3.10 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

This section describes the current population, housing, and employment of the SCAG region identifies potential impacts of the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (2012-2035 RTP/SCS or Plan) on these three factors, includes mitigation measures for the impacts, and evaluates the residual impacts. The data used in this section represents SCAG's most reliable available data for population, housing, and employment information.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Federal

Federal planning regulations, Title 23 CFR 450.322(e), require that in development of the regional transportation plan that the MPO validate data utilized in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the regional transportation plan. In updating the plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.

State

California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). State Housing Law (Government Code Section 65580) requires local government plans to address the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community through their housing elements. The housing element is one of seven (7) state-mandated elements that every General Plan must contain, and it is required to be updated every eight (8) years and determined legally adequate by the State. The purpose of the housing element is to identify the community's housing needs, state the community's goals and objectives with regard to housing production, rehabilitation, and conservation to meet those needs. In addition, the Housing Element defines the related policies and programs that the community will implement in order to achieve the stated goals and objectives. This would be accomplished through the allocation of regional housing needs consistent with the SCS.

California Relocation Assistance Act. The California Relocation Assistance Act (Government Code Section 7260 et seq.) establishes uniform policies to provide for the fair and equitable treatment of people displaced from their homes or businesses as a direct result of State and/or local government projects or programs. The California Relocation Assistance Act requires that comparable replacement housing be made available to displaced persons within a reasonable period of time prior to the displacement. Displaced persons or businesses are assured payment for their acquired property at fair market value. Relocation assistance in the form of advisory assistance and financial benefits would be provided at the local level. This includes aid in finding a new home location, payments to help cover moving costs, and additional payments for certain other costs.

Homeowners and Private Property Protection Act. In 2008, California voters approved Proposition 99, the Homeowners and Private Property Protection Act, which amended the California Constitution so that local governments are prohibited from using eminent domain authority to acquire an owner-occupied residence for the purposes of conveying it to a private recipient, with limited exceptions. Proposition 99 applies only to owner-occupied residences. Cities may still use eminent domain authority to convey multi-family and non-residential property to other private parties.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The State law requires preparation of a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The RHNA is a key tool for SCAG and its member governments to plan for this growth. The RHNA quantifies the regional need for housing that is allocated to each jurisdiction for a certain planning period (e.g. in the next RHNA cycle, the period is from 2014 to 2021). Communities then plan, consider and decide how they will address this need through the process of completing the Housing Elements of their General Plans. The RHNA does not necessarily encourage or promote growth, but rather allows communities to anticipate growth, so that they can grow in ways that enhance quality of life, improve access to jobs, transportation and housing, and not adversely impact the environment.

This region's RHNA is produced periodically by SCAG, as mandated by State law, to coincide with the region's schedule for preparing Housing Elements. It consists of two measurements of housing need: (a) existing need and (b) future need for very-low income, low-income, moderate and above-moderate income categories.

The existing need assessment is based on data from the most recent U.S. Census to measure ways in which the housing market is not meeting the needs of current residents. These variables include the number of low-income households paying more than 30 percent of their income for housing, as well as severe overcrowding.

The future need for housing is determined primarily by the forecasted growth in households in a community, based on historical growth patterns, job creation, household formation rates, and other factors to estimate how many households will be added to each community over the projection period. The housing need for new households is then adjusted to account for an ideal level of vacancy needed to promote housing choice, maintain price competition and encourage acceptable levels of housing upkeep and repair. The RHNA also accounts for units expected to be lost due to demolition, natural disaster, or conversion to non-housing uses. The sum of these factors household growth, vacancy need and replacement need form the "construction need" assigned to each community.

Finally, the RHNA considers how each jurisdiction might grow in ways that will decrease the concentration of low-income households in certain communities. The need for new housing is distributed among income groups so that each community moves closer to the regional average income distribution.

