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## Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing

This section describes the applicable land use policies and existing population and housing conditions in California, presents a description of applicable regulations, and analyzes whether possible changes in population and housing or land use effects could occur from the program implementation. Information used in this section was obtained from CAL FIRE, the California Department of Finance, and the California Employment Development Department.

No comments received on the Notice of Preparation were related to land use and planning or population and housing (see Appendix A).

### Environmental Setting

#### Land Use and Planning

##### Land Ownership

Land ownership in the treatable landscape is highly varied with types of owners including private owners, state agencies, special districts, counties, non-profit organizations, and cities. The amount of land owned by individual entities within the treatable landscape ranges from less than one acre to hundreds of thousands of acres. The majority of the land within the treatable landscape is in private ownership.

Table 3.12-1 Land Ownership in the Treatable Landscape

| Types of Owner | Amount of Land (acres) | Proportion of the Treatable Landscape |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Private Owners | 18,674,650 | 92% |
| State Agencies | 805,950 | 4% |
| Special Districts | 255,340 | 1% |
| Counties | 196,320 | 1% |
| Non-profit Organizations | 194,300 | 1% |
| Cities | 173,440 | 1% |
| **Total Area** | **20,300,000** | **100%** |

Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2019 based on CAL FIRE data

###### State Agencies

There are 18 state agencies, including California State Parks (CSP), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California State Lands Commission (CSLC), and CAL FIRE, that own land within the treatable landscape. CSP lands include state parks, state recreation areas, state historical monuments, state historic parks, state vehicular recreation areas, and state natural reserves. CDFW lands include ecological reserves and wildlife areas throughout the state, which are managed for conservation purposes. CSLC lands include “school lands” (lands located throughout the state that Congress granted to California in 1853 to benefit public education); and the beds of California’s navigable rivers, lakes, streams, tidelands, and associated natural resources under its jurisdiction. CAL FIRE lands in the treatable landscape include Demonstration State Forests. These forests are used for timber harvesting, forest management research and demonstration projects, public recreation, fish and wildlife habitat, and watershed protection. Refer to Section 3.14, “Recreation,” for additional description of CSP and CDFW lands in the treatable landscape.

###### Special Districts

Within the treatable landscape, 131 special districts own 1 percent of the land. The types of special districts include open space, park, recreation, utility, irrigation, water, sanitation, and community services districts. The special districts that own the largest areas include East Bay Regional Park District, Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, East Bay Municipal Utility District, Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, and Vista Irrigation District.

###### Non-profit Organizations

The treatable landscape encompasses land owned by 81 non-profit organizations. These lands are within preserves, reserves, conservancies, and land trusts. These lands are managed for a variety of uses, including protection and preservation of open space, wildlife habitat, watersheds, and other important natural and scenic features; retaining public access for education or recreation opportunities; preserving farmland; and conducting research.

###### Cities and Counties

Within the treatable landscape, 131 cities and 43 counties collectively own 2 percent of the land. Some of the cities (or city agencies) that own the largest areas include San Diego, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Santa Clarita, and the City of Los Angeles’ Department of Water and Power. Counties (or county agencies) that own the largest areas include City and County of San Francisco’s Public Utilities Commission, Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department, San Diego County, Orange County, and Riverside County.

##### Coastal Zone

A portion of the treatable landscape is located within the coastal zone, which was established ~~in~~by the Coastal Act and is within the jurisdictional boundary of the Coastal Commission. The Coastal Act is further discussed under Section 3.12.2, “Regulatory Setting,” below. The majority of the treatable landscape within the coastal zone falls within areas that are covered by Local Coastal Programs (LCPs), which are developed and implemented by local jurisdictions (see Table 3.12-2) upon certification by the Coastal Commission as to Coastal Act consistency. Among other things, LCPs specify coastal development permit permitting standards for jurisdictions within certified LCPs. For the purposes of compliance with the Coastal Act, areas ~~outside of~~without certified LCPs are under the permitting jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission.

Table 3.12-2 Areas of the Treatable Landscape within the Coastal Zone

| Coastal Zone Management | Amount of Land (acres) | Number of LCPs |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Local Coastal Programs | 528,810 | 54 |
| Coastal Commission | 13,360 | NA |
| **Total** | **542,170** | **54** |

Note: NA = not applicable

Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2019 based on CAL FIRE and Coastal Commission data

##### Land Use Planning and Wildfires

Treatments occur within the treatable landscape in areas governed by various city and county land use plans and ordinances. As described in Chapter 1, “Introduction” and Section 2.3.1, “Past and Current Treatments,” vegetation treatment currently occurs around the state under several other wildfire risk reduction programs implemented by various federal, state, and local agencies. In 2017–2018, CAL FIRE treated approximately 33,000 acres in California using the same treatment activities as proposed under the CalVTP.

CAL FIRE maps Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) based on defined factors (e.g., fuel, slope, and fire weather) with varying degrees of fire hazard (i.e., moderate, high, and very high). While FHSZ zones do not predict when or where a wildfire will occur, they do identify areas where wildfire hazards could be more severe and, therefore, are of greater concern. FHSZs are meant to help limit wildfire damage to structures through planning, prevention, and mitigation activities or requirements that reduce risk (CAL FIRE 2018). FHSZs are mapped for SRAs, local responsibility areas, and federal responsibility areas.

The FHSZs are used to designate areas where California’s wildland urban interface building codes apply to new buildings. They can be a factor in real estate disclosure and local governments consider fire hazard severity in the safety elements of their general plans. CAL FIRE has released their recommendations for very high FHSZ maps in LRAs. Government Code Section 51179 requires every local agency to designate, by ordinance, very high fire hazard severity zones in its jurisdiction within 120 days of receiving recommendations from CAL FIRE pursuant to subdivisions (b) and (c) of Section 51178. A local agency shall be exempt from this requirement if ordinances of the local agency, adopted on or before December 31, 1992, impose standards that are equivalent to, or more restrictive than, the standards imposed by this chapter. Adoption of the very high FHSZ designations in LRAs by the local jurisdiction will impose requirements for new buildings to be constructed of fire-resistant building materials as described in Chapter 7A of the California Building Code. Currently, there are 189 cities and 35 counties with very high FHSZ in the LRA; however, CAL FIRE does not have a current list of local agencies that have adopted ordinances establishing Very High Fire Hazard Severity zones within their boundaries (CAL FIRE 2018, 2019).

