies in the existing General Plan stress keeping Davis as a small, university-oriented city surrounded by farmland (Land Use and Circulation Section, Guiding Policy A). As described, development proposed under this alternative promotes these policies.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would increase the City’s existing housing stock from 22,850, as of January 1, 1999, to 26,779 in 2010, an increase of 3,929 units. The existing General Plan assumes a maximum probable buildout of 28,039 units by 2010. The number of units has been reduced since the General Plan was first adopted in 1987 due to revisions in the potential buildout of Covell Center and updates to current residential statistics. Because buildout of the planning area’s housing stock is consistent with the housing development that was proposed in the existing General Plan, there is no impact under this alternative.

The existing General Plan includes policies providing for growth to meet the internal needs of households whose work or study activities are or have been focused in Davis. The EIR for the existing General Plan concluded that full buildout of the designated commercial properties would lead to an imbalance of jobs and housing, resulting in significant in-commuting and resultant air quality impacts. The City chose to adopt findings of overriding considerations for this impact when it adopted the existing General Plan.

Alternative 3. Reduced Buildout Scenario. Policy LU 1.1 of the proposed General Plan update calls for the City to provide for sufficient housing to meet internal needs. The expansion of UC Davis by school year 2010-11 will create a need for 2,170 to 3,963 additional housing units within the City, depending upon the actual student population and staff employment numbers. In

addition, development of the areas currently designated for nonresidential development, such as Mace Ranch and South Davis, will generate additional employment opportunities. If the business park variation for Covell Center were approved as part of this alternative, an estimated additional 1,150 jobs would be generated. Alternative 3 would produce 2,636 housing units (estimated City population of 62,073). Under this scenario, full buildout by the University would create a demand exceeding the total number of units allowed citywide, leaving no capacity for other demands. Although the total population does not exceed the limit stated in Action LU 1.1e, compliance with Policy LU 1.1 is considered unlikely based on the development proposed under this alternative. The impact related to this land use map alternative is considered *significant*.

In preparing the General Plan update, City staff has identified the primary areas of policy where the proposed update differs from the existing General Plan. A list of these major changes is listed in Chapter 3 under a section labeled "New, Expanded, or Modified Goals and Policies in the General Plan Update". From this list, the following statements represent new policy direction (in bold type) associated with population and housing topics.

- Moderate increases in allowable residential densities and increases in maximum floor area ratios in commercial land uses (as part of encouraging a compact city)

Implementation of Alternative 3 would allow growth and development in the City to 2010 only for residential projects that are already entitled, plus a modest amount of infill. Implementation of the updated General Plan policies would result in slow, managed population growth over the next 10 years. The City of Davis wishes to maintain its small-town character, centered around the University. Implementation of these policies would help the City achieve its vision for a small, compact community with limited growth potential.

Specific housing policies (HOUSING 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5), if implemented, would potentially open up the housing market to a wider spectrum of the population that live, work, and attend school in the planning area. Policies that call for slow, managed population growth could contribute to a tight housing market, which in effect, could drive up housing prices as a result of increased housing demand. The requirements for providing a certain amount of housing that is affordable with new development will help to offset this market increase and help accommodate the City's diverse population, as will policies calling for the creation of programs for local employees to live in Davis. Because housing opportunities for local employees might be provided through either new construction or conversion of existing housing from commuter occupancy to local employee occupancy, housing for local employees does not necessarily require new construction.

Additionally, implementation of other policies (HOUSING 1.1, LU A.4) would also encourage increased housing densities within the urban areas of Davis. These policies promote the increase in densities, and encourage high density, in-fill development, and mixed-use projects. These policies could change the character of the housing stock and

are likely to conflict with Standard LU2,1a, calling for a housing stock of 50% single-family detached units. Although this change to a more urban, transit/pedestrian-oriented city is a desired vision, Policy LU A.1 highlights another aspect of increased densities. This policy constrains development densities that would negatively change the character of an area, even though densities would be within the ranges provided in the General Plan update. Although the policies are not explicitly inconsistent as written, they may raise difficulties in implementation.

The General Plan states the vision for the City as one that is both inclusive and small, discouraging sprawl while protecting existing neighborhoods and the character of the community. It may not be possible for the City to accommodate all housing needs without either expanding the developed area or changing the character of the existing City. This is a fundamental policy decision before the City Council in its consideration of the General Plan.

Overall, changes in policy provide better guidance on reaching the desired vision for the development of Davis. The inconsistency presented with Policy LU A.1 in combination with the overall shortage in housing is considered a *significant* policy impact.

