# 3.16 Socioeconomics

## 3.16.1 Introduction

This section discusses demographic conditions within the study area and examines the potential displacement and relocation of housing, residents, and businesses that may result from implementation of the proposed project.

Greater details on Socioeconomics can be found in the *Socioeconomics Technical Background Report*. Full bibliographic references can be found in Appendix B (Bibliography).

## 3.16.2 Existing Conditions

**Population and Employment**

Population and employment data are presented at the county and city level, and for the census blocks that comprise the study area. According to the 2006 American Community Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, approximately 9,948,000 persons lived in Los Angeles County in 2006, an approximate 1-percent increase from 2000.[76] The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects the population in Los Angeles County to grow approximately 27 percent from 2000 to 2030.[77] In this same time period, population in the city of Los Angeles is projected to increase by about 18 percent; in the city of Culver City by about 8 percent; and in the city of Santa Monica by about 9.6 percent. The cities in the study area are mostly built out, with growth rates far below the county as a whole. Approximately 290,800 persons resided in the study area in the year 2000. Population within the study area is expected to grow by 14 percent, about 40,300, by 2030.

Employment (i.e., jobs available) in Los Angeles County is projected to grow by 21 percent from 2000 to 2030 (SCAG 2007). Culver City and Santa Monica are expected to have substantial increases in employment from 2000 to 2030 at 104 percent and 100 percent, respectively (SCAG 2007). Table 3.16-1 (Population and Employment) presents population and employment data for year 2000, projections for 2030, and percent change over the ~~thirty~~30-year period. Approximately 222,600 people were employed in the study area in 2000. Employment in the study area is projected to grow by 24 percent in the 2000 to 2030 period, or approximately 52,800 as shown in Table 3.16-1 (Population and Employment).

[76] U.S. Census Bureau, American FactFinder, 2006 American Community Survey. Website: http://factfinder.census.gov, accessed November 13, 2007.
[77] SCAG Website: http://www.scag.ca.gov, accessed October 22, 2008.

**Table 3.16-1 Population and Employment**

| City | 2000 | 2030 | Percent Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Population** | | | |
| Study Area | 290,787 | 331,116 | 13.9% |
| Culver City | 38,816 | 41,929 | 8.0% |
| Los Angeles | 3,694,820 | 4,348,281 | 17.7% |
| Santa Monica | 84,084 | 92,120 | 9.6% |
| Los Angeles County | 9,884,300 | 12,513,500 | 26.6% |
| **Employment** | | | |
| Study Area | 222,633 | 275,405 | 23.7% |
| Culver City | 23,568 | 48,040 | 103.8% |
| Los Angeles | 1,690,316 | 1,960,393 | 16.0% |
| Santa Monica | 53,998 | 107,713 | 99.5% |
| Los Angeles County | 4,761,400 | 5,775,000 | 21.3% |

SOURCES: 2000 data are from the U.S. Census Bureau, American FactFinder, http://factfinder.census.gov (accessed November 13, 2007); 2030 data are from SCAG: http://www.scag.ca.gov (accessed October 22, 2008)

## Residential and Commercial Vacancy Rates

The ease of relocating individuals and businesses depends in part on the availability of residential and commercial/industrial properties within each city. Affected property owners would be compensated in accordance with the California *Relocation Assistance Act* (discussed below) regardless of the number of vacancies in the city. According to the California Department of Finance (DOF) in 2007, of the three cities, Santa Monica has the highest residential vacancy rate at 7 percent with an estimated 3,498 vacant dwelling units. City of Los Angeles residential vacancy rates are about 5 percent with approximately 64,770 vacant dwelling units, and Culver City residential vacancy rates are 3 percent with approximately 519 vacant dwelling units. The commercial (i.e., nonresidential) vacancy rates for Culver City, Los Angeles, and Santa Monica are roughly equal at 7 percent. Industrial vacancy rates are about 2 percent in Los Angeles. According to Grubb & Ellis in 2007, Culver City has the highest commercial vacancy rate at about 11 percent with an estimated 641,583 square feet (sf) of vacant commercial space. The commercial vacancy rate in West Los Angeles is at about 7 percent with an estimated 3,834,410 sf of vacant commercial space, and Santa Monica is at about 6 percent with an estimated 485,054 sf of vacant commercial space. Residential and commercial vacancy rates are provided in Table 3.16-2 (Existing Residential and Commercial Vacancy Rates).