The CAL FIRE Land Use Planning Program also engages with city and county planning and development departments to improve comprehensive fire hazard planning through general plan safety elements and other plans. Where city or county general plans cover lands within the SRA, the safety elements of those general plans must address the risk of fire for land classified as SRA and land classified as very high FHSZs. CAL FIRE’s review shall consider the advice included in the Office of Planning and Research’s most recent publication of “Fire Hazard Planning, General Plan Technical Advice Series” and other fire hazard-related topics as identified in California Government Code Section 65302(g)(3). Additionally, development in SRA, very high FHSZs, or wildland-urban interface fire area must also comply with applicable buildings codes included in Chapter 7A, Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure, of the California Building Code. Refer to Section 1.3 in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” for additional information about land use planning programs intended to reduce wildfire risk.

##### Community Wildfire Protection Plans

Communities at risk from wildland fire can develop Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP) to plan how they will reduce wildfire risk. CAL FIRE Units or Contract Counties prepare Fire Management Plans/Strategic Fire Plans (Unit Fire Plans), which also function as CWPPs. CWPPs must identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments across the landscape and jurisdictional boundaries and recommend the methods of treatment that will protect at-risk communities and structures. A CWPP must also recommend measures that homeowners can take to reduce the ignitability of structures throughout the area addressed by the plan. Preparation of CWPPs is a collaborative process that can include local, state, and federal agencies; local fire districts; and other interested parties. The local county, local fire district, and CAL FIRE must sign off on the final CWPP document. Qualifying projects under the CalVTP may be identified in CWPPs.

#### Population and Housing

##### Population

The existing and projected population for California and counties in the treatable landscape (i.e., all counties except San Francisco and Sutter, which do not contain SRA land) are provided in Table 3.12-3. Over the next 40 years, the state’s population is expected to grow by 28 percent. Seven counties are anticipated to grow by over 50 percent, including Imperial County in the south; Kern, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, and Yolo Counties in the central valley; and Placer County spanning from the central valley into the Sierra Nevada.

Table 3.12-3 Existing and Projected Population for California and Counties in the Treatable Landscape

