

4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section describes the existing population and housing conditions near the Sierra Colina Village Project site, presents a description of applicable regulatory considerations, and identifies potential environmental impacts that could result from each of the five proposed alternatives. The 2000 Census, though dated, is the best available information and is used to describe general demographic conditions in the project vicinity^a.

4.10.1 REGULATORY BACKGROUND

The regulations that guide the evaluation of the proposed project's impact on housing and population include those set forth by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and by Douglas County, as part of the Douglas County Master Plan (DCMP).

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

TRPA implements its authority to regulate growth and development in the Lake Tahoe region through the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (Regional Plan) (TRPA 1987). The Regional Plan, initially adopted in 1987, includes two documents relevant to population and housing: the Goals and Policies, and the Code of Ordinances. The other planning tool used by TRPA and applicable to population and housing is the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC). Review of population and housing impacts using the IEC is required for proposals that involve approval through the issuance of a permit.

Goals and Policies

The Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan establish an overall framework for development and environmental conservation in the Lake Tahoe region. This framework allows development of master plans to refine and implement Regional Plan policies appropriate to specific uses. Chapter II, Land Use, of TRPA's Goals and Policies, contains guidance with respect to population and housing, described below.

Population

TRPA environmental threshold carrying capacities define the capacity of the natural environment and set specific environmental performance standards related to land use. The thresholds, however, do not define the maximum population, densities, permitted uses, or other land use criteria for the manmade environment; this is the function of the Regional Plan (TRPA 2004a).

The following Goals and Policies are included in the Land Use subsection of Chapter II:

GOAL #2. Policy 1. Population growth in the Region is to be guided by the limitations on land use and other environmental threshold carrying capacities set forth in the [Regional] Plan (TRPA 2004a).

Housing

The following Goals and Policies are included in the Housing subsection of Chapter II:

GOAL #2. To the extent feasible, without compromising the growth management provision of the Regional Plan, the attainment of threshold goals, and affordable housing incentive programs, moderate-income housing will be encouraged in suitable locations for residents of the region.

^a The 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) is a new nationwide survey of the U.S. Census Bureau designed to track changes of some communities between the 10-year censuses. The ACS does not present data for all geographic areas in all years and does not present data for any of the geographic areas discussed in this section. Data from the 2006 ACS are available for over 6,000 geographic areas with a population of 65,000 or more (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007).

- ▶ **Policy #1** Special incentives, such as bonus development units, will be made available to promote housing for moderate-income households (120 percent of respective county's median income). Such incentives shall be made available within jurisdictions that develop housing programs that are substantially consistent with and complementary to the Regional Plan.
- ▶ **Policy #2** Residential units developed using moderate-income housing incentives shall be used to provide housing for full-time residents of the Tahoe Basin. Such units shall not be used for vacation rental purposes.
- ▶ **Policy #3** Residential units developed using moderate-income housing incentives shall remain permanently within the program.

TRPA Code of Ordinances

Moderate-Income Housing Ordinance

Chapter 2 (Definitions) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances defines moderate-income housing as:

Residential housing, deed restricted to be used exclusively as a residential dwelling by permanent residents with an income not in excess of 120 percent of the respective county's median income. Such housing units shall be made available for rental or sale at a cost that does not exceed the recommended state and federal standards. Each county's median income will be determined according to the income limits published annually by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (TRPA 2004b).

TRPA's Moderate-Income Housing Ordinance is also addressed in two chapters of the TRPA Code, Chapter 41, Permissible Subdivisions and Chapter 43, Subdivision Standards. As explained in detail below, TRPA regulations regarding moderate-income housing apply when subdivision of property occurs. Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would result in the construction of single- and multi-family residential developments including subdivision of the project site, and would therefore require an evaluation of impacts under the TRPA Moderate-Income Housing Ordinance, including any loss of moderate-income housing. Alternative 2 would result in the development of a single-family estate and under Alternative 5 (No Project Alternative), the site would remain undeveloped. Neither Alternative 2 nor Alternative 5 would result in subdivision of the site and the Moderate-Income Housing Ordinance would not apply.