**Table 3.16-2 Existing Residential and Commercial Vacancy Rates**

| City | Residential (%) | Commercial [Nonresidential] (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Culver City | 3.0 | 7.2 |
| Los Angeles | 4.6 | 7.4 |
| Santa Monica | 7.0 | 6.6 |

SOURCES: California Department of Finance, E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates 1/1/08. Website: http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5_2001-06/documents/E-5_2008%20Internet%20Version.xls, accessed September 2008; Grub& Ellis (2007) (retrieved from http://www.westside-la.org/pdf/WSOfficePres2007.pdf?2946f5d156af9794e8ab6f4d438ebd0c=33e380e454e5a0e411c0cdf3d51e1cc8 on Jan 17, 2008)

## 3.16.3 Regulatory Setting

### California Relocation Assistance Act (Government Code, Sections 7260, et seq.)

Following enactment of the federal relocation law in 1970, California's legislature enacted the *Relocation Assistance Act of 1971*, requiring public entities to provide procedural protections and benefits when they displace businesses, homeowners, and tenants in the process of implementing public projects for public benefit. State law allows a displaced person certain compensation for a forced relocation, including relocation assistance and reimbursement of moving costs.

### Eminent Domain Law (California Code of Civil Procedure, Title 7, Sections 12301.010 through 1273.050)

Title 7 of the California Code of Civil Procedure outlines the steps required for public entities to follow when the power of eminent domain is necessary to acquire property for a public use. The power of eminent domain may be exercised to acquire property for a proposed project only if all of the following are established: *(a)* the public interest and necessity require the project; *(b)* the project is planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury; and *(c)* the property sought to be acquired is necessary for the project.

The *California Public Utilities Code* Section 130051.11 gives the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) the right to administratively delegate to an organizational unit or to its chief executive officer any powers and duties it deems appropriate such as the power of eminent domain.

The Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority (Expo Authority) was established by the passage of California Senate Bill 504 that was signed by the Governor on October 10, 2003. As described in *California Public Utilities Code* (Code) Section 132600, the Expo Authority shall have various powers and duties, including the power of eminent domain related to the completion of a light-rail line between downtown Los Angeles and downtown Santa Monica.

### 3.16.4 Analytic Methodology

For the displacement and disruption of existing uses, real estate maps were used to identify properties that would be displaced or acquired for the project (refer to Appendix G). Where acquisitions are required, an effort was made to limit displacement by considering partial property acquisitions. Where this was not feasible, full acquisitions were identified. Existing residential and commercial vacancy rates within the cities in which the identified parcel acquisitions would occur were reviewed to determine whether relocation could be accommodated within the existing building inventory. Persons per household statistics for each city were used to identify the potential number of displaced residents. The actual number of residents living within each potentially displaced unit is unknown.

The study area for the socioeconomic analysis includes census blocks located within 0.5 mile on either side of the proposed alignment. Demographic information was obtained from SCAG, the U.S. Census Bureau 2000 census, and Claritas, a demographic research firm. Displacement and relocation effects were identified through review of the real estate maps.

### 3.16.5 Criteria, Impact Evaluation, and Mitigation Measures

| **Criterion** | **Would the project necessitate the acquisition of real property, and result in businesses, residential owners, or tenants being required to relocate?** |
|---|---|

**No-Build Alternative**

There would be roadway and transit service improvements associated with the No-Build Alternative. Within the Expo Phase 2 ROW, the No-Build Alternative would not require land acquisitions and relocations, and ***no impact*** would occur.

**Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative**

The TSM Alternative would include all of the improvements under the No-Build Alternative and new on-street bus services to directly serve the Expo Phase 2 community transit needs. Those additional improvements would include minor physical modifications such as upgraded bus stops and additional buses. Within the study area, the TSM Alternative would not result in any land acquisitions or relocation, and ***no impact*** would occur.

**LRT Alternatives**

The Expo Authority is required for any property acquisition to abide by existing laws and regulations to ensure relocation assistance and compensation. Table 3.16-3 (Estimated Property Acquisitions by LRT Alternative) provides a comparison of the estimated number of properties that could be acquired under each LRT Alternative. The LRT Alternatives would necessitate the acquisition of real property, and result in residential and business relocation.

There are a number of potential acquisitions associated with curb cuts in the tables below. These acquisitions are related to bringing the street corner radii up to current standards including the required ADA ramps when the LRT Alternatives involve street improvements. This modernization allows larger vehicles to more easily negotiate turns from one street to another.