| Population | 2018 | Projections 2020 | Projections 2030 | Projections 2040 | Projections 2050 | Projections 2060 | Population Growth  (2018 – 2060) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| California | 39,809,693 | 40,639,392 | 43,939,250 | 46,804,202 | 49,077,801 | 50,975,904 | 28% |
| Alameda County | 1,660,202 | 1,703,660 | 1,873,622 | 2,027,328 | 2,154,848 | 2,260,737 | 36% |
| Alpine County | 1,154 | 1,107 | 1,134 | 1,145 | 1,085 | 1,031 | -11% |
| Amador County | 38,094 | 37,560 | 39,917 | 41,502 | 42,494 | 44,028 | 16% |
| Butte County | 227,621 | 230,701 | 247,331 | 263,634 | 277,504 | 292,884 | 29% |
| Calaveras County | 45,157 | 44,953 | 46,920 | 48,033 | 48,566 | 50,259 | 11% |
| Colusa County | 22,098 | 23,144 | 24,948 | 26,419 | 27,450 | 28,594 | 29% |
| Contra Costa County | 1,149,363 | 1,178,639 | 1,309,118 | 1,420,595 | 1,500,541 | 1,563,465 | 36% |
| Del Norte County | 27,221 | 26,997 | 27,570 | 28,104 | 28,568 | 29,345 | 8% |
| El Dorado County | 188,399 | 189,576 | 206,010 | 222,972 | 235,323 | 250,957 | 33% |
| Fresno County | 1,007,229 | 1,033,095 | 1,145,673 | 1,256,599 | 1,358,990 | 1,457,732 | 45% |
| Glenn County | 28,796 | 29,691 | 31,600 | 33,267 | 34,363 | 35,395 | 23% |
| Humboldt County | 136,002 | 137,711 | 140,779 | 141,236 | 140,471 | 139,767 | 3% |
| Imperial County | 190,624 | 195,814 | 219,733 | 243,249 | 266,693 | 289,380 | 52% |
| Inyo County | 18,577 | 18,724 | 19,118 | 19,259 | 19,075 | 18,763 | 1% |
| Kern County | 905,801 | 930,885 | 1,068,729 | 1,214,656 | 1,351,803 | 1,489,326 | 64% |
| Kings County | 151,662 | 154,549 | 170,251 | 187,194 | 202,906 | 217,204 | 43% |
| Lake County | 65,081 | 65,302 | 67,536 | 70,093 | 72,833 | 76,695 | 18% |
| Lassen County | 30,911 | 30,626 | 30,157 | 29,117 | 27,941 | 26,999 | -13% |
| Los Angeles County | 10,283,729 | 10,435,036 | 10,868,614 | 11,144,846 | 11,257,873 | 11,234,711 | 9% |
| Madera County | 158,894 | 162,990 | 186,937 | 212,405 | 237,292 | 262,241 | 65% |
| Marin County | 263,886 | 265,152 | 272,375 | 277,087 | 275,467 | 271,601 | 3% |
| Mariposa County | 18,129 | 18,031 | 18,419 | 18,761 | 19,050 | 19,593 | 8% |
| Mendocino County | 89,299 | 90,175 | 93,452 | 95,124 | 95,403 | 96,164 | 8% |
| Merced County | 279,977 | 286,746 | 326,923 | 369,542 | 410,444 | 452,868 | 62% |
| Modoc County | 9,612 | 9,422 | 9,267 | 9,061 | 8,746 | 8,587 | -11% |
| Mono County | 13,822 | 13,986 | 14,663 | 14,991 | 14,749 | 14,150 | 2% |
| Monterey County | 443,281 | 454,599 | 489,001 | 518,441 | 538,908 | 552,239 | 25% |
| Napa County | 141,294 | 143,800 | 152,833 | 160,521 | 165,360 | 169,134 | 20% |
| Nevada County | 99,155 | 99,548 | 105,318 | 111,007 | 115,407 | 123,265 | 24% |
| Orange County | 3,221,103 | 3,260,012 | 3,433,510 | 3,558,071 | 3,615,935 | 3,616,576 | 12% |
| Placer County | 389,532 | 397,368 | 454,801 | 508,439 | 552,359 | 594,978 | 53% |
| Plumas County | 19,773 | 19,374 | 19,069 | 18,413 | 17,652 | 17,585 | -11% |
| Riverside County | 2,415,955 | 2,500,975 | 2,857,496 | 3,159,599 | 3,400,372 | 3,596,588 | 49% |
| Sacramento County | 1,529,501 | 1,572,886 | 1,757,616 | 1,936,861 | 2,100,156 | 2,257,413 | 48% |
| San Benito County | 57,088 | 60,067 | 66,693 | 73,432 | 79,107 | 84,370 | 48% |
| San Bernardino County | 2,174,938 | 2,230,602 | 2,478,888 | 2,730,966 | 2,976,804 | 3,232,412 | 49% |
| San Diego County | 3,337,456 | 3,398,672 | 3,631,155 | 3,822,756 | 3,989,654 | 4,129,358 | 24% |
| San Joaquin County | 758,744 | 782,662 | 894,330 | 995,469 | 1,078,992 | 1,149,124 | 51% |
| San Luis Obispo County | 280,101 | 284,126 | 300,033 | 308,077 | 307,134 | 305,391 | 9% |
| San Mateo County | 774,155 | 792,271 | 844,778 | 884,198 | 913,131 | 936,154 | 21% |
| Santa Barbara County | 453,457 | 460,444 | 491,023 | 514,691 | 529,780 | 539,036 | 19% |
| Santa Clara County | 1,956,598 | 2,011,436 | 2,223,743 | 2,436,897 | 2,633,652 | 2,804,044 | 43% |
| Santa Cruz County | 276,864 | 282,627 | 301,494 | 315,659 | 325,799 | 335,767 | 21% |
| Shasta County | 178,271 | 180,198 | 188,989 | 196,798 | 202,959 | 210,156 | 18% |
| Sierra County | 3,207 | 3,129 | 3,087 | 2,980 | 2,894 | 2,905 | -9% |
| Siskiyou County | 44,612 | 44,186 | 44,406 | 44,253 | 43,938 | 44,868 | 1% |
| Solano County | 439,793 | 453,784 | 507,219 | 554,668 | 593,854 | 631,028 | 43% |
| Sonoma County | 503,332 | 515,486 | 554,694 | 583,517 | 597,749 | 608,250 | 21% |
| Stanislaus County | 555,624 | 572,000 | 638,840 | 699,022 | 747,188 | 787,145 | 42% |
| Tehama County | 64,039 | 65,119 | 68,985 | 72,840 | 76,464 | 80,732 | 26% |
| Trinity County | 13,635 | 13,389 | 13,322 | 13,232 | 13,319 | 14,151 | 4% |
| Tulare County | 475,834 | 487,733 | 540,580 | 593,788 | 638,917 | 678,607 | 43% |
| Tuolumne County | 54,740 | 53,976 | 54,801 | 55,400 | 55,534 | 56,595 | 3% |
| Ventura County | 859,073 | 869,486 | 919,527 | 959,354 | 977,265 | 982,080 | 14% |
| Yolo County | 221,270 | 229,023 | 261,715 | 295,954 | 330,480 | 365,070 | 65% |
| Yuba County | 74,727 | 79,087 | 86,718 | 93,304 | 98,341 | 102,221 | 37% |

Source: DOF 2018a, 2018b

##### Housing

The housing characteristics for California and counties in the treatable landscape (i.e., all counties except San Francisco and Sutter, which do not contain SRA land) are provided in Table 3.12-4. Counties with the highest vacancy rates are generally those in more rural areas, such as in the Sierra Nevada mountains and in the northern portion of the state. Counties with the lowest vacancy rates are generally those within the metropolitan areas of the state, including the San Francisco bay area, Sacramento area, and the coastal area that stretches from Santa Barbara to San Diego Counties. The central valley counties of Fresno, Merced, and Kings also have vacancy rates lower than that of the state.

Table 3.12-4 Housing Characteristics for California and Counties in the Treatable Landscape

