Issues (es (and Supporting Information Sources): I. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:		Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				\boxtimes
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes

SETTING

Since 1920, when the population was estimated at 13,361, the population of Shasta County has steadily increased and is now estimated at approximately 167,000 (Department of Finance, 2001). Between 1990 and 2000, the population increased by an estimated 14 percent. By 2010, the population is forecast to reach 212,947 or 28 percent over levels in 2000. By 2020, the population could reach an estimated 240,975, an increase of another 13 percent.

Population density in 2000 is estimated at approximately 44 persons per square mile, or 0.07 persons per acre. By 2020, the population density could reach 64 persons per square mile or approximately 0.10 persons per acre.

Over 95 percent of the land in Shasta County is located in unincorporated areas. In 1990, an estimated 72,275 persons or 49 percent of the population lived in unincorporated Shasta County. An estimated 51 percent of the population lived in the two incorporated cities of Redding and Anderson. In 2000, an estimated 69,200 persons or 41 percent of the population lived in unincorporated Shasta County. An estimated 59 percent of the population lives in the three incorporated cities of Redding, Anderson and Shasta Lake. Redding, Anderson and Shasta Lake are all located in the southwestern portion of the county, along Interstate 5 (I-5).

The proposed project site is located near the communities of Burney Falls, McArthur and Fall River Mills in northeastern Shasta County. McArthur is approximately 10 miles south of the Shasta County-Siskiyou County border, while Fall River Mills is about 15 miles south and Burney Falls is 20 miles south. All three communities are south of the Ahjumawi Lava Springs State Park. The population of McArthur is estimated at 400, and the population of Fall River Mills is estimated at 900. The population of Burney Falls is estimated at 3,000 persons and is the largest community in northeastern Shasta County. (The three communities are connected by U.S.299.)

In 1990, Shasta County provided an estimated 60,500 housing units, 93 percent of which were occupied. Approximately 65 percent of the housing stock consisted of single-family homes, and another 18 percent consisted of mobile homes. An estimated 54 percent of the housing stock was located in the cities of Anderson and Redding. Shasta County now has an estimated 71,874 dwelling units, 93 percent of which are occupied. Approximately 67 percent of the housing stock consists of single family homes and 17 percent consists of mobile homes.

Neither the McArthur, Glenburn Dredge, Burney Falls site nor the Bowman Ditch site are occupied, either by employees and/or by others. The proposed project would therefore not result in displacement of persons.

POPULATION AND HOUSING IMPACT DISCUSSIONS

- a) The McArthur Swamp site would continue existing grazing, habitat improvement, and recreational uses, restricted by the proposed Conservation Easement and the McArthur Swamp Management Plan that would limit the use of the McArthur site to scenic, agricultural and open space uses. The Burney Falls site would continue existing recreational uses and would be incorporated into existing state parklands. As part of California's state park system, development would be restricted to recreational facilities appropriate to the site. In general, the communities near the project site are sparsely populated. Due to the limitations of the conservation easement and existing land use plans, and the fact that the project will not provide additional infrastructure or roads, it is not anticipated to induce population growth in any way.
- b) Neither the McArthur or Glenburn Dredge sites are occupied by residential structures, although there is an existing seasonal group dwelling at Camp Britton. Development on and of the sites would be constrained by the Conservation Easement, the McArthur Swamp Management Plan and the California Department of Parks and Recreation. The McArthur Swamp site is further constrained by difficult accessibility. The proposed project would therefore not result in displacement of housing.
- c) See XII.b., above. The project sites are not occupied by any permanent residential structures, and therefore no persons would be displaced by the proposed project.

REFERENCES

California State Department of Finance, California Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail: July 1, 1990-2040 in 10-Year Increments, http://

California State Department of Finance, Census of California Counties: 1850-1990, http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/1900-90.htm, accessed March 21, 2001.

California State Department of Finance, Shasta County Profile, http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/FS DATA/profiles/pf home.htm, accessed March 22, 2001.

California State Department of Finance, Table 2: Historical City, County, and State Population Estimates, 1991-2000, with 1990 Census Counts, http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/Hist E-4.XLS, accessed March 22, 2001.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Proponent's Environmental Assessment, Volume I, October 23, 2000.

U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census Lookup, http://venus.census.gov/cdrom/lookup, accessed March 22, 2001.

Shasta County, Shasta County General Plan,

http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/Departments/Resourcemgmt/drm/general_plan.htm, accessed March 22, 2001.