Chapter 41, Permissible Subdivisions, Subsection 41.2.F of the TRPA Code of Ordinances defines "Moderate-Income Housing" as follows:

For purposes of the subdivision ordinances only (Chapters 40-49, inclusive), moderate-income housing are residential units which are sold or rented at prices and rates affordable to households or tenants that earn not more than 120% of the applicable county median income. Moderate-income housing shall not include units with a rental rate that exceeds 30% of the tenant's monthly gross income. Subdivision projects shall be reviewed by TRPA Certified Local Jurisdiction Moderate-Income Housing Programs, for purposes of determining appropriate income and sales price limitations for the sales rate of moderate-income housing. In the absence of a certified local program, project proponents shall use the 4.2 multiplier, to be multiplied by 120% of median family income, to determine a maximum sales price for housing. Moderate-income units are subject to deed restriction, for long-term occupancy, at least 10 months in each calendar year, in accordance with Subsection 35.2.G.(3). The multiplier is subject to periodic amendment, to adjust for changes to median family income resulting in a numerical increase in the multiplier.

With respect to the subdivision of post-1987 Projects, Section 43.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances provides that subdivision of projects approved after July 1, 1987 pursuant to the 1987 Regional Plan, as it may be amended,

may be permitted subject to certain requirements. With regard to Moderate-Income Housing, Subsection 43.4.D applies:

Subdivision of moderate income housing projects, as defined in Subsection 41.2.F may be permitted provided TRPA finds that the resultant use qualifies as moderate income housing and appropriate deed restrictions or other covenants running with the land are recorded to document the restriction of units to moderate income housing.

Multi-Residential Incentive Program

TRPA has established a Bonus Unit Incentive Program for the purpose of assigning multi-residential and tourist accommodation “bonus units”. This program, the Multi-Residential Incentive Program (MRIP), provides incentives for project applicants to improve environmental conditions and/or, to build moderate-income and/or affordable housing by awarding applicable projects bonus units based on compliance with a set of criteria. The following conditions are required for a moderate-income housing project to receive bonus units:

- ▶ Housing must meet the definition of moderate-income housing as defined in Chapter 2 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances
- ▶ The local jurisdiction in which the project is located must maintain a TRPA-certified Local Government Moderate-income Housing Program as determined by Chapter 35 Section 2(G) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

A bonus unit awarded under the MRIP takes the place of the need for the applicant to acquire a development right for the unit. Chapter 35, Bonus Unit Incentive Program, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, outlines two methods by which an applicant may obtain a multi-residential bonus unit:

- ▶ A project applicant may propose to improve environmental conditions, through Sections 35.2.C and 35.2.D.
- ▶ Under Section 35.2.E a housing development project proposing to use multi-residential bonus units shall not be subject to Section 35.2.D, which sets forth the mitigation measures that could earn points for affordable housing bonus units, if the housing development project proposes moderate-income housing (as defined by TRPA) and is located within a jurisdiction maintaining a TRPA-certified Local Government Moderate Income Housing Program, in which case it is eligible to receive bonus units.

The number of bonus units assigned for such projects are assigned by TRPA on the basis of a project’s need for these units (TRPA 2002). The inclusion of moderate-income housing does not replace the need for the project applicant to obtain residential development rights or bonus units for each proposed unit pursuant to Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. In both of the scenarios described above, the applicant would be required to deed restrict the residences as moderate income or affordable housing as part of any subdivision pursuant to TRPA Code of Ordinances subsections 43.4.C or 43.4.D.

STATE OF NEVADA

The Legislature of the State of Nevada has found and declared in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 319.020 that there exists a serious shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the state available to persons and families of low and moderate income; that many other persons and families are unable to secure or afford, without assistance, decent, safe, and sanitary housing, and that each county with a population of more than 40,000 shall adopt a master plan that addresses these subjects.

