
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
7.14 Socioeconomic Conditions Affected Environment	7.14-1
7.14.1 Information Sources.....	7.14-1
7.14.2 Description of Existing Condition	7.14-1
7.14.3 Placer County Demographics	7.14-2
7.14.3.1 Population Trends.....	7.14-3
7.14.3.2 Housing	7.14-3
7.14.3.3 Income and Poverty	7.14-4
7.14.3.4 Key Industries and Employment in Placer County	7.14-4
7.14.3.5 Agriculture	7.14-4
7.14.4 Placer County Government.....	7.14-5
7.14.4.1 Structure	7.14-5
7.14.4.2 Budget and Fiscal Resources.....	7.14-5
7.14.5 Public and Emergency Services	7.14-6
7.14.6 Environmental Justice.....	7.14-7

List of Tables

- Table 7.14-1. Placer County Population and Growth Rates, 1990–2009.
- Table 7.14-2. Population and Population Growth Rates, Placer County Cities, 1990–2010.
- Table 7.14-3. Housing Units, Placer County Cities and County Total, 1990–2010.
- Table 7.14-4. Placer County Employment by Industry.
- Table 7.14-5. Major Private Sector Employers in Placer County.
- Table 7.14-6. Placer County General Government Revenues, by Source.
- Table 7.14-7. Placer County General Government Expenditures, by Function.

7.14 SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This section provides a general description of the existing socioeconomic conditions in the vicinity of the Middle Fork American River Project (MFP or Project). The primary information sources used to develop this section are described first, followed by a description of the existing conditions. The subsection on existing conditions begins with an overview of the socioeconomic setting in the immediate vicinity of the MFP, followed by a description of the socioeconomic conditions in Placer County. The MFP is primarily located within the boundaries of Placer County. Therefore, the information presented in this section focuses on Placer County.

7.14.1 Information Sources

The information used for this socioeconomic section was obtained from several local, state, and federal sources. By level of government, major sources include the following:

- County:
 - Agricultural Commissioner reports and data
 - Treasurer and Tax Collector reports and data
 - Planning Department reports and data
- State
 - Department of Finance reports on population and income
 - Economic Development Department reports on key industries and employment
 - Department of Food and Agriculture reports on crop and livestock production
- Federal
 - Census Bureau data on population and housing
 - Commerce Department data on numbers of businesses and employees by industry
 - Department of Agriculture information from Census of Agriculture

7.14.2 Description of Existing Condition

Placer County is located in northern California and generally encompasses (from west to east) the valley, foothill, and high country areas between the city of Roseville and Lake Tahoe. The county covers about 961,800 acres including 898,820 acres of land and 62,980 acres of water (DOF 2009b). Placer County is bounded to the south by El Dorado and Sacramento counties, to the north by Nevada County, on the west by

Sutter and Yuba counties, and to the east by the State of Nevada. There are six incorporated cities in Placer County, including Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville. Approximately 67% of the population lives in the incorporated cities and 33% in unincorporated areas (DOF 2009a). In the last 20 years, the county economy has diversified and the population has increased more quickly than that of the state overall.

The MFP is situated in the eastern portion of Placer County, along the Middle Fork American River, the Rubicon River, and their tributaries. Placer County Water Agency (PCWA), which owns and operates the MFP, is a public agency governed by an elected five-member Board of Directors. PCWA operates the MFP and carries out a broad range of responsibilities including water resource planning and management, retail and wholesale supply of irrigation and drinking water, and production of hydroelectric energy. PCWA is an independent generator (wholesaler of electricity) of power produced from the MFP.

The MFP facilities and the land within the existing Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) Project boundary are located primarily within the Eldorado National Forest (ENF) and Tahoe National Forest (TNF) with a small portion on PCWA-owned property. Private parcels are present throughout the Watershed and intersect the FERC Project boundary at various locations. Land surrounding Project facilities is heavily forested, rural in nature, and sparsely populated. There are no residential or commercial developments in the immediate vicinity of the MFP. The nearest population center is Foresthill, located approximately 4 miles west-northwest of Ralston Afterbay. Land use within the FERC Project boundary is focused on water supply, hydropower generation, and recreation. Land use outside of the FERC Project boundary is managed for recreation, timber harvest, grazing, natural resource protection, and to a lesser extent mining.