## Table 3.16-3 Estimated Property Acquisitions by LRT Alternative

| LRT Alternative | Residential Acquisitions[a] | | | Commercial Acquisitions[b] | | | Public Acquisitions | | Total Property Acquisitions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Full | Partial | Partial (curb cuts) | Full | Partial | Partial (curb cuts) | Full | Partial | |
| LRT 1: Expo ROW–Olympic[b] | 2 | ~~2~~8 | ~~12~~7 | 7 | ~~4~~13 | ~~22~~20 | 4 | ~~9~~7 | ~~62~~68 |
| LRT 2: Expo ROW–Colorado | 1 | ~~2~~8 | ~~12~~7 | ~~8~~7 | ~~7~~19 | ~~40~~39 | ~~4~~5 | ~~9~~6 | ~~83~~92 |
| LRT 3: Venice/Sepulveda–Olympic[b] | ~~27~~29 | ~~48~~46 | 22 | ~~12~~19 | ~~17~~14 | ~~54~~51 | ~~5~~0 | ~~9~~7 | ~~194~~188 |
| LRT 4: Venice/Sepulveda–Colorado | ~~26~~28 | ~~48~~46 | 22 | ~~13~~19 | 20 | ~~72~~70 | ~~5~~1 | ~~9~~6 | ~~215~~212 |

SOURCES: DMJM Harris, 2008; PBS&J, 2008; updated 2009.

a. Four potential TPSS locations were identified in Segment 1. For purposes of this analysis 1 residential property and 3 commercial properties were consolidated into 1 residential full acquisition.

b. Two potential TPSS locations were identified in Segment 3 (Olympic) that require potential acquisition. One location could require acquisition of up to 5 properties (4 commercial properties and 1 residential property have been identified). The other location would require acquisition of a public parcel. For the purpose of this analysis, the effect from acquiring the 1 residential and 4 commercial properties is evaluated.

In some instances, jurisdictional cities have allowed variances from the city standards, which still comply with ADA, in order to avoid impacting adjacent properties. The Expo Authority will work with the appropriate cities to determine the optimum design for the selected LRT Alternative. Thus, the number of curb cuts in the table above ~~below~~ indicates a conservative approach and will likely be reduced during Preliminary Engineering (PE).

The number of acquisitions associated with each LRT Alternative ranges from a low of 68~~62~~ to a high of 212~~215~~, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Adherence to existing laws and regulations regarding relocation assistance and compensation for property acquisitions would be required and would ensure that this impact remains ***less than significant***.

**FEIR Design Options**

As detailed in Table 3.16-4 (Estimated Changes in Property Acquisitions by FEIR Design Option), implementation of the Sepulveda Grade Separation, Colorado Parking Retention, Colorado/4th Parallel Platform and South Side Parking, Maintenance Facility Buffer, or Expo/Westwood Station No Parking design options would alter the number of full and partial commercial acquisitions associated with the LRT Alternatives. In general, the design options would either reduce the total number of property acquisitions or result in no net change. As such, impacts would remain ***less than significant***.

**Table 3.16-4 Estimated Changes in Property Acquisitions by FEIR Design Option**

| FEIR Design Option | Changes in Commercial Acquisitions | | | Changes in Property Acquisitions |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Full | Partial | Partial (curb cuts) | |
| Sepulveda Grade Separation | -1 | -6 | -2 | -9 |
| Colorado Parking Retention | -1 | 0 | +1 | 0 |
| Colorado/4th Parallel Platform and South Side Parking | -1 | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| Maintenance Facility Buffer | +1 | -1 | -1 | -1 |
| Expo/Westwood Station No Parking | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

SOURCE: DMJM Harris, 2009.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Criterion** | **Would the project displace substantial numbers of people and/or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere or create a demand for additional housing that cannot be accommodated by existing housing stock?** |

**No-Build Alternative**

There would be roadway and transit service improvements associated with the No-Build Alternative. Within the Expo Phase 2 ROW, the No-Build Alternative would not require land acquisitions and relocations, and ***no impact*** would occur.

## Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative

The TSM Alternative would include all of the improvements under the No-Build Alternative and new on-street bus services to directly serve the Expo Phase 2 community transit needs. Those additional improvements would include minor physical modifications such as upgraded bus stops and additional buses. Within the study area, the TSM Alternative would not result in displacement of people and/or existing housing, and ***no impact*** would occur.