Under NRS 278.160, the master plan must include a housing plan that (i) determines the present and prospective need for affordable housing in the community; (ii) analyzes any impediments to the development of affordable

housing and the development of policies to mitigate those impediments; and (iii) outlines a plan for maintaining and developing affordable housing to meet the housing needs of the community. NRS 278.230 (1) (a) requires the local governing body in putting the adopted master plan into effect to "...ensure an adequate supply of housing, including affordable housing..."

LOCAL

Douglas County Master Plan

The DCMP recognizes a need for affordable housing in the region and established goals and policies to encourage the provision of affordable housing for its current and future residents. Based on this recognized need, the DCMP has set the following three goals related to housing:

GOAL 11.01: To increase the availability of affordable housing for persons with special needs, in light of the housing needs identified in the Housing and Population Element.

GOAL 11.02: To consider a tiered or incremental approach to progressively greater County involvement in housing programs and policy, as needed, in light of limited County resources, state legal requirements, and a County-wide focus.

GOAL 11.03: To recognize and address the regional nature of housing problems in the region.

Douglas County Moderate-Income Housing Program

On December 6 and 7, 2006 the Douglas County Board of Commissioners unanimously approved a moderate-income housing program for the Tahoe Township portion of Douglas County (Douglas County 2007). At its May 2007 meeting, the TRPA Governing Board certified and approved by Resolution the Moderate-Income Housing Program approved by Douglas County in December of 2006 (TRPA 2007).

In April of 2004, TRPA amended the Regional Plan in an effort to encourage the development of moderate-income housing units in the Basin (TRPA 2004b). The amendments made multi-residential bonus units available to moderate-income housing projects. Additionally, these moderate-income projects are to receive residential allocations from a separate allocation pool that is in addition to the annual allotment granted to each local jurisdiction.

As discussed above, TRPA has established the MRIP, which allows bonus units to be awarded for the development of moderate-income housing. A bonus unit awarded under the MRIP takes the place of the need for the applicant to acquire a development right for the unit. Along with a development right, each unit is also required to obtain an allocation. While TRPA distributes a specific number of allocations among each jurisdiction within the Tahoe Basin each year to be used at the discretion of the jurisdiction, TRPA also maintains its own pool of allocations, which it administers. At the beginning of each year, unused allocations from the previous year are assigned to the TRPA-administered allocation pool. These allocations are intended to support the retirement of sensitive lands, and to support the development of moderate-income housing (TRPA 2004b, TRPA 2007). Two hundred multi-residential bonus units and 200 residential allocations are available for moderate-income projects (TRPA 2007).

For projects to take advantage of the multi-residential bonus units and allocations, the local jurisdiction must establish and have certified by the TRPA Governing Board a Moderate-Income Housing Program. Douglas County has such a program, as described above. If Plan Area Statement (PAS) 073 is amended as proposed to allow Special Area #1 (the project site) to be eligible for the MRIP, the Sierra Colina project site will have met all the conditions necessary to be eligible to receive bonus units via the MRIP as well as allocations from TRPA's own pool for the development of moderate income homes on the site.

4.10.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Stateline, Nevada is an unincorporated community (census-designated place [CDP]) in Douglas County. The estimated population of Douglas County in 2006 based on 2000 Census statistics was 45,909 (U.S. Census Bureau 2000a). In 2000, the population of the Lake Tahoe portion of Douglas County was 6,734, and the population of the Stateline CDP was 1,215 (U.S. Census Bureau 2000b). Average occupancy is 2.38 people per household in Stateline and an average of 2.23 people per household for all three CDPs in the project area (Stateline, Kingsbury, and Zephyr Cove/Round Hill). Approximately 27.5 percent of the housing units located in the Stateline CDP are owner-occupied, as compared to 37 percent for Zephyr Cove and 42 percent for the Kingsbury Community.