Given its rural nature, job opportunities in the vicinity of the Project are limited. Most of the work force in the immediate vicinity of the Project consists of California State Department of Recreation employees, United States Department of Agriculture-Forest Service (USDA-FS) employees, concessionaires hired by the USDA-FS to maintain and operate developed recreation facilities, and PCWA employees and subcontractors. As of October 2009, PCWA employs 179 full-time employees, of which 18 are assigned to the Power Division in support of the MFP administration, engineering, operations and maintenance. Of the 18, 16 work out of PCWA's Foresthill office while two reside year-round at the operator cottages located near Hell Hole Reservoir.

7.14.3 Placer County Demographics

Key demographic variables considered in this section are population, housing, and income.

7.14.3.1 Population Trends

The growth of population and industry since 1980 has stimulated job growth and fostered the conversion of many rural areas in western and southern Placer County into growing communities (North Fork Associates and AgResource Solutions 2002). The population of Placer County almost doubled (174,905 to 344,565) between July 1, 1990 and July 1, 2009 (Table 7.14-1). The compound average rate of growth over the 19-year period was 3.63% per year.

Population in Placer County is projected to grow to 428,535 by 2020 and 751,208 by 2050 (DOF 2007a). Relative to the 2000 population (248,399), Placer County population is expected to grow at a compound 2.8% annual rate through 2020 and a 2.2% annual rate through 2050.

Population growth has been concentrated in the Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln area. Between 1990 and 2000, Rocklin grew at a faster rate than the other incorporated cities in Placer County, at a compound rate of 6.8% per year. During that same period, Roseville grew at a compound annual rate of 6%, Lincoln at 4.5% per year, and Colfax by 1.5% per year. More recently, Lincoln has also expanded significantly. Between 2000 and 2010, Lincoln has grown at a compound annual rate of 13.9%, Rocklin has grown at 4.4% annually, Roseville at 3.8% annually, and Colfax at 2.7% annually (Table 7.14-2).

Residents of Placer County are predominantly White (79.26%) followed by Latinos/Hispanics (12.54%) and Asians (4.75%). The remaining population is divided amongst Multirace (2.19%), Black (0.59%), American Indian (0.57%) and Pacific Islander (0.11%). All of Placer County's ethnic characteristics are below State averages with the exception of the proportion of Whites (state average 40.83%) and American Indian (state average 0.55%) (DOF 2010).

7.14.3.2 Housing

The stock of housing units in Placer County has grown along with population. As shown in Table 7.14-3, between 1990 and 2000, the total stock of housing in the county grew by 3.3% per year, including 1.3% in the unincorporated areas. The most rapid rate of increase among cities was in Rocklin, followed by Roseville, at compound annual rates of 6.8 and 6%, respectively. Between 2000 and 2010, the most rapid growth in the number of housing units was in Lincoln, 15.7% annually, followed by Rocklin and Roseville both at a compound annual rate of 4% (DOF 2007b).

The median home sale price in Placer County generally remains below the prices seen on an overall basis for California and for most of the Bay Area, but above other counties within the Sacramento Region. In September 2009, Placer County's median home price was \$293,750. Of the County's incorporated cities for which data was available, Colfax had the lowest median price of \$198,250, while Loomis had the highest price of \$389,750. Placer County's overall change in median home prices from 1999 to 2009 (approximately 52%) was greater than the state average (CSER 2010).

7.14.3.3 Income and Poverty

In 1999, Placer County median family income was \$65,858 (in 1999 dollars), and 3.9% of families lived at or below the poverty level (DOF 2009b). The median family income was 24.2% higher than that for all of California, in which 10.6% of families lived at or below the poverty level.