| Geographic Area | Total | Vacant Units | Vacancy Rate | Geographic Area | Total | Vacant Units | Vacancy Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| California | 14,157,590 | 1,043,750 | 7.4% |  |  |  |  |
| Alameda | 602,047 | 24,924 | 4.1% | Orange | 1,094,169 | 56,996 | 5.2% |
| Alpine | 1,778 | 1,301 | 73.2% | Placer | 164,820 | 20,746 | 12.6% |
| Amador | 18,221 | 3,536 | 19.4% | Plumas | 15,850 | 7,280 | 45.9% |
| Butte | 99,353 | 8,391 | 8.4% | Riverside | 840,904 | 110,984 | 13.2% |
| Calaveras | 28,074 | 9,784 | 34.9% | Sacramento | 570,305 | 33,249 | 5.8% |
| Colusa | 8,151 | 840 | 10.3% | San Benito | 18,935 | 1,105 | 5.8% |
| Contra Costa | 413,923 | 21,738 | 5.3% | San Bernardino | 719,911 | 75,664 | 10.5% |
| Del Norte | 11,322 | 1,579 | 13.9% | San Diego | 1,210,138 | 70,487 | 5.8% |
| El Dorado | 91,745 | 17,480 | 19.1% | San Joaquin | 243,420 | 15,220 | 6.3% |
| Fresno | 332,051 | 23,782 | 7.2% | San Luis Obispo | 121,661 | 14,405 | 11.8% |
| Glenn | 11,170 | 1,072 | 9.6% | San Mateo | 278,044 | 13,033 | 4.7% |
| Humboldt | 62,870 | 5,931 | 9.4% | Santa Barbara | 158,622 | 9,757 | 6.2% |
| Imperial | 57,737 | 7,646 | 13.2% | Santa Clara | 667,970 | 25,877 | 3.9% |
| Inyo | 9,522 | 1,428 | 15.0% | Santa Cruz | 105,646 | 8,786 | 8.3% |
| Kern | 298,301 | 28,077 | 9.4% | Shasta | 78,745 | 6,414 | 8.1% |
| Kings | 46,170 | 2,293 | 5.0% | Sierra | 2,345 | 951 | 40.6% |
| Lake | 34,560 | 9,966 | 28.8% | Siskiyou | 24,185 | 4,816 | 19.9% |
| Lassen | 12,756 | 3,125 | 24.5% | Solano | 158,786 | 10,108 | 6.4% |
| Los Angeles | 3,546,853 | 208,195 | 5.9% | Sonoma | 203,579 | 16,903 | 8.3% |
| Madera | 50,315 | 5,098 | 10.1% | Stanislaus | 181,916 | 12,884 | 7.1% |
| Marin | 112,293 | 7,702 | 6.9% | Sutter | 34,363 | 2,154 | 6.3% |
| Mariposa | 10,449 | 2,650 | 25.4% | Tehama | 27,636 | 2,989 | 10.8% |
| Mendocino | 40,560 | 5,243 | 12.9% | Trinity | 8,892 | 2,898 | 32.6% |
| Merced | 85,927 | 5,883 | 6.8% | Tulare | 149,342 | 11,528 | 7.7% |
| Modoc | 5,268 | 1,409 | 26.7% | Tuolumne | 31,573 | 9,384 | 29.7% |
| Mono | 14,061 | 8,414 | 59.8% | Ventura | 288,579 | 14,907 | 5.2% |
| Monterey | 140,330 | 13,991 | 10.0% | Yolo | 77,138 | 3,509 | 4.5% |
| Napa | 55,157 | 5,876 | 10.7% | Yuba | 28,324 | 2,367 | 8.4% |
| Nevada | 53,745 | 12,098 | 22.5% |  |  |  |  |

Source: DOF 2018c

##### Employment

The housing characteristics for California and counties in the treatable landscape (i.e., all counties except San Francisco and Sutter, which do not contain SRA land) are provided in Table 3.12-5. The statewide unemployment rate is 4.8 percent. The unemployment rate for individual counties in California ranges between 2.7 percent in San Mateo County to 19.1 percent in Imperial County. Over half of the counties in the state have unemployment rates that exceed the statewide unemployment rate.

Table 3.12-5 Unemployment for California and Counties in the Treatable Landscape

| Geographic Area | Unemployment | Rate | Geographic Area | Unemployment | Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| California | 918,900 | 4.8% |  |  |  |
| Alameda County | 30,900 | 3.6% | Orange County | 56,600 | 3.5% |
| Alpine County | 30 | 6.1% | Placer County | 7,000 | 3.8% |
| Amador County | 720 | 4.9% | Plumas County | 690 | 8.9% |
| Butte County | 5,900 | 5.7% | Riverside County | 56,300 | 5.2% |
| Calaveras County | 1,000 | 4.7% | Sacramento County | 32,600 | 4.6% |
| Colusa County | 1,540 | 14.3% | San Benito County | 1,800 | 5.9% |
| Contra Costa County | 21,400 | 3.8% | San Bernardino County | 46,600 | 4.9% |
| Del Norte County | 630 | 6.4% | San Diego County | 63,500 | 4.0% |
| El Dorado County | 3,900 | 4.4% | San Joaquin County | 2,260 | 7.0% |
| Fresno County | 38,100 | 8.5% | San Luis Obispo County | 5,100 | 3.6% |
| Glenn County | 960 | 7.5% | San Mateo County | 12,100 | 2.7% |
| Humboldt County | 2,640 | 4.2% | Santa Barbara County | 9,700 | 4.5% |
| Imperial County | 14,100 | 19.1% | Santa Clara County | 33,400 | 3.2% |
| Inyo County | 380 | 4.4% | Santa Cruz County | 8,200 | 5.7% |
| Kern County | 35,400 | 9.2% | Shasta County | 4,300 | 5.8% |
| Kings County | 5,100 | 8.9% | Sierra County | 80 | 6.5% |
| Lake County | 1,710 | 5.7% | Siskiyou County | 1,300 | 7.2% |
| Lassen County | 560 | 5.6% | Solano County | 9,900 | 4.8% |
| Los Angeles County | 240,300 | 4.7% | Sonoma County | 8,800 | 3.4% |
| Madera County | 4,900 | 8.1% | Stanislaus County | 18,200 | 7.5% |
| Marin County | 4,000 | 2.9% | Sutter County | 3,900 | 8.7% |
| Mariposa County | 450 | 5.9% | Tehama County | 1,630 | 6.4% |
| Mendocino County | 1,790 | 4.5% | Trinity County | 300 | 6.0% |
| Merced County | 10,800 | 9.3% | Tulare County | 21,400 | 10.4% |
| Modoc County | 260 | 8.0% | Tuolumne County | 1,160 | 5.4% |
| Mono County | 380 | 4.4% | Ventura County | 19,100 | 4.5% |
| Monterey County | 15,800 | 7.2% | Yolo County | 5,400 | 5.0% |
| Napa County | 2,700 | 3.7% | Yuba County | 2,100 | 7.5% |
| Nevada County | 2,000 | 4.1% |  |  |  |

Source: EDD 2018

### Regulatory Setting

#### Land Use and Planning

##### Federal

No federal laws or regulations related to land use and planning are applicable to the project.