Local

Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). SCAG has also prepared and issued the 2008 RCP in response to SCAG's Regional Council directive in the 2002 Strategic Plan to define solutions to interrelated housing, traffic, water, air quality, and other regional challenges.[1] The 2008 RCP is an advisory document that describes future conditions if current trends continue, defines a vision for a healthier region, and recommends an Action Plan with a target year of 2035. The RCP may be voluntarily used by local jurisdictions in developing local plans and addressing local issues of regional significance. The plan incorporates principles and goals of the Compass Blueprint Growth Vision and includes nine chapters addressing land use and housing, transportation, air quality, energy, open space, water, solid waste, economy, and security and emergency preparedness. The action plans contained therein provide a series of recommended near-term policies that developers and key stakeholders should consider for implementation, as well as potential policies for consideration by local jurisdictions and agencies when conducting project review.

EXISTING SETTING

Table 3.10-1 shows the existing (2011) population, households, and employment numbers for each of the counties located within the SCAG region and the total for SCAG.

[1]SCAG, 2008 RCP website, http://www.scag.ca.gov/rcp/pdf/finalrcp/ f2008RCP_ExecSum.pdf, accessed May 26, 2011.

TABLE 3.10-1: 2011 POPULATION, HOUSEHOLDS, AND EMPLOYMENT IN THE SCAG REGION			
County	**2011 Population**	**2011 Households**	**2011 Employment**
Imperial	177,711	49,240	58,985
Los Angeles	9,894,657	3,250,864	4,148,186
Orange	3,045,507	1,001,689	1,497,913
Riverside	2,240,793	692,725	589,175
San Bernardino	2,066,502	614,402	643,691
Ventura	832,737	267,181	327,312
SCAG Region	**18,257,907**	**5,876,101**	**7,265,262**
SOURCE: SCAG Growth Forecasting, 2011.			

Population

The SCAG region is the second most populous metropolitan region in the nation. The U.S. Census reported the 2010 population (the most recent Census data available) of the SCAG region was 18,051,534. The California State Department of Finance estimates that the population of the region has since reached 18,163,664. Approximately six percent of the national population lives in the SCAG region, and for over half a century the region has been home to approximately half the population of California. **Table 3.10-2** shows the total population of the region, by decade, and the region's percentage of the total U.S. and California populations.

TABLE 3.10-2: SCAG POPULATION AND PERCENTAGE OF U.S. AND CALIFORNIA POPULATIONS, 1900 – 2010			
Year	**Population**	**Percentage of U.S. Population**	**Percentage of California Population**
1900	250,187	0.3%	16.9%
1910	661,907	0.7%	27.8%
1920	1,193,705	1.1%	34.8%
1930	2,657,969	2.2%	46.8%
1940	3,312,460	2.5%	48.0%
1950	4,997,221	3.3%	47.2%
1960	7,823,721	4.4%	49.8%
1970	10,055,351	4.9%	50.4%
1980	11,589,678	5.1%	49.0%
1990	14,640,832	5.9%	49.2%
2000	16,516,006	5.9%	48.8%
2010	18,051,534	5.8%	48.5%
SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census website, *http://factfinder2.census.gov*, accessed May 23, 2011.			

The population in the SCAG region increased by 1.7 million people between 2000 and 2011. This represents an increase of 10.6 percent (**Table 3.10-3**). In descending order, Riverside County grew by 45 percent (695,406 persons), Imperial County grew by 25 percent (35,350 persons), San Bernardino County grew by 21 percent (357,068 persons), Ventura County grew by 11 percent (79,540 persons), Orange County grew by seven percent (199,218 persons), and Los Angeles County grew by four percent (375,319 persons). Riverside County had the highest annual growth rate (4.09 percent) in the SCAG region.

TABLE 3.10-3: POPULATION GROWTH FOR 2000 AND 2011

County	2000 Population	2011 Population	2000-2011 Growth (Persons)	Percent Change (2000-2011)	Annual Growth Rate
Imperial	142,361	177,711	35,350	25%	2.26%
Los Angeles	9,519,338	9,894,657	375,319	4%	0.36%
Orange	2,846,289	3,045,507	199,218	7%	0.64%
Riverside	1,545,387	2,240,793	695,406	45%	4.09%
San Bernardino	1,709,434	2,066,502	357,068	21%	1.90%
Ventura	753,197	832,737	79,540	11%	0.96%
SCAG Region	**16,516,006**	**18,257,907**	**1,741,901**	**10.55%**	**0.96%**

SOURCE: SCAG, 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, Growth Forecast Appendix, Table 10, Page 21, 2011.