In 2008, the most recent year for which data are available, total personal income in Placer County was \$16 billion, and per capita personal income was \$47,195 (USDOD 2008). Per capita, personal income in Placer County was 7.6% higher than that for California in 2008, which was \$43,852.

The community of Foresthill is defined as a disadvantaged community with a median household income in 2000 of \$34,348 (U.S. Census Bureau 2000).

7.14.3.4 Key Industries and Employment in Placer County

Over the past ten-year period that data is available, Placer County employment increased from 95,100 jobs to 137,700 jobs (1998–2008) (Table 7.14-4). The Trade, Transportation and Utilities sector added the greatest number of jobs at 10,000, followed by the Educational and Health Services sector which added 7,900 jobs, and Leisure and Hospitality which added 7,000 jobs (EDD 2010).

The largest private sector employers in Placer County are shown in Table 7.14-5. The businesses cover a variety of industries, from manufacturing to healthcare, amusement and recreation, transportation, telecommunications, and services. In 2009, Kaiser Permanente, with offices in Roseville, was the largest employer, with 3,281 employees (CSER 2010).

7.14.3.5 Agriculture

Agriculture has been an integral part of Placer County for more than 150 years (North Fork Associates and AgResource Solutions 2002). A combination of favorable climate and soils, availability of water, proximity to a transcontinental transportation network, and other factors have all contributed to the importance of the sector. While the dependence on agriculture within the county has declined over time, Placer County has indicated its commitment to maintaining agricultural land for both its commercial and non-commercial features. The 1994 General Plan lists as a goal for agricultural land use the designation of “adequate agricultural land” and the promotion of “development of agricultural uses to support the continued viability of Placer County’s agricultural economy” (Placer County 1994).

In 2007, there were 1,488 farms in Placer County, with an average size of 89 acres (USDA 2009). In that year, the gross value of crop and livestock products from Placer County farms was \$63,304,828 (Placer County 2008b). In terms of production value, the most important products were field crops (primarily rice), nursery products, and cattle and calf production. Timber products represented about 6% of the total.

Much of the urban development in Placer County since the early 1980s has been on agricultural land. Between 1984 and 2002, 33,448 acres of agricultural land were converted to non-agricultural purposes. Urban and built-up land accounted for 23,590 of those acres, and “Other land” for 10,053 acres. Among the 33,448 acres, grazing land accounted for 22,412 and prime farmland and farmland otherwise unique or of statewide or local importance accounted for 11,036 acres.

7.14.4 Placer County Government

7.14.4.1 Structure

Placer County is governed by a Board of Supervisors (Board), which is a five-member legislative body elected by local citizens. There is one board member for each of the five supervisorial districts in the county: District 1 (Roseville), District 2 (Lincoln), District 3 (Auburn), District 4 (Granite Bay/Roseville), and District 5 (Meadow Vista). District supervisors are elected to four-year terms, which are staggered, (i.e., two supervisors are elected in one general election and three supervisors in the next). The Board usually meets every other week in the city of Auburn, the county seat, with occasional meetings in North Lake Tahoe. Other key government personnel include the County Executive Officer, County Counsel, Assessor, Auditor-Controller, Clerk-Recorder-Registrar, District Attorney, Sheriff-Coroner-Marshall, and Treasurer-Tax Collector.

7.14.4.2 Budget and Fiscal Resources

Fiscal conditions in Placer County are directly related to the revenues it receives, mainly in the form of tax collections and intergovernmental transfers, and expenditures made to fund essential public services and other programs. Tables 7.14-6 and 7.14-7 summarize Placer County revenues and expenditures, respectively, over the past seven (2002–2009) fiscal years (FY).

Placer County revenues in FY 2008–2009 totaled approximately \$499.1 million (Placer County 2009a). Of this total, roughly \$179.2 million (or 36%) came from tax revenues, \$203.3 million (41%) from intergovernmental transfers, and \$116.6 million (23%) from other sources. Total county revenues have increased by over 46% compared to FY 2002–2003 levels.