Alternative 4. Community Expansion Scenario with Oeste Campus. Although the area to be developed under this alternative would be greater than for Alternative 3, the majority of the additional land will be planned for nonresidential uses. The total increase in housing stock under this scenario would be 3,466 dwelling units (estimated City population of 64,094). As with Alternative 3, this is insufficient to meet the potential demand of UC Davis at full 2010-11 expansion and the substantial increase in land designated for employment generation, making compliance with Policy Land Use 1.1 impossible. It also slightly exceeds the 64,000-resident limit under LU 1.1e). This is particularly pertinent in light of the housing need generated by the jobs that would be produced by the Oeste Campus. UC Davis demand essentially consumes the entire available supply. This impact is considered *significant*.

Related to the second significance criteria (impacts related to policy changes), impacts would be similar to Alternative 3. Changes in policy with the General Plan update provide better guidance on reaching the desired vision for the development of Davis. The inconsistency presented with Policy LU A.1 in combination with the overall shortage in housing is considered a *significant* policy impact.

Alternative 5. Community Expansion Scenario with Davis Tech Campus. This alternative provides the most housing of the four because of the addition of the intervening lands area. Additional housing would be generated on the Covell Center property, along with modest additional units through infill and the redesignation of the Mace Ranch site. Under this scenario, housing is projected to increase by 4,026 dwelling units (estimated City population, 64,458). If UC Davis expands to full capacity, only 63 dwelling units would be available within the City to provide for housing need generated by other uses such as the Davis Technology Campus, Nishi, and buildout of the vacant nonresidential land in the existing General Plan. This impact is considered *significant*

because the total estimated population exceeds the limit in action (e) and because insufficient housing is available to comply with Policy LU 1.1.

Related to the second significance criteria (impacts related to policy changes), impacts would be similar to Alternative 3. Changes in policy with the General Plan update provide better guidance on reaching the desired vision for the development of Davis. The inconsistency presented with Policy LU A.1 in combination with the overall shortage in housing is considered a *significant* policy impact.

Although this alternative does not provide sufficient housing to meet the needs from the projected employment increase, it does provide some self-mitigation through the provision of additional housing units on the Covell Center site and the intervening lands area. In the Chapter 5A of this EIR, "Land Use and Aesthetics", a mitigation measure is suggested to change the intervening lands from residential to nonresidential uses. If that mitigation measure were to be adopted, Alternative 5 would create an even worse imbalance between the number of jobs created and the number of housing units allowed. This alternative would be the worst of the options in terms of the jobs/housing balance.

Mitigation Measures

This impact is directly related to a potential inconsistency between policies calling for slow growth and policies calling for the City to meet internal housing needs. Mitigation requires revisions to the inconsistent policies and to the land use maps sufficient to meet community needs beyond those generated by UC Davis. The following suggested mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

PH-1.1. Add an Action to Policy LU A.1 (Alternatives 3, 4, and 5)

The policy impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by adding a reconciling action to Policy LU A.1.

The Action could read:

"Develop guidelines for infill projects and zoning changes to allow increases in density that do not jeopardize the character of the existing city and its neighborhoods."

<i>Funding Source:</i>	<i>Davis City Council</i>
<i>Implementing Party:</i>	<i>City of Davis Planning and Building Department and Davis City Council</i>
<i>Monitoring Agency:</i>	<i>City of Davis Planning and Building Department</i>
<i>Timing:</i>	<i>Prior to adoption of General Plan update</i>

PH-1.2. Revise Policy LU 1.1 (Alternatives 3, 4, and 5)

The City of Davis should revise Policy LU 1.1 as follows:

“Provide for adequate growth to meet the needs of households whose work or study activities are in Davis, without jeopardizing the character of the city and its neighborhoods.”

Funding Source: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department and City of Davis City Council*
Implementing Party: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department and City of Davis City Council*
Monitoring Agency: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department*
Timing: *Prior to adoption of General Plan update*

PH-1.2. Revise Action LU 2.1e (Alternatives 3, 4, and 5)

The City of Davis should revise Policy LU 1.1 as follows:

“The City shall adopt design guidelines for adding second units to provide guidance to property owners and neighbors on acceptable ways to create additional housing without jeopardizing the character of existing neighborhoods. The Planning and Building Department shall make available a basic information sheet to inform interested parties that second or additional units are allowed in the residential categories.”