##### State

###### California State Parks General Plans

A State Park general plan is the primary management document for a CSP unit, defining a framework for resource stewardship, interpretation, facilities, visitor use, and operations. General plans define an ultimate purpose, vision, and intent for unit management through goal statements, guidelines, and broad objectives, but stop short of defining specific objectives, methodologies, designs, and timelines on how and when to accomplish these goals. The general plans also include guidelines to address public safety issues that are related to the issues and conditions that exist in each park unit. Guidelines do not replicate

District Superintendents may develop or cause to be developed any number of management plans for units as needed or directed by the general plan for the unit. This includes, but is not limited to, wildfire management plans, area development plans, interpretation management plans, roads and trails plans, and vegetation management plans. In developing goals and guidelines for a general plan, current CSP policies that apply to units statewide are generally not included, other than to reference their source and application to future park management. For example, CSP Department Operations Manual includes policies that guide the development and implementation of fire management programs in state parks, which involves involve pre-fire planning, fuel (vegetation) management, public safety measures, fire control support, post-fire evaluation and rehabilitation.

###### California Department of Fish and Wildlife Land Management Plans

Per Section 1019 of the Fish and Game Code, CDFW must draft Land Management Plans (LMPs) for any property wholly under its jurisdiction, such as wildlife areas and ecological reserves. LMPs include:

* Inventories of fish, wildlife, and native plant habitats;
* Guidance for management of habitats, species, and programs to protect and enhance native wildlife for their ecological value and enjoyment by the public;
* Guidance for public uses;
* Operation, maintenance, and personnel requirements to implement management goals; and
* Environmental documentation necessary for compliance with state and federal statutes and regulations.

Individual LMPs may also include goals related to wildfire management and coordination with CAL FIRE and other fire protection agencies.

###### California Coastal Act

The Coastal Act (PRC Section 30000 et seq.) includes specific policies that address issues relating to specified coastal resources such as shoreline public access and recreation, lower cost visitor accommodations, terrestrial and marine habitat protection, visual resources, landform alteration, agricultural lands, commercial fisheries, water quality, transportation, development design, and public works. The Coastal Commission partners with local municipalities, such as such as cities and counties, to plan and regulate ~~the use of land and water~~development and to protect coastal resources within the coastal zone. Development within the coastal zone would require a coastal development permit from the Coastal Commission or from ~~the~~a local jurisdiction if the activity is within a~~n~~ jurisdiction with a certified LCP. “Development” is defined by the Coastal Act (PRC Section 30106) as follows:

“Development” means, on land, in or under water, the placement or erection of any solid material or structure; discharge or disposal of any dredged material or of any gaseous, liquid, solid, or thermal waste; grading, removing, dredging, mining, or extraction of any materials; change in the density or intensity of use of land, including, but not limited to, subdivision pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act (commencing with Section 66410 of the Government Code), and any other division of land, including lot splits, except where the land division is brought about in connection with the purchase of such land by a public agency for public recreational use; change in the intensity of use of water, or of access thereto; construction, reconstruction, demolition, or alteration of the size of any structure, including any facility of any private, public, or municipal utility; and the removal or harvesting of major vegetation other than for agricultural purposes, kelp harvesting, and timber operations which are in accordance with a timber harvesting plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Z’berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973 (commencing with Section 4511).

As used in this section, “structure” includes, but is not limited to, any building, road, pipe, flume, conduit, siphon, aqueduct, telephone line, and electrical power transmission and distribution line.

All treatment projects in the Coastal Zone that qualify as “development” under the definition presented in PRC Section 30106 would require a coastal development permit (CDP) pursuant to the Coastal Act.~~According to Coastal Commission staff, the CalVTP treatment activities are considered development under the Coastal Act and would be required to obtain a coastal development permit for any future activities that would occur within the coastal zone.~~

##### Local

When state agencies, including CAL FIRE, are conducting governmental activities under the authority of state law or the State Constitution, in this case, treatments implemented under the proposed CalVTP, they are exempt from local government plans, policies, and ordinances (unless a constitutional provision or statute directs otherwise). Nonetheless, CAL FIRE voluntarily seeks to operate consistently with local governance to the extent feasible. Given its statewide extent and the possible number of local and regional responsible agencies, this PEIR does not identify potentially applicable local government plans, policies, and ordinances. Types of local regulations relevant to land use and planning include general plans and local coastal programs, which are described below. This PEIR assumes that any vegetation treatments proposed by local or regional agencies under the CalVTP would be consistent with local plans, policies, and ordinances, as required by SPR AD-3.

###### City and County General Plans

California Government Code (Government Code) Section 65300 et seq. establishes the obligation of cities and counties to adopt and implement general plans. A general plan is a comprehensive, long-term document that describes plans for the physical development of a city or county and of any land outside its boundaries that, in the city’s or county’s judgment, bears relation to its planning. A general plan addresses a broad range of topics, including, at a minimum, land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety (and, going forward, environmental justice). In addressing these topics, a general plan typically identifies the goals, objectives, policies, principles, standards, and plan proposals that support the city’s or county’s vision for the area. A general plan is a long-range document that typically addresses the land use, development policies, and desired resource characteristics of a jurisdiction over a 20-year period or longer (though housing elements must be updated every eight years). General plans are required to include a safety element for the protection of the community from a number of risks, including wildland fires.

Senate Bill 379, Statutes of 2015, added a requirement for safety elements of general plans to address climate adaptation and resiliency. On or after January 1, 2017, or beginning on January 1, 2022 for jurisdictions that have not yet adopted a local hazard mitigation plan, the safety element shall address climate adaptation and resiliency strategies, which includes how climate change may affect risks related to wildfires. These requirements are included in Government Code Section 65302(g)(4). A vulnerability assessment must be prepared that identifies the risks that climate change poses to the local jurisdiction, including how climate change may affect risks related to wildfire. The safety element must also include a set of adaptation and resilience goals, policies, objectives, and implementation measures that are developed for the protection of the community related to climate change risks, such as increased risk of wildfire exacerbated by climate change.