Property taxes, which are included in Table 7.14-6, play a large role in the County’s revenue stream. As with all California counties, the baseline property tax rate in Placer County is 1%. Taking into account local agency/district levies, the average property tax rate throughout the County in FY 2008–2009 was 1.57%. This rate is applied to the assessed value of property. The total assessed value of the property tax roll was \$58.1 billion in FY 2008–2009 (Placer County 2009a). After taking into account exemptions and other factors, actual property tax levies in Placer County during this period totaled \$562.5 million, with \$537.9 million in collections. This represents an approximate 203% increase in property tax collections relative to FY 1998–1999 levels.

Sales taxes are another critical component of county tax revenues. Taxable sales in Placer County in 2008 totaled \$6.6 billion, of which \$4.8 billion occurred in incorporated cities (BOE 2008).

The fiscal revenues collected by Placer County described above are expended in a variety of ways as shown in Table 7.14-7. Total government expenditures in FY 2008–2009 were \$559 million (Placer County 2009a). The largest government expenditures is public protection, which in fiscal year 2008–2009 accounted for \$174.3 million (or 31%) of all expenditures. Other significant expenditures include health and sanitation (\$86.2 million) and general government (\$60.1 million).

7.14.5 Public and Emergency Services

PCWA supplies irrigation and treated drinking water to Colfax, Auburn, Loomis, Rocklin, Lincoln, a small portion of Roseville, unincorporated areas of western Placer County, and a small community in Martis Valley near Truckee. In addition, PCWA operates an extensive raw water distribution system that includes 165 miles of canals, ditches, flumes and several small reservoirs. Consumptive water supplied by PCWA is used to meet municipal, industrial, and agricultural demands within PCWA's service area.

Placer County provides government services to those residents that live in the unincorporated areas of the county. For county residents who live in incorporated cities or towns (i.e., Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville) the county also provides many services, including public safety and public health services, in addition to the services provided by the cities. Important public services provided by Placer County include law enforcement, fire protection and other emergency services, education, solid waste disposal, and utilities.

Law enforcement services in unincorporated areas are provided by the Placer County Sheriff's Department. The Sheriff's Department is served by a total of 482 assigned full-time staff, of which there is 149 sworn field operation staff (Placer County 2006b). Law enforcement services are supplemented by local police departments that serve incorporated areas.

Fire protection in Placer County is provided by a wide range of paid and volunteer departments. The Placer County Fire Department (part of the County Office of Emergency Services), in conjunction with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (formerly CDF, now referred to as California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection [CAL FIRE]), primarily serve the unincorporated areas of the county.

Public education in Placer County is provided by numerous elementary, middle and high schools, as well as community colleges. Total school enrollment in 2008–2009 was 80,987 students (Placer County 2009b). Enrollment in elementary schools (outside of local unified school districts) totaled 27,779 during this period. An additional 34,869 students were enrolled in the five unified school districts (i.e., Placer High, Rocklin Unified, Roseville Joint Unified, Tahoe Truckee, and Western Placer). Sierra Community College served 18,339 students.

Placer County contracts with two companies to provide residential garbage pickup and disposal in the unincorporated areas of the county, Auburn Placer Disposal Service and Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal. The western portion of the county is served by one major landfill, Western Regional Sanitary Landfill in Lincoln, and regional recycling facility, Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), both of which are owned and operated by the Western Placer Waste Management Authority. The estimated total permitted capacity at the landfill is 36.35 million cubic yards, with an estimated remaining capacity of 80% (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2010). The Eastern Regional Landfill is the disposal site for solid waste collected from eastern Placer County, including the town of Truckee, the city of Colfax, and portions of El Dorado and Nevada counties.

Other utilities include electricity, natural gas, and water. Electrical power in the county is provided by the City of Roseville, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Sierra Pacific Power Company, and Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). Hydroelectric stations generate a considerable quantity of the electricity in the region. Natural gas is available for commercial and residential uses in Placer County through PG&E. PCWA is a major provider of water to Placer County customers.