Funding Source: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department and City of Davis City Council*
Implementing Party: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department and City of Davis City Council*
Monitoring Agency: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department*
Timing: *Prior to adoption of General Plan update*

PH-1.3. Amend Action (e) under Policy LU 1.1. (Alternatives 3, 4, and 5)

The policy impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by amending Policy LU 1.1 to reflect the alternative chosen as the General Plan project, as anticipated in the explanatory text for the action.

Funding Source: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department and City of Davis City Council*
Implementing Party: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department and City of Davis City Council*
Monitoring Agency: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department*
Timing: *Prior to adoption of General Plan update*

PH-1.3½. Delete Standard LU 2.1(a) (Alternatives 3, 4, and 5)

The policy impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by deleting the policy calling for the City's housing stock to be 50% single-family detached.

Funding Source: Davis City Council
Implementing Party: City of Davis Planning and Building Department and Davis City Council
Monitoring Agency: City of Davis Planning and Building Department
Timing: Prior to adoption of General Plan update

Impact: PH-2. Inability to Provide Housing to Meet Fair-Share Requirements

Significance Criterion

- The proposed land use map alternative is determined to have a significant adverse impact if the alternative would prevent the City from meeting its fair-share housing requirement.

Table 5B-5 provides an overview/comparison of the level of impact associated with the General Plan under the four land use map alternatives evaluated in this EIR. A more detailed discussion of each alternative is described below.

Table 5B-5. Fair-Share Housing Requirement Impacts Associated with the Land Use Map Alternatives

Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
• Potentially inconsistent with future unknown fair-share requirements	• Potentially inconsistent with future unknown fair-share requirements	• Potentially inconsistent with future unknown fair-share requirements	• Potentially inconsistent with future unknown fair-share requirements

Alternative 2. Buildout to 2010 Using Existing General Plan. The City of Davis' 1993 housing element update documented the ability of the existing General Plan to meet the City's existing fair share of low- and very low-income housing (City of Davis 1993). That analysis is incorporated by reference. Under the existing General Plan, approximately 200 low- and very low-income dwelling units could be accommodated in excess of the current fair-share housing requirement. The majority of the units are expected to be built prior to the issuance of new fair-share numbers in 2002; sites for 116 affordable units are likely to remain vacant (because of funding constraints) until the next fair-share period. The Redevelopment Agency Five-year Implementation Plan and CDBG Critical Needs Assessment anticipate additional affordable housing to be generated

through infill, acquisition/rehabilitation projects, and other programs not requiring new development areas.

If the future SACOG fair-share allocation is similar to the existing allocation, the City would be unable to meet the requirement for total units to be accommodated and possibly the requirement for affordable units. Under current patterns, it is likely that most of the vacant residential land in the City will be developed before the next Housing Element term. The two major new developments not previously accounted for are the Nishi/Gateway and Covell Center projects. Under the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance, these projects may be expected to provide approximately 370 low- and very low-income dwelling units. Even when combined with the unbuilt units remaining from 1991-1996, this is likely to be insufficient to meet the housing allocation for low- and very low-income residents without the identification of additional locations where affordable units could be generated. The approximately 1,360 additional dwellings produced by these two projects would not allow the City to meet a future total housing allocation similar to the current allocation. This would be a *significant* effect.

The current General Plan contains a Housing Element policy that states,

“If adequate sites are not available to meet the five-year need for housing at all income levels, the City must provide sufficient sites with zoning that permits owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use by right, including density and development standards that could accommodate low or moderate income housing.”

This policy reduces the impacts on ability to meet fair-share requirements to a less-than-significant level.

Alternative 3. Reduced Buildout Scenario. Under this scenario, which essentially avoids all of the major projects contained in the other three alternatives, the City would add no additional sites for low- and very low-income units beyond those already identified. Sites to accommodate 199 units are likely to remain vacant at the beginning of the 2002 fair-share period, and other affordable housing may be identified through projects or programs not requiring community expansion. If the fair-share numbers developed by SACOG for the 2002 update of the City's housing element are similar to those issued for the current planning period, the City will fall approximately 1,000 units short of meeting the fair-share need for very low- and low-income housing units. The shortage of moderate- and above moderate-income units would be proportional. This would be a *significant* impact.