Household Size

Household size in the SCAG region decreased by approximately 0.11 of a person between 2000 and 2011, from 3.16 persons per household to 3.05 persons per household (**Table 3.10-4**). Average household size does not vary significantly from one county to another. In descending order, San Bernardino County and Riverside County household size grew, while Imperial County, Ventura County, Orange County and Los Angeles County household size declined between 2000 and 2011.

TABLE 3.10-4: HOUSEHOLD SIZE

County	2000	2011	2000-2011 Change (Persons)
Imperial	3.42	3.37	-0.05
Los Angeles	3.14	2.99	-0.15
Orange	3.06	3.00	-0.06
Riverside	3.09	3.18	0.09
San Bernardino	3.17	3.28	0.11
Ventura	3.11	3.06	-0.05
SCAG Region	**3.16**	**3.05**	**-0.11**

SOURCE: SCAG, 2012-2035 RTP.SCS, Growth Forecast Appendix, Table 6, Page 14, 2011.

Housing Characteristics

There were approximately 5.8 million households in the SCAG region in 2010 (**Table 3.10-5**). Los Angeles County accounts for nearly half of all households in the region.

Median household income in the SCAG region varies widely, from $37,458 in Imperial County to $77,539 in Ventura County. The county with the second highest median income is Orange County ($76,412). Across the SCAG region, the average median income is $59,155. Homeownership rates also vary, from a low of 48.6 percent in Los Angeles County to a high of 68.3 percent in Riverside County. The average homeownership rate in the SCAG region is 55.5 percent.

TABLE 3.10-5: 2010 HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

County	Households	Median Household Income	Homeownership Rate
Imperial	49,126	$37,458	54.50%
Los Angeles	3,241,204	$55,811	48.60%
Orange	992,781	$76,412	61.50%
Riverside	686,260	$58,464	68.30%
San Bernardino	847,400	$56,539	63.90%
Ventura	266,920	$77,539	66.80%
SCAG Region	**5,847,909**	**$59,155**	**55.50%**

SOURCE: SCAG, *Profiles of Imperial County, Los Angeles County, Orange County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, and Ventura County*, 2010. 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, Growth Forecast Appendix, Table 11, Page 21, 2011.

Employment

Employment trends in Southern California have long followed a "boom and bust" cycle. Much of the 2000's saw a boom of housing development, particularly, in the Inland Empire, only to be followed by a bust starting in 2008. This resulted in impacts to employment, particularly in the construction (housing) and service sectors. As shown in **Table 3.10-6**, only one county, Imperial, continues to show a net gain in jobs between 2000 and 2011. The remaining counties in the SCAG region, Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura all show a negative employment growth, as does the SCAG region as a whole. As of 2011, employment in Imperial County grew by 20 percent (9,200 jobs). The counties with the highest employment loss (in increasing order of percent of lost employment) are: Orange County (5 percent), Los Angeles County (14 percent loss), San Bernardino County (16 percent loss), Riverside County (17 percent) and Ventura County (20 percent loss). Overall, the SCAG Region lost approximately 995,300 jobs (or 13 percent) between 2000 and 2011.

TABLE 3.10-6: EMPLOYMENT GROWTH FOR 2000 AND 2011

County	2000 (Jobs)	2011 (Jobs)	2000-2011 Growth (Jobs)	Percent Change (2000-2011)
Imperial	46,300	55,500	9,200	20%
Los Angeles	4,424,900	3,788,900	-636,000	-14%
Orange	1,429,100	1,361,900	-67,200	-5%
Riverside	644,200	535,500	-108,700	-17%
San Bernardino	704,000	588,100	-115,900	-16%
Ventura	374,900	298,200	-76,700	-20%
SCAG Region	**7,623,400**	**6,628,100**	**-995,300**	**-13%**

SOURCE: State of California, Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, Industry Employment and Labor Force by Annual Average, March 2006 Benchmark, May 18, 2007. SCAG Growth Forecasting, 2011.