The Planning and Zoning Law (Chapter 4 of Division 1 [“Planning and Zoning Law”] of Title 7 [“Planning and Land Use”] of the Government Code) establishes that zoning ordinances, which are laws that define allowable land uses in a specific zone district, are generally required to be consistent with the applicable general plan and any applicable specific plans. Zoning ordinances generally also set forth standards for development of land, use of hazardous materials, and noise generation.

The treatable landscape covers land owned by local jurisdictions, special districts, non-profit-organizations, and private landowners in multiple counties with multiple cities. Each of these counties and cities has local regulations and general plans with unique goals and policies related to land use and planning.

###### Local Coastal Programs

LCPs are developed by local governments, approved by the Coastal Commission, and set forth goals, objectives, and policies that govern ~~the use of land and water~~proposed development and protect coastal resources within the coastal zone consistent with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act of 1976. LCPs contain coastal resources planning and management policies that address public access, recreation, marine environment, land resources, development, and industrial development. They must also address coastal hazards, including minimizing risks to life and property in areas of high fire hazards, by providing for solutions that have the least impacts on coastal resources.

LCPs specify appropriate location, type, and scale of new or changed uses of land and water, similar to general plans and zoning codes outside of the coastal zone. Each LCP includes a land use plan element and implementing measures to ~~implement the plan (such as zoning ordinances)~~provide more specific standards to implement Land Use Plan policies. Prepared by local governments and approved by the Coastal Commission, these programs ~~govern decisions that determine the short- and long-term conservation and use of coastal resources~~allow local governments to carry out locally-developed programs which can be found consistent with the Coastal Act.

After an LCP has been finally approved by the Coastal Commission, the Commission’s coastal development permitting authority over ~~most~~ new development within that jurisdiction is transferred to the local government, which applies the requirements of the LCP in reviewing proposed new developments. The Coastal Commission retains permanent coastal development permitting jurisdiction over development proposed on tidelands, submerged lands, and public trust lands. The Coastal Commission also ~~acts on~~considers appeals from certain local government coastal development permit decisions~~, such as approvals of Coastal Development Permits~~.

#### Population and Housing

##### Federal

No federal laws or regulations related to population and housing are applicable to the project.

##### State

###### California Housing Element Law

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) implements the California Housing Element Law, enacted in 1969. HCD is responsible for reviewing local government housing elements for compliance with state law and providing written comments to local governments. HCD determines the regional housing need for each county and allocates funding to meet this need to the council of government for distribution to its jurisdictions. The regional housing need is informed by population projections developed by the California Department of Finance. Other factors, including economic conditions and regional housing markets, are also considered in developing the regional housing needs. HCD also oversees distribution of funding related to the regional housing need by the council of governments to the local governments to ensure that funds are appropriately allocated.

##### Local

A description of the applicability of and compliance with local regulations for CalVTP is provided above under “Land Use and Planning.”

The following describes only those regional governmental agencies with plans and policies pertaining to socioeconomic resources applicable to the areas within the treatable landscape.

###### Councils of Government

Councils of Government (COGs) throughout the state act as area-wide planning agencies, assisting local governments with multijurisdictional issues such as air quality, transportation, water quality, energy, land use, greenhouse gases, and housing. COGs operate either under a joint powers authority or a memorandum of understanding with the member agencies and can conduct a range of duties as directed by their member agencies, including regional review of environmentally significant projects per CEQA; area-wide clearinghouse for review of federal financial assistance; regional housing needs assessment; modeling and programming; and general planning support and technical assistance. Although many COGs are formed to focus on transportation planning and programming, some COGs are tasked by their local governments to address homelessness, water infrastructure, energy efficiency, earthquake safety, and more.

Under California housing law, the HCD is responsible for estimating the relative share of California’s projected population growth that will reside in each county in the state based on California Department of Finance population projections and historical growth trends. Based upon the projected growth in the number of households in each COG region, the HCD calculates the number of additional units needed during that period. In turn, each COG is required by state law to determine the portion of funding for regional housing to be allocated to each jurisdiction within the region.

###### General Plan Housing Elements

In accordance with state law, each local municipality general plan’s housing element must be consistent and compatible with other general plan elements. Additionally, housing elements must provide clear policy and direction for making decisions pertaining to zoning, subdivision approval, housing allocations, and capital improvements. State law (Government Code Sections 65580–65589.8) mandates the contents of housing elements. By law, a housing element must contain:

* An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting those needs (Government Code Section 65583(a)),
* A statement of the community’s goals, quantified objectives, and policies relevant to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing (Government Code Section 65583(b)),
* A program which sets forth a schedule of actions during the planning period, each with a timeline for implementation, which the local government is undertaking or intends to undertake to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of the housing element, and
* The land use and development controls, regulatory concessions and incentives, appropriate federal and state financing and subsidy programs, and low- and moderate-income housing fund of the agency if the locality has established a redevelopment project area pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law (Division 24 [commencing with Section 33000] of the Health and Safety Code) to support implementation of the programs identified in the housing element. (Government Code Section 65583(c).)

A housing element must identify existing and projected housing needs and establish goals, policies, objectives, and programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing to meet the needs of all economic sectors of a community. Its purpose is to provide an assessment of both current and future housing needs and the constraints in meeting those needs; it must also provide a strategy to establish local housing goals and policies and set forth programs to accomplish those goals and policies.

### Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

#### Analysis Methodology

The analysis of environmental impacts on land use and population focuses on the potential for the physical division of an established community; significant environmental impacts due to conflicts with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; inducing substantial unplanned population growth; and displacing substantial numbers of people or housing. Qualitative methods were used to assess the impact of vegetation treatment activities related to land use and planning and population and housing. Potential impacts were assessed based on the activities, methods, and techniques for implementing the proposed CalVTP. Significance determinations account for the influence of relevant SPRs, which are incorporated into treatment design and listed below.