7.14.6 Environmental Justice

Environmental justice refers to the fair and equitable treatment of individuals regardless of race, ethnicity, or income level in the development and implementation of environmental management policies and actions. Executive Order (EO) 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations," requires each federal agency to "make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low income populations" (Council on Environmental Quality 1997). The EO was accompanied by a memorandum that directs federal agencies to analyze the environmental effects, including human health, social, and economic concerns, of their actions where such analysis is required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

LITERATURE CITED

- Center for Strategic Economic Research (CSER). 2010. Placer County Economic and Demographic Profile 2010. February.
- North Fork Associates and AgResource Solutions. 2002. Western Placer County Agricultural Land Assessment and Agricultural Land Conservation Evaluation Criteria, prepared for Placer County Planning Department, Auburn.
- Placer County. 1994. Placer County General Plan Update. Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/>. Accessed February 25, 2010.

- _____. 2003. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2003. Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Auditor.aspx/>. Accessed February 24, 2010.
- _____. 2004. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2004. Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Auditor.aspx/>. Accessed February 24, 2010.
- _____. 2005. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2005. Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Auditor.aspx/>. Accessed February 24, 2010.
- _____. 2006a. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2006. Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Auditor.aspx/>. Accessed February 24, 2010.
- _____. 2006b. "Placer County Sheriff – Coroner – Marshal": Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/sheriff/index.htm/>. Accessed March 10, 2006.
- _____. 2007. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2007. Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Auditor.aspx/>. Accessed February 24, 2010.
- _____. 2008a. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Auditor.aspx/>. Accessed February 24, 2010.
- _____. 2008b. "2008 Annual Crop Report." Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Agriculture/AgrCropRpts.aspx/>. Accessed February 25, 2010.
- _____. 2009a. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2009. Available online at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Auditor.aspx/>. Accessed February 24, 2010.
- _____. 2009b. Placer County Office of Education. Annual Report 2009.
- State of California, Board of Equalization (BOE). 2008. "Taxable Sales in California 2008." Available online at: <http://www.boe.ca.gov/news/tsalescont08.htm/>. Accessed February 25, 2010.

- State of California, Department of Finance (DOF). 2007a. Population Projections for California and Its Counties 2000–2050, by Age, Gender and Race/Ethnicity. Sacramento, California. July.
- _____. 2007b. E-8 Historical Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 1990–2000. Sacramento, California. August.
- _____. 2009a. E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001–2010, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, California. May.
- _____. 2009b. California Statistical Abstract, 2008. Sacramento, California. January.
- _____. 2010. California County Race/Ethnic Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year, July 1, 2000–2008. Sacramento, California. June.
- State of California, Economic Development Department (EDD). 2010. Industry Employment and Labor Force - By Annual Average, March 2009 Benchmark. June.
- State of California, Integrated Waste Management Board. 2010. Active Landfills Profile – Western Regional Landfill. Available online at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/profiles/facility/landfill/LFProfile1.asp?COID=31&FA CID=31-AA-0210/>. Accessed March 11, 2010.
- United States Census Bureau. 2000. Summary File 1 (SF1) and Summary File 3 (SF3) for the Foresthill Census Designated Place, CA.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2009. 2007 Census of Agriculture, Placer County, California. Available online at: <http://www.nass.usda.gov/>. Accessed February 25, 2010.
- United States Department of Commerce (USDOC). 2008. Bureau of Economic Analysis. CA05N Personal Income by Major Source and Earnings by Industry, Placer (County), California. Available online at: <http://www.bea.gov/>. Accessed July 23, 2010.

TABLES

Table 7.14-1. Placer County Population and Growth Rates, 1990–2009.