Unemployment

The 2010 (the most recent full year data available) unemployment rates in the SCAG region are among the highest in the country, exceeding the National and State average (9.5 percent and 12.4 percent, respectively). As shown in **Table 3.10-7**, in 2010 Imperial County had the highest unemployment rate in the SCAG region (almost 30 percent), while Orange County had the lowest in the SCAG region (9.6 percent, on par with the national average). In 2011, the average unemployment rate in the SCAG region was 15.3 percent. As shown in Table 3.10-7, the average year-to-date unemployment rates for 2011 show slightly lower unemployment rates for the entire SCAG region, State and Nation, indicating an increase in jobs.

TABLE 3.10-7: UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

County	2000 Unemployment Rate	Average 2011 Year-to-Date Unemployment (September 2011)
Imperial	17.4%	29.6%
Los Angeles	5.4%	12.2%
Orange	3.5%	8.6%
Riverside	5.4%	14%
San Bernardino	4.8%	12.9%
Ventura	4.5%	10.1%
SCAG Region	**6.8%**	**14.6%**
State Average	**4.90%**	**11.4%**
National Average	**4%**	**9.1%**

SOURCE: State of California Employment Development Department website, http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov, accessed May 26, 2011; SCAG 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, Growth Forecast Appendix, Figure 1, Page 7

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on CEQA Appendix G and adapted for the Plan, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would have a significant impact related to population, housing, and employment if it would:

- Induce substantial population growth to areas of the region; and/or
- Require the acquisition of right-of-ways that would displace a substantial number of existing businesses or homes.

Methodology

This following summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the expected population, housing, and employment impacts of implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS in the SCAG region[2].

Cumulative Analysis

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS addresses transportation projects and land use distribution patterns, including land use scenarios. These land use distribution patterns identify growth distribution and anticipated land use development to accommodate growth projections. The Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) used for this analysis captures pass-through traffic that does not have an origin or destination in the region, but does impact the region, so that too is included in the project analysis. Although a similar level of development is anticipated even without the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, this Plan would influence growth, including distribution patterns, throughout the region. To address this, the analysis in the PEIR covers overall impacts of all transportation projects and land development described in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. In addition, this PEIR considers cumulative impacts from other regional plans (e.g., the South Coast Air Quality management District), which could result in additional impacts inside and outside the region.

Comparison with the No Project Alternative

The analysis of population, housing, and employment includes a comparison of the expected future conditions with the Plan and the expected future conditions if no Plan were adopted (No Project). This evaluation is not included in the determination of the significance of impacts (which is based on a comparison to existing conditions); however, it provides a meaningful perspective on the effects of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS.

Determination of Significance

The methodology for determining the significance of population, housing, and employment impacts compares the existing conditions to future (2035) conditions, as required in CEQA Section 15126.2(a).

The CEQA Guidelines require "growth-inducing" impacts to be discussed. Such impacts occur when the Plan could foster economic or population growth, or remove obstacles to growth. Growth inducing impacts include both changes in the amount and distribution of growth. This section analyzes the potential growth-inducing impacts of the 2012 RTP/SCS.

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS consists of a combination of transportation policies, objectives, investments, and land use-transportation measures (see Chapter 2.0 Project Description of this PEIR for the Plan's goals,

[2]The Environmental Justice section of the Plan and associated appendix contains substantial analysis of gentrification and displacement impacts to low income, minority and other protected groups. See Environmental Justice Appendix of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. However, the PEIR does not rely on this analysis as it addresses displacement impacts as they affect the community as a whole, including loss of affordable housing.