* **SPR AD-3 Consistency with Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances**: The project proponent will design and implement the treatment in a manner that is consistent with applicable local plans (e.g., general plans, Community Wildfire Protection Plans, CAL FIRE Unit Fire Plans), policies, and ordinances to the extent the project is subject to them. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.
* **SPR AD-9:** **Obtain a Coastal Development Permit for Proposed Treatment Within the Coastal Zone Where Required**. When planning a treatment project within the Coastal Zone, the project proponent will contact the local Coastal Commission district office, or applicable local government to determine if the project area is within the jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission, a local government with a certified Local Coastal Program (LCP), or both. All treatment projects in the Coastal Zone will be reviewed by the local Coastal Commission district office or local government with a certified LCP (in consultation with the local Coastal Commission district office regarding whether a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) is required). If a CDP is required, the treatment project will be designed to meet the following conditions:

i. The treatment project will be designed in compliance with applicable provisions of the Coastal Act that provide substantive performance standards for the protection of potentially affected coastal resources, if the treatment activity will occur within the original jurisdiction of the Commission or an area of a local coastal government without a certified LCP; and

ii. The treatment project will be designed in compliance with the applicable provisions of the certified LCP, specifically the substantive performance standards for the protection of potentially affected coastal resources, if the treatment activity will occur within the jurisdiction of a local coastal government with a certified LCP.

This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.

#### Thresholds of Significance

Thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. A treatment implemented under the proposed CalVTP would result in a significant impact related to land use and planning and population and housing if it would:

* physically divide an established community;
* cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
* induce substantial unplanned 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); or
* displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

#### Issues Not Evaluated Further

Wildland-urban interface (WUI) fuel reduction treatments would be implemented in areas near development in communities and cities to reduce wildfire risk. Fuel breaks would be established typically along prominent topographic features (e.g., ridgelines) and existing roadways. Ecological restoration would be implemented outside of the WUI in order to restore ecosystem processes, conditions, and resiliency. These treatment types could be located near communities and cities; however, they would not result in construction of physical barriers that would change the connectivity between portions of a community or city. The nature of these treatment types would not result in the physical division of an established community. Similarly, for the reasons described above, the nature of proposed CalVTP treatments would also not displace people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. These issues are not evaluated further.

#### Impact Analysis

Impact LU-1: Cause a Significant Environmental Impact Due to a Conflict with a Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation

The proposed CalVTP would implement vegetation treatment on lands owned and managed by various entities, including state agencies, private owners, special districts, non-profit organizations, cities, and counties. For projects on state lands, a land management agency would develop the project consistent with its land management plan. For projects subject to local plans, policies, or regulations, CAL FIRE would voluntarily seek to operate consistently with local governance to the extent feasible. In general, all project proponents will design and implement treatments in a manner that is consistent with applicable local plans (e.g., general plans), policies, and ordinances to the extent the project is subject to them, as required SPR AD-3. Treatment activities that would occur within the coastal zone would be required to comply with the California Coastal Act or a certified LCP (as applicable), including obtaining a coastal development permit, when necessary pursuant to the provisions of SPR AD-9. Furthermore, the environmental impacts of the proposed CalVTP are addressed throughout this PEIR and mitigation is identified to reduce significant effects, thereby avoiding a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This impact would be **less than significant**.

The proposed CalVTP would implement treatment activities on lands owned and managed by various entities, including state agencies, private owners, special districts, non-profit organizations, cities, and counties. Treatment activities on state-owned and -managed lands would be subject to plans that have been adopted by the subject agency, including general plans for state parks and land management plans for CDFW wildlife areas and ecological reserves. Treatment activities on lands owned or managed by private owners, special districts, non-profit organizations, cities, and counties are generally required to comply with applicable city and county general plans and other local policies and ordinances. Treatments on land within the coastal zone are subject to the requirements of the Coastal Act ~~and associated~~or certified LCPs, as applicable.

For projects on state lands, the implementing state agency (project proponent) would be involved in designing the project; therefore, it is assumed that the treatment project would inherently be consistent with its land management plan (e.g., general plan, land management plan). As described above under “Local” in Section 3.12.2, “Regulatory Setting,” qualifying treatments implemented by CAL FIRE or other state agency under the proposed CalVTP are exempt from compliance with local government plans, policies, and ordinances (unless a constitutional provision or statute directs otherwise). However, CAL FIRE would voluntarily seek to operate consistently with local governance to the extent feasible, which is demonstrated through incorporation of SPR AD-3, which requires project proponents to design and implement treatment activities in a manner that is consistent with applicable local plans (e.g., general plans), policies, and ordinances to the extent the project is subject to them.

Treatments implemented under the CalVTP on land located within the coastal zone are subject to the California Coastal Act. All treatment projects in the Coastal Zone that qualify as “development” under the definition presented in PRC Section 30106 would require a coastal development permit (CDP) pursuant to the Coastal Act. According to California Coastal Commission staff, the CalVTP treatment activities are typically considered development, in part, under the Coastal Act, because they can result in the removal of major vegetation for purpose other than agricultural use ~~in accordance with~~as specified in PRC Section 30106. As a result, ~~they~~ anyone undertaking CalVTP treatment activities within the coastal zone ~~would generally~~may be required to first obtain a coastal development permit ~~for any treatment activities that would occur within the coastal zone~~. ~~Applicable~~ Allowable treatment activities, including appropriate parameters and any requisite measures would be determined on a project-level, site-specific basis, and could be informed through the coastal development permit process. Coastal development permits are issued by the California Coastal Commission or from the local ~~agency~~government that has delegated coastal development permitting authority in a~~n~~ certified LCP.

As described above, when designing treatments, project proponents would be required to review consistency with local plans, policies, and ordinances. The potential environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed CalVTP are assessed throughout this PEIR and mitigation is identified to reduce significant impacts; thus, this PEIR addresses, to the extent applicable to the proposed CalVTP, potentially significant impacts for which a land use plan, policy, or regulation was developed to avoid or mitigate. Additionally, project proponents would be required to complete a project-specific analysis (PSA, see Appendix PD-3, “Project-Specific Analysis”) that would evaluate the proposed treatment to determine whether the activity(ies) and environmental effects are addressed within the scope of this PEIR, consistent with Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines for later activities consistent with a program and its PEIR. The PSA requires the project proponent to determine that all applicable SPRs and mitigation measures identified in the CalVTP PEIR have been incorporated into the project, and whether additional mitigation would be necessary.