## LRT Alternatives

This analysis accounts for the potential displacement of existing housing units along the LRT Alternatives as a result of full property acquisitions needed to create the LRT right-of-way. Full acquisitions often require relocation, while partial acquisitions would not. Table 3.16-54 (Estimated Residential Displacements by LRT Alternative) provides a comparison of the estimated number of units and residents that could be relocated under each LRT Alternative. Each homeowner and renter displaced as a result of the project would be given advanced written notice and would be informed of the eligibility requirements for relocation assistance and payments. An effort would be made to limit displacement.

**Table 3.16-54 Estimated Residential Displacements by LRT Alternative**

| LRT Alternative | Los Angeles | | Culver City | | Santa Monica | | Total Residents Displaced |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Units | Residents | Units | Residents | Units | Residents | |
| LRT 1: Expo ROW–Olympic | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| LRT 2: Expo ROW–Colorado | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| LRT 3: Venice/ Sepulveda–Olympic | ~~73~~75 | ~~178~~183 | 31 | 76 | 1 | 2 | ~~256~~261 |
| LRT 4: Venice/ Sepulveda–Colorado | ~~73~~75 | ~~178~~183 | 31 | 76 | 0 | 0 | ~~254~~259 |

SOURCE: Department of Finance. 2008. http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5_2001-06/documents/E-5_2008%20Internet%20Version.xls accessed January 20, 2009.

Residential displacement was determined by multiplying the number of displaced residential households by 2.44 persons per household (pph); the average for the three cities:

Culver City: 2.42 pph
Los Angeles: 2.97 pph
Santa Monica: 1.92

For the residential acquisitions within Culver City, Los Angeles, and Santa Monica, it appears that there would be sufficient housing stock to absorb the displaced occupants. For each of the property displacements, relocation assistance and compensation would be provided by the Expo Authority as required by the *California Relocation Assistance Act*. Any potential displacement of existing housing units would require the Expo Authority to abide by existing

laws and regulations to ensure relocation assistance and compensation, ensuring that this impact remains ***less than significant***.

**FEIR Design Options**

Development of the Sepulveda Grade Separation, Colorado Parking Retention, Colorado/4th Parallel Platform and South Side Parking, Maintenance Facility Buffer, or Expo/Westwood Station No Parking design options would not displace people and/or existing housing. As such, no change in the impact of the project would occur with implementation of the design options. Impacts would remain ***less than significant***.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Criterion** | **Would the project result in the termination of Metro's long-term leases/licenses prior to their original expiration date for the purpose of constructing a transit service improvement and supporting infrastructure?** |

**No-Build Alternative**

There would be roadway and transit service improvements associated with the No-Build Alternative. Within the Expo Phase 2 ROW, the No-Build Alternative would not require lease terminations, and ***no impact*** would occur.

**Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative**

The TSM Alternative would include all of the improvements under the No-Build Alternative and new on-street bus services to directly serve the Expo Phase 2 community transit needs. Those additional improvements would include minor physical modifications such as upgraded bus stops and additional buses. Within the study area, the TSM Alternative would not result in termination of any leases/licenses, and ***no impact*** would occur.

**LRT Alternatives**

This analysis assesses the need to terminate long-term and temporary lease/license arrangements between Metro and businesses located within the Expo ROW. Two types of lease/license agreements currently exist: agreements originally made with the Southern Pacific ~~Santa Fe~~ Railroad prior to Metro's purchase of the Expo ROW; and lease/license agreements entered into by Metro with businesses after the acquisition of the Expo ROW.

Leases/licenses entered into directly by Metro generally include the right to terminate the lease/license for any transportation project and include a relocation waiver as a condition to entering into the lease/license; or are month-to-month leases/licenses, which are temporary in nature. The termination of these leases/licenses would not constitute an impact and would not require compensation. Pre-acquisition leases/licenses have been identified along the LRT Alternatives; however, no early lease/license terminations are anticipated to be required. If early lease/license terminations are subsequently determined to be required, the business owner would be compensated pursuant to *California Relocation Assistance Act* requirements. Adherence to these existing laws and regulations regarding relocation assistance and compensation for property acquisitions would ensure that this impact remains ***less than significant***.

**FEIR Design Options**

Development of the Sepulveda Grade Separation, Colorado Parking Retention, Colorado/4th Parallel Platform and South Side Parking, Maintenance Facility Buffer, or Expo/Westwood Station No Parking design options would not result in the termination of additional Metro long-term leases other than those associated with the LRT Alternatives. As such, no change in the impact of the project would occur with implementation of the design options. Impacts would remain ***less than significant***.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Criterion** | **Would the project Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?** |

Refer to Chapter 5 (Other CEQA Considerations) for the discussion of growth inducement.