policies transportation investments and land use policies). In addition, project growth forecasts were developed for a range of alternatives (see Chapter 4.0 Alternatives). For each alternative, differing sets of policies, objectives, and investments were applied. Alternative growth forecasts vary in their reliance on local input trend data and existing General Plans. The No Project Alternative includes only those programmed transportation projects that received federal environmental clearance by December 2011, projects in the 2011 FTIP and projects currently under construction or right of way approval. The growth forecast for the No Project Alternative relies exclusively on trend data adjusted to reflect 2012-2035 RTP/SCS growth totals. The 2008 Modified RTP Alternative is an update of the adopted 2008 RTP to reflect the most recent growth estimates and transportation planning decisions and assumptions, and the Envision 2 Alternative builds on the concentration of growth in the High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs) as described in the Plan and goes further. It includes far more aggressive densities than the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, especially around HQTAs, increases mobility, reduces emissions, and limits the development of single-family housing that would be built in the region. The No Project Alternative indicates the population, household, and employment distribution that could be expected without implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The 2035 population, households, and employment growth projections for each alternative are held constant at the regional level, but differ from one another in distribution of people, households, and jobs. Changes in investments and policies would shift the population distribution as a function of changes in mobility and land use decisions.

Projects in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS were reviewed to identify those that may involve right-of-way acquisition and the potential for displacement of homes and businesses. Each project that might require acquisition of right-of-way was reviewed to generally identify locations that had the potential for large displacement of existing homes and businesses.

The potential for community disruption was assessed by evaluating the location of proposed projects in relation to surrounding land uses and community development. Highway and transit extensions and major interchange projects were assumed to have a higher potential to disrupt or divide existing communities since they would involve the creation of new roadways. Highway widening and other projects along established transportation rights-of-way were assumed to have a lower potential to divide or disrupt existing communities and neighborhoods.

The following analysis is based on general descriptions of projects in the Plan (see Chapter 2.0 Project Description and Appendix B 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Project List) and is regional and programmatic in nature. This section is intended to serve as a regional cumulative analysis for local jurisdictions in the preparation of project specific environmental documentation and to provide a framework for mitigation measures.

Implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would affect the distribution of population, households, and employment. Expected significant impacts include substantial induced population growth in areas of the region adjacent to transit, right-of-way acquisitions that could displace a substantial number of existing businesses and homes, separation of residences from community facilities and services, and a cumulatively considerable impact on vacant natural lands.

Short-term construction-related impacts and long-term or permanent displacement, as well as off-site impacts from new facilities, would occur as a result of implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. Indirect impacts from the changes in population distribution expected to occur due to the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS's transportation investments and land use policies are also identified.

IMPACTS

Impact 3.10-1 Potential to facilitate substantial population growth to some areas of the region.

Population Growth. As discussed in Chapter 2.0 Project Description, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS growth scenario is based on local input with a redistribution of growth around HQTAs and other minor modifications. The population growth projection represents the expected amount and distribution of people that would occur in 2035 if the policies and investments included in the Plan were to be implemented. As shown in **Table 3.10-8,** the total SCAG region population is expected to increase by approximately 3.89 million persons upon buildout of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The land use development pattern of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, which assumes a significant increase in small-lot, single- and multi-family housing, will mainly occur in infill locations near transit infrastructure (HQTAs). In some cases, the land use pattern assumes that more of these housing types will be built than is currently anticipated in local general plans, and in most cases, this shift in housing type—especially the switch from large-lot to small-lot single-family homes—will occur naturally in the marketplace as developers shift to products in high demand. In 2008, 45 percent of total housing units were multi-family products. The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS projects that in 2035, 68 percent of new homes in the SCAG region will be multi-family units.

Of the 648,000 new housing units expected in 2020, 28 percent will be at a minimum 30 dwelling units per acre; and of the 1.5 million new housing units expected in 2035, 34 percent will be at a minimum 30 dwelling units per acre. In accordance with Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(ii), these projected housing densities will help the region accommodate the projected housing needs at all income levels over the life of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, especially housing at the lower income categories. Additionally, SCAG moves towards improving the current distribution of households by income category in the region through the allocation of projected housing needs at the local level. After the final RHNA plan is adopted in October 2012, SCAG jurisdictions will revise their Housing Elements to meet their respective allocations. The SCS's strategies will inform the development of those Housing Elements.