Treatments under the CalVTP on state-owned and -managed lands would be developed to be consistent with applicable state plans; treatment activities that are within the jurisdiction of local governments would adhere to SPR AD-3 that would require consistency with local plans, policies, and ordinances to the extent the project is subject to them. Treatment activities that would occur within the coastal zone would be required to comply with the California Coastal Act or a certified LCP (as applicable), including obtaining a coastal development permit, when necessary pursuant to the provisions of SPR AD-9. ~~Applicable~~ Allowable treatment activities, including appropriate parameters and any requisite measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts or inconsistencies related to the Coastal Act would be determined on a project-level, site-specific basis. Further, the environmental impacts of the proposed CalVTP are evaluated throughout this PEIR; SPRs and mitigation measures are identified to avoid or reduce impacts and ensure consistency with land use plans, policies, or regulations pertinent to resources considered in this PEIR and adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating effects to these resources. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed CalVTP would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation. This impact would be **less than significant**.

##### Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

Impact LU-2: Induce Substantial Unplanned Population Growth

The increase in the pace and scale of vegetation treatments under the proposed CalVTP would result in additional demand for employees to implement treatments across the state within and near the treatable landscape. Implementation of the proposed CalVTP would result in an average of approximately five additional employees within each CAL FIRE unit (21 units). Other state agencies, such as CSP and CDFW, could also generate demand for some additional employees, although at a lower rate than the employment increase anticipated for CAL FIRE. Other project proponents may employ or contract workers permanently or seasonally to perform treatments. The increase in employee demand would be spread throughout the state and there would not be any specific areas that would experience a substantial increase in demand for vegetation treatment employees. Thus, implementation of the proposed CalVTP would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in any one area to cause a need for new housing, roads, or infrastructure. This impact would be **less than significant**.

CAL FIRE currently employs an estimated 110 staff who implement vegetation treatment projects within the state. These employees are typically not dedicated solely to vegetation treatment and may work on other projects or tasks for CAL FIRE; however, achieving the identified treatment acreage target under the CalVTP would require dedicated vegetation treatment crews. Currently, the average crew size for treatments is 20 to 25 staff. With implementation of the proposed CalVTP, the amount of land that would be treated would increase from approximately 33,000 acres up to approximately 250,000 acres treated each year by 2024.

Vegetation treatments associated with CalVTP would be implemented by a number of different entities including the 21 CAL FIRE Units within the state, six contract counties; other state, regional, and local agencies with land management or ownership authority; and Fire Safe Councils or other non-governmental organizations. Staff for vegetation treatments are provided by these entities and others, including from Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs), California Conservation Corps (CCC), local fire districts, and local contractors.

The increase in pace and scale of vegetation treatments that would occur with implementation of CalVTP would increase the number of people employed across the state to conduct treatment activities. It is anticipated that the majority of employment demand, especially for project proponents other than CAL FIRE, would be seasonal. CAL FIRE estimates that the number of CAL FIRE employees implementing vegetation treatment projects could double and add approximately 110 new employees under the scenario where approximately 250,000 acres are treated per year. This would result in an average of five new employees within each CAL FIRE Unit. Privately owned land, which would be treated by CAL FIRE, accounts for 92 percent of the treatable landscape (see Table 3.12-1). Outside of privately-owned land in the treatable landscape, state agencies own approximately 50 percent of remaining acres in the treatable landscape. Because of the high proportion of state-owned land in the treatable landscape, state agencies, such as CSP and CDFW, could also demand new employees, but not to the extent of the demand identified for CAL FIRE.

Other demand could be met through increases in the number of CCC members and seasonal or permanent increases in local contractor crews, local fire districts, RCDs, and other state, regional, and local agency staff. The state currently has plans to expand CCC operations to include dedicated crews to treat vegetation to reduce wildfire risk (CCC 2019). The state also has allocated budget to expand and improve residential bed space for CCC members and includes plans for three new CCC residential centers and renovation of the Fortuna residential center. The state’s plans to increase vegetation treatment staff capacity and residential capacity could meet the needs for additional vegetation treatment employees generated by the proposed CalVTP. Any new residential facilities would be required to undergo project-level environmental review to assess environmental effects.

For the purposes of this PEIR, an increase in permanent employment demand would also result in an increase in population growth. If the employment demand is not “planned” (i.e., accounted for in city or county general plans), it is considered unplanned. A substantial increase in unplanned population growth would likely necessitate the construction of housing or other infrastructure to support the population increase; this construction could cause physical environmental effects. Any new housing or infrastructure would be required to undergo project-level environmental review to assess environmental effects. Employee demand could be met by residents near treatment activities or could result in some people relocating to those areas where treatment activities would occur. However, because of the nature of the location of these entities (e.g., CAL FIRE Units, CCC crews, local contractor crews) and treatment activities within the state, implementation of the proposed CalVTP would not result in substantial demand for permanent employment in any one area. Thus, the increase in employment needs for CalVTP would not induce substantial unplanned population growth. Additionally, as indicated in Table 3.12-4, 37 of the 57 counties within the treatable landscape have higher vacancy rates than the statewide vacancy rate of 7.4 percent, which indicates there would be sufficient sources of existing housing to meet any additional demand.

As described above, the proposed CalVTP would increase employment demand across the state within and in the areas near the treatable landscape. However, because the increase in demand would be spread throughout the state there would not be specific areas that would experience a substantial increase in demand for vegetation treatment employees. It is expected that the demand could be met by new employees that are existing residents in the vicinity of where treatments would occur. The potential also exists for people to relocate to the area where there is a demand for vegetation treatment employees, but there would be sufficient housing to meet the housing demand associated with these new employees that may relocate from outside of an area. Thus, implementation of the proposed CalVTP would not induce substantial unplanned population increases in any one area to cause a need for new housing and other infrastructure. This impact would be **less than significant**.

##### Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for this impact.

This page intentionally left blank.