Year	Population (July)
1990	174,905
1991	183,630
1992	190,810
1993	197,214
1994	202,786
1995	211,555
1996	218,502
1997	226,101
1998	233,298
1999	243,339
2000	252,341
2005	313,935
2009	344,565
Compound Annual Growth Rates	
1990–2000	3.73%
2000–2009	3.52%
1990–2009	3.63%

Sources:

State of California, Department of Finance, Population Estimates and Components of Change by County, July 1, 2000–2009. Sacramento, California, December 2009 (2000, 2005, and 2009 data); and State of California, Department of Finance, Revised County Population Estimates and Components of Change by County, July 1, 1990–2000. Sacramento, California, February 2005. (1990–1999 data).

Table 7.14-2. Population and Population Growth Rates, Placer County Cities, 1990–2010.

Compound Annual Growth Rate							
City	1990	2000	2005	2010	1990–2000	2000–2010	1990–2010
Auburn	10,653	12,462	12,971	13,578	1.6%	0.9%	1.2%
Colfax	1,306	1,520	1,840	1,993	1.5%	2.7%	2.1%
Lincoln	7,248	11,205	27,403	41,111	4.5%	13.9%	9.1%
Loomis	5,705	6,260	6,334	6,743	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
Rocklin	18,806	36,330	50,977	56,019	6.8%	4.4%	5.6%
Roseville	44,685	79,921	103,161	115,781	6.05	3.8%	4.9%

Sources:

State of California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001–2010, with 2000 Benchmark, Sacramento, California, May 2010 (2000, 2005, and 2010 data); and State of California, Department of Finance, E-8 Historical Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 1990–2000, Sacramento, California, August 2007 (1990 data).

Table 7.14-3. Housing Units, Placer County Cities and County Total, 1990–2010.

Compound Annual Growth Rate							
City	1990	2000	2005	2010	1990– 2000	2000– 2010	1990– 2010
Auburn	4,795	5,457	5,814	6,041	1.3%	1.0%	1.2%
Colfax	621	647	801	875	0.4%	3.1%	1.7%
Lincoln	2,602	4,146	11,880	17,804	4.8%	15.7%	10.1%
Loomis	2,030	2,273	2,353	2,462	1.1%	0.8%	1.0%
Rocklin	7,481	14,421	19,679	21,397	6.8%	4.0%	5.4%
Roseville	17,789	31,925	42,219	47,190	6.0%	4.0%	5.0%
Unincorporated Area	42,561	48,433	52,100	54,913	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%
Total County	77,879	107,302	134,846	150,682	3.3%	3.5%	3.4%

Sources:

State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2010, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2010 (2000, 2005, and 2010 data); and State of California, Department of Finance, E-8 Historical Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 1990-2000. Sacramento, California, August 2007 (1990 data).

Table 7.14-4. Placer County Employment by Industry.

Industry	1998	2008	Change in Total Jobs 1998–2008	% Change 1998–2008
Total, All Industries	95,100	137,700	42,600	44.8%
Agriculture	400	400	0	0%
Mining and Logging	100	100	0	0%
Construction	8,400	12,300	3,900	46.4%
Manufacturing	9,300	8,000	-1,300	-14.0%
Trade, Transportation and Utilities	17,900	27,900	10,000	55.9%
Information	2,100	2,400	300	14.3%
Financial Activities	5,500	10,600	5,100	92.7%
Professional and Business Services	10,400	14,900	4,500	43.3%
Educational and Health Services	8,800	16,700	7,900	89.8%
Leisure and Hospitality	12,600	19,600	7,000	55.6%
Other Services	4,000	5,100	1,100	27.5%
Government	15,700	20,000	4,300	27.4%

Source:

California Employment Development Department, Industry Employment and Labor Force—by Annual Average, March 2009 Benchmark. June 2010.

Table 7.14-5. Major Private Sector Employers in Placer County.