TABLE 3.10-8: 2012 RTP/SCS POPULATION GROWTH PROJECTIONS (2035)

County	2011 Existing Population (Persons)	2035 Plan Projected Population (Persons)	Increase (Persons)
Imperial	177,711	288,200	110,489
Los Angeles	9,894,657	11,350,400	1,455,743
Orange	3,045,507	3,417,800	372,293
Riverside	2,240,793	3,380,900	1,140,107
San Bernardino	2,066,502	2,749,800	683,298
Ventura	832,737	958,700	125,963
SCAG Region	**18,257,907**	**22,145,800**	**3,887,893**

SOURCE: SCAG Growth Forecasting, 2011.

As significant changes occur in existing communities there is potential for "gentrification," or the displacement of lower-income residents if new development brings higher-income residents into a neighborhood. As the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS is implemented, jurisdictions in the SCAG region must be sensitive to the possibility of gentrification and work to employ strategies that can ameliorate it. One strategy is the general approach of higher-density infill development, which means that neighborhoods will be adding to the local housing stock rather than maintaining the current stock and simply changing the residential population. A second is the development of permanently affordable housing, through deed restrictions or development by nonprofit developers, which will ensure that some units will remain affordable to lower income households. SCAG will work with local jurisdictions and community stakeholders to seek resources and provide assistance to address any possible gentrification effects of new development on existing communities and vulnerable populations.

The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS land use development pattern accommodates over 50 percent of new housing and employment growth in HQTAs, while keeping jurisdictional totals consistent with local input. It moves the region towards more compact, mixed-use development leading to more opportunities for walking and biking, more transit use, and shorter auto trips. The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS includes 13 development types, which are used to meet the demand for a broader range of housing types, including the development of smaller-lot single-family homes, townhomes, and multi-family condominiums and apartments.

The transportation investments and urban form strategies in the proposed 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would foster substantial economic and household growth and would remove some obstacles to growth in some parts of the region. Specifically, the improved accessibility from the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS could help facilitate population and economic growth to areas of the region that are currently not developed. Therefore, implementation of the Plan would induce growth in some areas of the SCAG region. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-POP1** would reduce impacts related to population growth; however, the impacts would remain significant.

Impact 3.10-2 Potential to require the acquisition of rights-of-way (ROW) that could displace a substantial number of existing homes and businesses.

In general, projects proposed in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would attempt to utilize existing rights-of-way (ROWs) to the maximum extent feasible. However, development of some highway, arterial, and transit projects proposed under the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would result in the disturbance and/or loss of residential and business uses (notably the I-710 Gap Closure). In particular, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS includes system expansion projects such as new freeway lane miles and new transit track miles that have the potential to result in the loss of land currently used for residential and business purposes. In past RTPs, SCAG has envisioned a system of truck-only lanes extending from the San Pedro Bay Ports to downtown Los Angeles along the I-710, connecting to an east-west segment, and finally reaching the I-15 in San Bernardino County. Significant progress towards a regional freight corridor system has continued as evidenced by recent work on an environmental impact report (expected to be completed in 2012) for the I-710 segment. As part of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, SCAG includes a refined concept for the east-west corridor component of the system and connections to an initial segment of I-15. After adoption of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, it is anticipated that significant additional study of alignments will be conducted, including an alternatives analysis completed as part of a full environmental review.

The East-West Freight Corridor would carry between 58,000 and 70,000 trucks per day. These are trucks that would be removed from adjacent general-purpose lanes and local arterial roads. These facilities, depending on the alignment, potentially would traverse through lands currently used for residential and business purposes. The final alignment would likely be adjacent to or concurrent with existing alignments, thus the adverse effects on displacing homes and businesses would be minimized. Additional goods movement projects included in the Plan such as grade separations also have the potential to displace homes or businesses as many of the areas where grade separations are proposed would be in developed urban areas.

SCAG's GIS was used to analyze where major freeway, rail, and transit projects, such as those described above, would intersect areas used for residential development and business uses. A 150-foot potential impact zone was drawn around the freeway, rail and transit projects in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS to compute the number of acres that could potentially be affected by the construction and operation of project in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. **Table 3.10-9** shows the current land uses that are located within the 150 feet of either side of Plan projects.