Alternative 4. Community Expansion Scenario with Oeste Campus. Under this scenario, the Covell Center project would be the new source of dwelling units within the City, beyond those analyzed in the existing housing element. Under current patterns, it is likely that most of the vacant residential land in the City will be developed by the end of the current housing element term in 2002. Although over 3,400 dwelling units would be built within the City by 2010 under this alternative, all but approximately 740 units are already accounted for under the 1993 analysis. Applying the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance to this number to estimate the minimum number of low- and very low-income housing units that would be required, the City will produce

approximately 199 new units in these two categories. Adding this to the 1999 units expected to be built on vacant sites identified in the 1993 study would result in about 400 units. If the fair-share numbers developed by SACOG for the 2002 update of the City's housing element are similar to those issued for the current planning period, the City's will fall approximately 800 units short of meeting the fair-share need. The shortage of moderate- and above moderate-income units would be proportional. This would be a *significant* impact.

Alternative 5. Community Expansion Scenario with Davis Technology Campus. Under this scenario, new residences would be supplied in the, Covell Center and Intervening Lands projects. Although over 4,000 dwelling units would be built within the City by 2010 under this alternative, all but approximately 1,300 units are already accounted for under the 1993 analysis. Applying the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance to this number to estimate the minimum number of low- and very low-income housing units that would be required of these projects, the City will produce approximately 353 units in these two categories. Adding this to the 199 units expected to be built on vacant sites identified in the 1993 study would result in about 550 units being produced. If the fair-share numbers developed by SACOG for the 2002 update of the City's housing element are similar to those issued for the current planning period, the City's will fall approximately 650 units short of meeting the fair-share need in the low- and very low-income categories. There would be a proportional shortage of moderate- and above moderate-income units. This would be a *significant* impact.

Mitigation Measures

The significance of this impact depends in large part upon the future fair-share housing allocation that will be assigned to the City by SACOG. If the SACOG fair-share allocations exceed the City's ability to accommodate housing, the following suggested mitigation measures would reduce this impact to the level of a *less-than-significant* impact.

PH-2.1. Add a Housing Action to Policy LU 1.1. (Alternatives 3, 4, and 5)

At the next revision of the City's Housing Element, the City should revise the land use map and pertinent Land Use and Growth Management policies, standards, and actions, if necessary, to ensure that the supply of land available for residential development can accommodate the needs of future residents of all income levels. Alternatives for revisions may include redesignating land from nonresidential to residential use, identifying new locations for selective in-fill, or other programs authorized under state law for accommodating housing needs.

<i>Funding Source:</i>	<i>City of Davis Planning and Building Department and City of Davis City Council</i>
<i>Implementing Party:</i>	<i>City of Davis Planning and Building Department and City of Davis City Council</i>
<i>Monitoring Agency:</i>	<i>City of Davis Planning and Building Department</i>
<i>Timing:</i>	<i>Prior to the City's approval or adoption of the General Plan</i>

Impact: PH-3. Inability to Comply with the City/County Pass-through Agreement

Significance Criterion

- The proposed land use map alternative is determined to have a significant adverse impact if the alternative would preclude the City's compliance with the City/County pass-through agreement.

Table 5B-6 provides an overview/comparison of the level of impact associated with the General Plan under the four land use map alternatives evaluated in this EIR. A more detailed discussion of each alternative is described below.

Table 5B-6. City/County Pass-Through Agreement Impacts Associated with the Land Use Map Alternatives

Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
• No impact – City will exceed minimum population	• No impact – City will exceed minimum population	• No impact – City will exceed minimum population	• No impact – City will exceed minimum population

Alternative 2. Buildout to 2010 Using Existing General Plan. The City/County pass-through agreement is based on City growth projected from a 1988 base population at a 1.78% average annual growth rate, noncompounded. Development within Davis during 1988 to 1999 has exceeded the agreed upon growth rate. As a result, the population projected under this alternative (65,222), exceeds the minimum number of 60,145 required under the agreement. There is *no impact* under this land use map alternative.

Alternative 3. Reduced Buildout Scenario. Alternative 3 is projected to result in a City population of 62,073 persons by 2010. This scenario will provide sufficient growth to exceed the agreement's minimum population requirement of 60,145 persons and exceed the minimum growth rate requirement when averaged over the period between 1988 and 2010. There is *no impact* under this land use map alternative.

Alternative 4. Community Expansion Scenario with Oeste Campus. Alternative 4 is projected to result in a City population of 64,094 by 2010. The alternative would exceed the target population set by the agreement. There is *no impact* under this land use map alternative.

Alternative 5. Community Expansion Scenario with Davis Technology Campus. Alternative 5 would produce the largest population (65,458 people by 2010) of the scenarios being considered. The residential contribution of the Intervening Lands is the primary differentiation between it and Alternative 4. The alternative would exceed the target population set by the agreement. There is *no impact* under this land use map alternative.