Name	Industry	Employment
Kaiser Permanente	Healthcare	3,281
Hewlett-Packard Co.	Computer Hardware Manufacturing	3,000*
Sutter Health	Healthcare	2,270
Union Pacific Railroad	Transportation, Railroad	2,000
Thunder Valley Casino Resort	Casinos	1,651
PRIDE Industries Inc.	Manufacturing and Logistics Services	1,352
Northstar-at-Tahoe	Ski Resort	1,250
NEC Electronics America Inc.	Electronic Components and Accessories	791
Safeway Inc.	Retail Grocery	700
Wells Fargo & Co.	Financial Services	668
Pacific Gas and Electric	Utility Distributor	619
SureWest Communications	Telecommunications	560
United Natural Foods, Inc.	Wholesale Groceries	500
Resort at Squaw Creek	Misc. Amusement, Recreation Services	480**
Raley's	Retail Grocery	408
Sierra Pacific Industries	Sawmills & Planning Mills	336
Future Automotive Group	Auto Dealerships	271
Nugget Market, Inc.	Retail Grocery	90

Source:

Center for Strategic Economic Research, Placer County Economic and Demographic Profile 2010, February 2010.

*Estimated employment.

**Peak seasonal employment; 265 year-round employees.

Table 7.14-6. Placer County General Government Revenues, by Source.

Fiscal Year	Taxes	Intergovernmental Transfers	Other¹	Total Revenues
2002–2003	\$95,244,103	\$159,854,844	\$87,450,384	\$342,549,331
2003–2004	\$105,647,190	\$154,468,289	\$78,324,977	\$338,440,456
2004–2005	\$118,407,215	\$188,684,897	\$91,875,495	\$398,967,607
2005–2006	\$162,425,000	\$183,632,000	\$99,720,000	\$445,777,000
2006–2007	\$180,581,000	\$200,242,000	\$120,977,000	\$501,800,000
2007–2008	\$187,958,000	\$201,232,000	\$122,492,000	\$511,682,000
2008–2009	\$179,239,000	\$203,295,000	\$116,558,000	\$499,092,000

Source:

Placer County, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, FY 02-03, FY 03-04, FY 04-05, FY 05-06, FY 06-07, FY 07–08, and FY 08–09.

¹Other includes: licenses and permits; fines, forfeitures and penalties; use of money and property; charges for services; tobacco settlement; and miscellaneous.

Table 7.14-7. Placer County General Government Expenditures, by Function.

Fiscal Year	General Government	Public Protection	Public Assistance	Community Development¹	Health & Sanitation	Public Ways & Facilities	Recreation & Cultural Services	Education	Other²	Total
02-03	\$48,427,649	\$104,450,569	\$50,760,486	–	\$50,564,834	\$18,102,276	\$431,133	\$4,884,177	\$29,770,310	\$307,391,434
03-04	\$54,577,767	\$109,701,782	\$50,005,393	–	\$48,805,220	\$19,389,573	\$576,396	\$3,931,553	\$27,590,181	\$314,577,865
04-05	\$55,713,094	\$119,944,506	\$49,377,587	–	\$60,094,352	\$27,267,922	\$338,254	\$4,520,347	\$46,429,091	\$363,685,153
05-06	\$54,552,000	\$141,926,000	\$55,842,000	–	\$74,929,000	\$29,121,000	\$3,638,000	\$4,879,000	\$56,256,000	\$421,143,000
06-07	\$57,685,000	\$154,778,000	\$59,496,000	–	\$81,156,000	\$48,254,000	\$4,124,000	\$5,210,000	\$37,372,000	\$448,075,000
07-08	\$78,261,000	\$169,095,000	\$71,076,000	–	\$85,129,000	\$44,186,000	\$4,708,000	\$5,816,000	\$36,052,000	\$494,323,000
08-09	\$60,101,000	\$174,274,000	\$57,713,000	\$7,206,000	\$86,169,000	\$49,762,000	\$4,466,000	\$6,023,000	\$113,322,000	\$559,036,000

Source:

Placer County, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, FY 02-03, FY 03-04, FY 04-05, FY 05-06, FY 06-07, FY 07-08, and FY 08-09.

Notes:

¹Community Development is a new category of expenditures that was added in FY 08-09.

²Includes capital outlays, debt service, interest, fiscal charges, bond issuance costs, and payment to refunded bond escrow agent.