TABLE 3.10-9: LAND USES AFFECTED BY PLAN PROJECTS

Land Use	No Project (Acres)	Plan (Acres)
Agriculture	60.88	1,604.80
Commercial	266.11	3,703.80
Education	45.47	282.19
Extraction	0.00	79.62
Facilities	46.06	536.37
Industrial	117.21	2,028.49
Low Density Residential	255.83	1,993.22
Medium to High Residential	97.13	1,048.38
Military Installations	0.66	489.59
Mixed Commercial and Industrial	8.02	103.55
Mixed Urban	0.06	26.41
Open Space and Recreation	184.71	732.72
Rural Density Residential	5.65	194.21
Transportation, Communications, and Utilities	1,869.39	3,912.95
Under Construction	1.62	161.59
Undevelopable	161.29	3.68
Unknown	0.69	27.70
Vacant	952.68	9,187.57
Water	0.30	77.98
Total	**4,073.77**	**26,194.81**

SOURCE: SCAG GIS Analysis, 2011; SCAG Land Use, 2008.

As indicated in **Table 3.10-9**, all types of residential and business uses would be impacted by Plan projects. In total, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS includes 74,297 new lane miles including freeways, toll roads, major and minor arterials, collectors, and HOV lanes. These additional transportation facilities could displace homes and businesses in the region.

Additional residential and business lands would be affected by the growth associated with the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-POP2** and **MM-POP3** would reduce impacts related to population displacement; however, the impacts would remain significant.

Displacement of affordable housing in particular can have a negative impact on a community as these types of units may not be replaced. MM-POP4 could reduce impacts but not below a significant level.

Cumulative Impact 3.10-3: The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS will influence the pattern of growth in the region through transportation investments and land use strategies. These investments and land use strategies could contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in population outside the region.

Implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS will result in an increase in population, housing and employment over the next 25 years, it is possible that the improved accessibility gained by transportation investments and key land use strategies could result in an increase in population in areas outside the region (as people find it easier to move from outside the region to employment centers within the region). If population increases to areas outside the SCAG region were in excess of forecasts and plans, it would be a significant impact. Therefore, the Plan would contribute to a cumulatively considerable population impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-POP5** and **MM-POP6** would reduce cumulative impacts; however, the impacts would remain significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures **MM-POP1, MM-POP5,** and **MM-POP6** shall be implemented by SCAG over the lifetime of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. Mitigation Measures **MM-POP2, MM-POP3** and **MM-POP4** can and should be implemented by project sponsors (for both development and transportation projects) as applicable. Project specific environmental documents may adjust these mitigation measures as necessary to respond to site-specific conditions. Projects taking advantage of CEQA Streamlining provisions of SB 375 can and should apply mitigation measures as appropriate to site-specific conditions.

Population Growth

MM-POP1: SCAG shall work with its member agencies to implement growth strategies to create an urban form designed to focus development in HQTAs in accordance with the policies, strategies and investments contained in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, enhancing mobility and reducing land consumption.

Displacement

MM-POP2: For projects with the potential to displace homes and/or businesses, project sponsors can and should evaluate alternate route alignments and transportation facilities that minimize the displacement of homes and businesses. An iterative design and impact analysis would help where impacts to homes or businesses are involved. Potential impacts should be minimized to the extent feasible. If possible, existing rights-of-way should be used.

MM-POP3: Project sponsors can and should develop a construction schedule that minimizes potential neighborhood deterioration from protracted waiting periods between right-of-way acquisition and construction.

MM-POP4: Project sponsors shall mitigate impacts to affordable housing as feasible through construction of affordable units (deed restricted to remain affordable for an appropriate period of time) or payment of any fee established to address loss of affordable housing.

Cumulative

MM-POP5: SCAG's Compass Blueprint strategy will be used to build consensus in the region relating to changes in land use to accommodate future population growth while maintaining the quality of life in the region.