In general, a large portion of the housing stock in the Tahoe Basin consists of houses used only seasonally. Providing affordable housing, moderate-income housing, and housing for permanent residents has been a consistent item of discussion during Pathway, the recent basin-wide planning process. Pathway is a Regional Plan update process and a collaborative effort between TRPA, the U.S. Forest Service, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Board, and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection. Currently, there are no approved moderate-income, deed-restricted homes in the Douglas County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Avance, pers. comm. 2007). Table 4.10-1 describes housing characteristics of the area.

| Table 4.10-1 Occupied Housing Units and Population for Douglas County, Lake Tahoe, Nevada (2000) | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Occupied Housing Units | Zephyr Cove/Round Hill CDP, Nevada* | Kingsbury CDP, Nevada | Stateline CDP, Nevada |
| Total Housing Units: | 1,426 | 1,925 | 562 |
| Total Occupied units | 798 | 1,176 | 140 |
| Owner-occupied units | 532 | 806 | 140 |
| Renter-occupied units | 266 | 370 | 370 |
| Vacant/Seasonal Vacation Use | 628 | 749 | 52 |
| Total Household Population: | 1,649 | 2,619 | 1,215 |
| Average household size ¹ | 2.07 | 2.23 | 2.38 |
| Owner-occupied | 1,101 | 1,197 | 333 |
| Renter-occupied | 550 | 762 | 372 |

¹ Equals Total Household Population\Total Occupied Units (rounded)

* CDP: Census Designated Place: A statistical entity, defined for each decennial census according to Census Bureau guidelines, comprising a densely settled concentration of population that is not within an incorporated place, but is locally identified by a name. CDPs are delineated cooperatively by State and local officials and the Census Bureau, following Census Bureau guidelines. These entities were called unincorporated places for the 1940 through 1970 censuses.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000c-e

Existing residential housing in PAS 073 consists of 325 condominiums that together comprise the Lake Village condominium subdivision development located across Lake Village Drive north of the project site. Market rate homes for sale in the Lake Village condominium complex in Stateline are listed from approximately \$400,000 (one-bedroom townhouse condominiums) to \$1,000,000 (three-bedroom and four-bedroom condominiums) (Nevada Association of Realtors 2007).

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) estimates the Douglas County median family income for 2006 at \$65,800 (HUD 2006). Adjusted to household size, this estimate is as follows: \$67,000 for a four-person household, \$60,333 for a three-person household, \$53,666 for a two-person household and \$46,833

for a one-person household (HUD 2006). The Douglas County Moderate-Income Housing Program was developed to be consistent with the Moderate-Income Housing Guidelines of TRPA (Douglas County 2007). Table 4.10-2 describes the maximum allowable moderate-income housing rental and sale costs per these guidelines (Chapter 2 and Chapter 41, Subsection 41.2.F of TRPA Code), and based on HUD estimates of the Douglas County Annual Median Family Income for 2006 (adjusted for household size).

| Table 4.10-2 Moderate-Income Housing Rental and For-Sale Rates for Douglas County, Nevada | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Household Size | Douglas County 2006 Median Family Income¹ | Moderate-Income Housing Maximum Rental Rates² | Moderate-Income Housing Maximum Sales Rates³ |
| 1 person | \$46,833 | \$1,405/mo. | \$236,038 |
| 2 person | \$53,666 | \$1,610/mo. | \$270,477 |
| 3 person | \$60,333 | \$1,810/mo. | \$304,078 |
| 4 person | \$67,000 | \$2,010/mo. | \$337,680 |

Source: HUD 2006.
¹ Adjusted for household size (HUD 2006).
² Calculated as 30% of Douglas County median monthly family income adjusted for household size multiplied by 120%, per TRPA Code 41.2.F (HUD 2006), (TRPA 2004b).
³ Calculated as 120% of Douglas County 2006 median family income adjusted for household size multiplied by 4.2, per TRPA Code 41.2.F (HUD 2006), (TRPA 2004b).

4.10.3 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

CRITERIA OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of analysis, impacts related to population and housing would be significant if the project would:

- ▶ result in a loss of moderate-, low-, or very-low-income housing;
- ▶ decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region;
- ▶ substantially alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population; or
- ▶ result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents.

Population and Housing Analysis Methodology

The Sierra Colina parcel is undeveloped, and there are no existing housing units on this parcel, which is located in an urban area. Thus, none of the alternatives propose the temporary or permanent removal of any existing housing, and would therefore not result in a loss or decrease in housing or the displacement of any residents. These issues will not be further analyzed in this document.

Population projections for Alternatives 1-4 assume that the number of full-time residents would be similar to the rest of the Lake Tahoe area of Douglas County. As described above, approximately 68% of the units in the Lake Tahoe area of Douglas County are occupied year round with an average occupancy of 2.2 people per household.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Alternative 1 – Proposed Project

IMPACT 4.10.1-1 **Change in Availability of Moderate-Income Housing.** *Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in the construction of 50 new residential units including nine moderate-income, deed-restricted single-family homes in the Stateline area. The addition of moderate-income housing to the area would be considered **beneficial**.*

The project site is currently undeveloped. Alternative 1 would result in the construction of 50 new residential units, including nine moderate-income, deed-restricted single-family homes^b.

The sources for all necessary development rights, allocations, and existing residential units to be transferred or allocated to the project area are discussed in detail in Section 2.2. The applicant needs to transfer 40 development rights and/or ERUs to the project parcel. If the project is approved, the applicant can transfer 1 banked development right (from a high capability, vacant land parcel) and 45 banked ERUs (one from a high land capability parcel and 44 from a restored sensitive (SEZ) parcel) to meet TDR requirements. The transferable development rights and ERUs include a combination of market rate units and affordable units. The affordable units have been documented by TRPA to have been adequately mitigated through implementation of prior TRPA approvals.

There are currently no TRPA or other regulations applicable to either the project site or to the proposed project requiring the inclusion of any low- or moderate-income deed-restricted homes in any project proposed for the site. Encouraging moderate-income housing is part of the TRPA Regional Plan (see *Regulatory Background*, above). The addition of moderate-income housing to the area would be considered **beneficial**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

IMPACT 4.10.1-2 **Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region.** *Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in 50 new residential units on the project site, which is a permissible land use under PAS 073. This impact would be **less-than-significant**.*

Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in the construction of 50 new residential units on the project site. Based on the Stateline average of 2.2 people per household, Alternative 1 would result in a population increase of 110 persons.

Construction of Alternative 1 would take approximately three years to complete. The project would be completed in phases lasting approximately one year each, with occupancy occurring at each phase. Therefore, population growth would occur incrementally over a period of three years or longer.

PASs are one set of guiding documents included in the Regional Plan through which TRPA implements its authority to regulate growth and development in the Lake Tahoe region. The primary land use classification for PAS 073, Lake Village, is residential and permissible land uses for Special Area #1 (the project site) include single- and multi-family dwellings up to a density of three units per acre (54 units total for the 18-acre site).

^b The applicant owns 45 existing residential units (ERUs) from previously-existing residential development, 44 of which were banked on site at the time of demolition of an apartment building in the Stateline area. The apartment building units were determined to be affordable housing units and their removal was mitigated through construction of deed-restricted affordable housing units at another site in Stateline, Nevada.

Because implementation of Alternative 1 would result in 50 new residential units on the project site and such use and density are permissible under the Regional Plan via PAS 073, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Alternative 2 – Grand Private Estate

IMPACT 4.10.2-1 *Change in Availability of Moderate-income Housing. Alternative 2 would result in the construction of a grand private estate on a currently undeveloped site. No moderate-income housing would be created or lost as a result of Alternative 2. Therefore there would be **no impact** associated with implementation of Alternative 2.*

Alternative 2 would result in the construction of a grand private estate that would include 3 houses: main house, guest house, and a caretaker home. The project site is currently undeveloped and therefore would not result in the loss of moderate-income housing. There are currently no TRPA or other regulations applicable to either the project site or the proposed project requiring the inclusion of any low- or moderate-income deed-restricted homes in any project proposed for the site. Therefore there would be **no impact** associated with implementation of Alternative 2.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

IMPACT 4.10.2-2 *Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region. Alternative 2 would result in the construction of one grand private estate, assumed to house one family. This impact would be **less-than-significant**.*

Alternative 2 would result in the construction of one grand private estate, assumed to house one family, and a secondary residence (caretaker cottage). A single-family home is a permissible land use under the Regional Plan via PAS 073. Under TRPA Code of Ordinances, a proposed single-family home, secondary residence and accessory uses on a parcel are subject to standard TRPA permitting requirements, but are not subject to review or approval by either a Hearing Officer or the TRPA Governing Board. This scale of development would have a negligible impact on the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the region. Therefore this impact would be considered **less-than-significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative

IMPACT 4.10.3-1 *Change in Availability of Moderate-income Housing. Alternative 3 would result in the construction of 37 new residential units on a currently undeveloped site. No moderate-income housing would be created or lost as a result of Alternative 3. Implementation of Alternative 3 would have **no impact** on moderate-income housing.*

Alternative 3 would result in the construction of 37 new residential units on the currently undeveloped project site. However, this alternative would not include any deed-restricted moderate-income housing. Because the site is currently undeveloped, there would be no loss of moderate-income housing and there are currently no TRPA or other regulations applicable to either the project site or the proposed project requiring the inclusion of any low- or

moderate-income deed-restricted homes in any project proposed for the site. Implementation of Alternative 3 would have **no impact** on moderate-income housing.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

IMPACT 4.10.3-2 **Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region.** *This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1- 2 described above for Alternative 1. Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in the construction of 37 new residential units on the project site, which is a permissible and planned for land use under the Regional Plan via PAS 073. This impact would be **less than significant**.*

This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. See full discussion above.

Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in the construction of 37 new residential units on the project site. Based on the Stateline average of 2.2 people per household, Alternative 3 would result in an increase of the population of Stateline by 81 people.

Alternative 3 would require construction phasing similar to that of Alternative 1 (three years). Occupancy is likely to occur in phases similar to those under Alternative 1. Therefore, population growth would occur over a period of three years or longer.

As discussed under Alternative 1 above, development of the project site for 37 residential units and associated growth under Alternative 3 is already planned for under the Regional Plan via PAS 073. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Alternative 4 – Increased Density Alternative

IMPACT 4.10.4-1 **Change in Availability of Moderate-Income Housing.** *This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1-1 for the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in the construction of 54 new residential units including 12 moderate-income, deed-restricted single-family homes in the Stateline area. The addition of moderate-income housing to the area would be considered **beneficial**.*

This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. See full discussion above

The project site is currently undeveloped. Alternative 4 would result in the construction of 54 new residential units including 12 moderate-income deed-restricted single-family homes.

There are currently no TRPA or other regulations applicable to either the project site or the proposed project requiring the inclusion of any low- or moderate-income deed-restricted homes in any project proposed for the site. Encouraging moderate-income housing is part of the TRPA Regional Plan (see *Regulatory Background*, above). The addition of moderate-income housing to the area would be considered **beneficial**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

IMPACT 4.10.4-2 **Alter the Location, Distribution, Density, or Growth Rate of the Human Population Planned for the Region.** *This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1-2 for the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in 54 new residential units on the project site, which is a permissible and planned for land use under the Regional Plan via PAS 073. This impact would be **less than significant**.*

This impact would be similar to Impact 4.10.1-2 described above for Alternative 1. See full discussion above

Implementation of Alternative 4 would result in the construction of 54 new residential units on the project site. Based on the Stateline average of 2.2 people per household, Alternative 4 would result in an increase of the population of Stateline by 119 persons.

Alternative 4 would require construction phasing similar to that of Alternative 1 (three years). Occupancy is likely to occur in phases similar to those under Alternative 1, so population growth would occur over a period of three years or longer.

As with Alternative 1, development of the project site for 54 residential units and associated growth under Alternative 4 is already allowed under the Regional Plan via PAS 073. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 5 – No Project Alternative

Under Alternative 5, the project site would remain as an undeveloped, privately-owned single parcel. No housing (moderate-income or otherwise) would be created or lost as a result of Alternative 5. Therefore there would be **no impact** associated with implementation of Alternative 5.