MM-POP6: SCAG shall work with neighboring planning agencies and MPOs to ensure plans and strategies can accommodate future population growth beyond SCAG's borders.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Population Growth

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-POP1** would reduce potential impacts related to population. In addition, the policies included in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS seek to direct growth in a way that is efficient for both mobility and land consumption. However, implementation of the Plan would help induce growth to certain areas of the region. Therefore, this impact would remain significant.

Displacement

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-POP2** through **MM-POP3** would reduce potential impacts related to displacement of residences and businesses. Not all of the projects included in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS will be constructed in existing right-of-way. A substantial number of businesses and residences will likely be displaced due to development associated with projects in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. Therefore, this impact will remain significant. Mitigation Measure **MM-POP4** would help mitigate impacts to affordable housing.

Cumulative

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-POP5** and **MM-POP6** would reduce potential impacts related to cumulative population, housing, and employment. However, the accessibility and afforded by the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, and the expected shift in population, households and employment associated with the mobility benefits would change growth patterns in the region. Therefore, this impact would remain significant.

COMPARISON WITH THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Given the location of the region, its mild climate and existing population trends, growth in the region is inevitable. **Table 3.10-10** shows the growth that would be expected to occur under the No Project Alternative and the Plan. In the No Project Alternative, the population of the SCAG region grows by the same number of people (approximately 3.89 million); however, no regional transportation investments are made other than existing programmed projects.

TABLE 3.10-10: 2035 POPULATION, HOUSEHOLDS, AND EMPLOYMENT IN THE SCAG REGION

	2035 Population		2035 Households		2035 Employment	
County	**No Project**	**Plan**	**No Project**	**Plan**	**No Project**	**Plan**
Imperial	288,200	288,200	90,800	90,800	121,100	121,100
Los Angeles	11,350,400	11,350,400	3,851,300	3,851,300	4,826,600	4,826,600
Orange	3,417,800	3,417,800	1,123,500	1,123,500	1,779,000	1,779,000
Riverside	3,380,900	3,380,900	1,091,500	1,091,500	1,236,800	1,236,800
San Bernardino	2,749,800	2,749,800	847,400	847,400	1,059,400	1,059,400
Ventura	958,700	958,700	318,400	318,400	413,200	413,200
SCAG Region	**22,145,800**	**22,145,800**	**7,322,900**	**7,322,900**	**9,436,100**	**9,436,100**

SOURCE: SCAG Growth Forecasting, 2011.

Direct Impacts

The No Project Alternative contains fewer transportation investments than the Plan. Consequently, there would be fewer places where businesses and homes would be displaced and fewer places where communities would be disrupted. The GIS analysis of existing land use data shows that the freeway, transit, and freight rail projects in the No Project Alternative would occur within 150 feet of 275 acres of business land uses (commercial, industrial, and extraction land uses) and 359 acres of residential land uses (rural, low, and medium to high density housing land uses). For the Plan, 3,834 acres of business land uses and 3,236 acres of residential land uses would be affected by transportation projects. The Plan impacts would be greater than the No Project Alternative impacts for Impacts 3.10-1, 3.10-2 and 3.10-3.

Cumulative Impacts

The No Project Alternative is expected to accommodate the same increases in total population as the Plan. However, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS includes land use measures that would help reduce displacement and would target growth in developed urban areas. These mitigation measures are absent in the No Project Alternative. The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS also includes additional transportation improvements that facilitate access to currently vacant lands that would be less accessible with the No Project Alternative. This improved accessibility under the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS could encourage growth in previously undeveloped areas, however, land use strategies would aggressively seek to reduce consumption of vacant, open space/recreation and agricultural lands. The No Project Alternative could consume about 742 acres of vacant, open space/recreation and agricultural lands, while the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS would consume about 334 acres. Although the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS and the No Project Alternative would result in a different distribution of consumed land, they would result in the same total population, employment and households.

Because the Plan would facilitate coordinated planning efforts with neighboring planning agencies and would target growth in HQTAs and away from vacant lands, the No Project Alternative's cumulative impacts to population, households and employment could be greater than those of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS.