# 4.18 Growth-Inducing Impacts

## 4.18.1 Regulatory Framework and Methodology

### 4.18.1.1 Regulatory Framework

The applicable federal, state, and local regulations that are relevant to an analysis of the proposed project's growth-inducing impacts are listed below. For additional information regarding these regulations, please see the Growth-Inducing Impacts Report in Appendix Y of this Draft EIS/EIR.

#### Federal

Federal regulations that would be applicable to the proposed project include the following:

- National Environmental Policy Act; and
- Federal Transit Administration Guidelines.

#### State

The following state regulation would be applicable to the proposed project:

- California Environmental Quality Act.

#### Local

Local regulations that would be applicable to the proposed project include the following:

- Metropolitan Planning Organization;
- 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (2008 RCP);
- 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy;
- Compass Blue Print;
- City of Los Angeles Community Plans; and
- City of Los Angeles Framework Element.

### 4.18.1.2 Methodology

NEPA requires that the federal government use all practicable means to ensure that all Americans have safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] 4331(b)(2)). NEPA does not include specific guidance or direction with respect to evaluating alternatives and relative effects of inducing growth.

The growth inducing impact analysis is based on the established demographic characteristics within the project study area, which are identified by using the most current available data from SCAG, the California Department of Finance and the California Employment Development Department. This data is used to document changes in various trends (population, housing and employment). The potential for the project alternatives to result in growth inducing impacts is based on their ability to influence the: (1) rate, (2) location, (3) amount and (4) type of growth in the project study area and/or Los Angeles County.

### 4.18.1.3 Significance Thresholds

Significance thresholds are used to determine whether a project may have a significant environmental impact or effect. The significance thresholds, as defined by federal and state regulations and guidelines, are discussed below.

#### NEPA

NEPA does not include specific significance thresholds. According to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing NEPA, the determination of significance under NEPA is based on context and intensity.[1] The CEQA thresholds (described below) encompass the factors taken into account under NEPA to determine the significance of an action in terms of its context and the intensity of its impacts. Therefore, the CEQA thresholds listed below also apply to NEPA for the proposed project and its alternatives.

#### CEQA

CEQA requires analysis of a project's potential to induce growth. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) require that environmental documents "discuss the ways in which the project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment."[2]

Per the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would result in a significant growth-inducing impact if it would:[3]

- 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).

#### L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide

According to the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis and shall consider the following factors in determining whether a project would normally have a significant growth-inducing impact:[4]

- The degree to which the project would cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of projected occupancy/buildout and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment;
- Whether the project would introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted community plan or general plan; and
- The extent to which growth would occur without implementation of the project.

[1] Code of Federal Regulations. *CEQ-Regulations for Implementing NEPA, 40 CFR Part 1508, Terminology and Index*.
[2] Association of Environmental Professionals. *2015 CEQA Statute and Guidelines.*
[3] Association of Environmental Professionals. *2015 CEQA Statute and Guidelines.*
[4] City of Los Angeles. 2006. *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*. Available: http://www.http://environmentla.com/programs/Thresholds/Jci.la.ca.us/ead/programs/Thresholds/J-Population%20and%20Housing.pdf. Accessed March 30, 2015.

# 4.18.2 Affected Environment/Existing Conditions

## 4.18.2.1 Regional Population, Housing, and Employment

As shown in Table 4.18-1, the population for the SCAG region in 2008 was more than 17 million persons. The number of households in the region in 2008 was 5,814,000. Approximately 7,738,000 persons were employed at that time in the SCAG region.

The population, number of households, and employment in the SCAG region are all expected to increase by 2035. Population is expected to increase by approximately 23 percent to 22,091,000 persons. The number of households is expected to increase by 26 percent to 7,325,000 in 2035. Similarly, the number of employed persons is expected to increase to 9,441,000, which amounts to a 22 percent increase from 2008.

**Table 4.18-1: Regional Population, Housing, and Employment Growth**

| County | 2008 Population | 2035 Population | 2008 Households | 2035 Households | 2008 Employment | 2035 Employment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imperial | 170,000 | 288,000 | 49,000 | 91,000 | 62,000 | 121,000 |
| Los Angeles | 9,778,000 | 11,353,000 | 3,228,000 | 3,852,000 | 4,340,000 | 4,827,000 |
| Orange | 2,989,000 | 3,421,000 | 987,000 | 1,125,000 | 1,624,000 | 1,779,000 |
| Riverside | 2,128,000 | 3,324,000 | 679,000 | 1,092,000 | 664,000 | 1,243,000 |
| San Bernardino | 2,016,000 | 2,750,000 | 606,000 | 847,000 | 701,000 | 1,059,000 |
| Ventura | 813,000 | 954,000 | 266,000 | 318,000 | 348,000 | 411,000 |
| SCAG Region | 17,895,000 | 22,091,000 | 5,814,000 | 7,325,000 | 7,738,000 | 9,441,000 |

Source: Southern California Association of Governments 2012 Final Adopted Integrated Growth Forecast. Available: http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/adoptedgrowth.htm.

### Project Study Area Population, Housing, and Employment

This section provides population, housing, and employment growth estimates for the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando. The project study area is located primarily in the City of Los Angeles. A small portion of the project study area is located within the City of San Fernando. Therefore, for purposes of this report, the City of Los Angeles and City of San Fernando are used to define the project study area.

Table 4.18-2 shows population growth projections for both the City of Los Angeles and the City of San Fernando. The population of the City of Los Angeles is estimated to increase by 550,100 persons from 2008 to 2035. This is a 15 percent change. The population in the City of San Fernando is expected to increase by 1,900 during this time period, which would result in an estimated change of 8 percent.

### Table 4.18-2: Project Study Area – Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando Population Growth 2008–2035

| Area | 2008 | 2035 | Population Change | Percent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| City of Los Angeles | 3,770,500 | 4,320,600 | 550,100 | 15 |
| City of San Fernando | 23,600 | 25,500 | 1,900 | 8 |

Source: Southern California Association of Governments. 2012. *Final Adopted Integrated Growth Forecast.* Available: http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/adoptedgrowth.htm.

Table 4.18-3 shows household growth projections for the City of Los Angeles and the City of San Fernando. The number of households in the City of Los Angeles is estimated to increase by 316,700 households from 2008 to 2035, which is an estimated 25 percent increase. As shown in the table, the number of households in the City of San Fernando is also estimated to increase during this time period. Specifically, the number of households in the City of San Fernando is expected to increase by 12 percent during this same period. This would amount to an increase of 700 households by 2035.

### Table 4.18-3: Project Study Area – Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando Household Growth 2008–2035

| Area | 2008 | 2035 | Household Change | Percent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| City of Los Angeles | 1,309,900 | 1,626,600 | 316,700 | 25 |
| City of San Fernando | 5,900 | 6,600 | 700 | 12 |

Source: Southern California Association of Governments. 2012. *Final Adopted Integrated Growth Forecast.* Available: http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/adoptedgrowth.htm.

Table 4.18-4 shows employment growth projections for the City of Los Angeles and the City of San Fernando. The number of jobs in the City of Los Angeles is estimated to increase by 171,600 jobs by 2035, which is a 10 percent increase. During this same period, the number of jobs in the City of San Fernando is anticipated to increase by 6 percent, from 15,000 jobs in 2008 to 15,900 in 2035.

### Table 4.18-4: Project Study Area – Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando Employment Growth 2008–2035

| Area | 2008 | 2035 | Employment Change | Percent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| City of Los Angeles | 1,735,200 | 1,906,800 | 171,600 | 10 |
| City of San Fernando | 15,000 | 15,900 | 900 | 6 |

Source: Southern California Association of Governments. 2012. *Final Adopted Integrated Growth Forecast.* Available: http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/adoptedgrowth.htm.

Table 4.18-5 shows housing type for both the City of Los Angeles and City of San Fernando. As shown, approximately 19% of the total dwelling units located in the City of San Fernando are multi-dwelling units. Approximately 54% of the total dwelling units in the City of Los Angeles are multi-family units.

**Table 4.18-5: Project Study Area – Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando Housing Type (2011)**

| Project Area | Single-Family Dwelling Units[a] | Multi-Family Dwelling Units[b] | Other Dwelling Units[c] | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| City of Los Angeles | 640,605 (45% of total) | 762,007 (54% of total) | 10,029 (1% of total) | 1,412,641 |
| City of San Fernando | 5,182 (80% of total) | 1,206 (19% of total) | 118 (1% of total) | 6,506 |

[a] Includes both single-family detached and attached dwelling units.
[b] Includes structures with two units or more dwelling units.
[c] Includes mobile homes, boats, RVs, vans, etc.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau. 2014. *American Community Survey, 2007–2011, 5-Year Estimates.* Table DP04.

# 4.18.3 Environmental Consequences, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

This section describes the construction, operational, and cumulative growth-inducement impacts and effects of the No-Build Alternative, the TSM Alternative, and four build alternatives, which include two BRT alternatives (Alternatives 1 and 2) and two rail alternatives (Alternatives 3 and 4). Any measures required to mitigate or minimize significant or adverse impacts and effects are also identified.

## 4.18.3.1 No-Build Alternative

### Construction Impacts

Under the No-Build Alternative, no new transportation infrastructure would be built within the project study area, aside from projects that are currently under construction or funded for construction and operation by 2040. Because the No-Build Alternative would not propose new construction, it would not be growth inducing.

### Operational Impacts

#### Direct Impacts

Much of the project study area is characterized by urban streets and dense land uses. Under this alternative, past trends would likely continue and a substantial permanent change to the physical environment of the project study area would not occur. The No-Build Alternative would not result in new homes or businesses, and therefore, would not directly induce growth.

#### Indirect Impacts

No new transportation infrastructure would be built within the project study area, aside from projects that are currently under construction or funded for construction and operation by 2040. No indirect growth inducing impacts would occur under this alternative.

## Cumulative Impacts

The study area for cumulative growth inducement effects consists of the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando. Since the No-Build Alternative would not directly or indirectly induce growth, it would not contribute to any growth inducement effects.

## Mitigation Measures

### Construction Mitigation Measures

No construction mitigation measures are required.

### Operational Mitigation Measures

No operational mitigation measures are required.

## Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

### NEPA Finding

No effects would occur.

### CEQA Determination

No impacts would occur under the No-Build Alternative.

# 4.18.3.2 TSM Alternative

## Construction Impacts

The TSM Alternative would consist primarily of low-cost transit service improvements. Physical improvements to the transportation network would be minor. Therefore, construction activities associated with this alternative would be minimal and no growth inducement impacts would occur as a result.

## Operational Impacts

### Direct Impacts

This alternative could include transit service improvements and minor modifications to the existing transportation network. It would not include development of new housing or businesses. Although more frequent bus service may require additional bus drivers, the increase in employment is expected to be small. Given this alternative would not include new housing or businesses and any temporary or long-term increases in employment that could directly occur as a result of this alternative would be small, the TSM Alternative would not directly induce substantial growth.

### Indirect Impacts

Given the relatively minor service and other improvements that could occur under this alternative and the fact the proposed project is located in a developed urban area, it is unlikely this alternative would indirectly induce any substantial growth.

## Cumulative Impacts

Since the TSM Alternative consists primarily of low-cost transit service improvements and would include only minor physical improvements to the transportation network, it would not induce growth and consequently would not contribute to any cumulative growth inducement effects.

## Mitigation Measures

### Construction Mitigation Measures

No construction mitigation measures are required.

### Operational Mitigation Measures

No operational mitigation measures are required.

## Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

### NEPA Finding

Effects would not be adverse.

### CEQA Determination

Impacts would be less than significant.

# 4.18.3.3 BRT Alternatives (Build Alternatives 1 and 2)

## Alternative 1 – Curb-Running BRT

### Construction Impacts

The growth inducement potential of construction activities under Alternative 1 – Curb-Running BRT and other build alternatives would vary depending on the extent, duration, cost, and number of construction jobs generated by each alternative. However, it is not expected that the increase in construction jobs under any of the build alternatives would result in substantial increases in project study area populations because of the fact that there is a large pool of skilled and unskilled construction workers in Los Angeles County within commuting distance of the project and because of the temporary nature of construction jobs. Consequently, it is unlikely few if any construction workers employed by the proposed project would relocate to the project study area. Therefore, proposed construction activities would not result in a substantial increase in the project study area population.

### Operational Impacts

#### *Direct Impacts*

The Curb-Running BRT Alternative would not include the development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce growth. Additional permanent employment opportunities (bus driver positions) may occur under this alternative. However, this potential increase would be relatively minor and would not result in a significant increase in the project study area population. Therefore, this alternative would not directly induce substantial residential or employment population growth.

### *Indirect Impacts*

The Curb-Running BRT Alternative would enhance and improve the transportation system within the corridor including upgrades to existing Metro Rapid stations. This would increase overall system efficiency and improve general connectivity. The increased transportation system efficiency due to this alternative may contribute to the general economic growth of businesses located within the corridor, particularly near proposed stations, and may encourage businesses to relocate to the project study area. As described in the Existing Conditions section of the Growth-Inducing Impacts Report (see Appendix Y), the applicable City of Los Angeles community plans include several goals, objectives, and policies that encourage development near transit stations and promote housing and mixed-use projects in transit corridors. The plans also promote pedestrian-oriented mobility and utilization of bicycles for commuter, school, recreation use, economic activity, and access to transit facilities. Implementation of Alternative 1 – Curb Running BRT would be consistent in supporting these goals and objectives. Therefore, this alternative may indirectly result in growth along the corridor and within the project study area. However, given this alternative would be located in an urban area that contains a limited number of vacant or underutilized parcels and would not extend transit service into undeveloped areas, it would not indirectly induce growth that would substantially change existing land use and development patterns at the corridor level or induce substantial new growth or development beyond what is projected in regional or local plans.

## Cumulative Impacts

The BRT alternatives would not include the development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce growth. Therefore, neither BRT alternative would directly contribute to cumulative growth inducement effects in the study area. However, as acknowledged in the impacts discussions above, proposed project improvements to the transit system and increases in transportation network efficiency and connectivity could be a catalyst for new development in the project study area. The indirect growth inducement effects of the BRT alternatives could contribute to the growth inducement effects of other infrastructure projects and new residential and business development projects in the cumulative impacts study area. This induced growth could be substantial and result in significant adverse impacts to the environment. However, it should be noted that in general, this cumulative induced growth is accounted for in local (i.e., City of Los Angeles community plans and City of San Fernando General Plan) and regional (i.e., SCAG RCP and RTP/SCS) plans (see Tables 4.18-2 through 4.18-4, above). Pursuant to Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines, "no further cumulative impacts analysis is required when a project is consistent with a general, specific, master or comparable programmatic plan where the lead agency determines that the regional or areawide cumulative impacts of the proposed project have already been adequately addressed, as defined in section 15152(f), in a certified EIR for that plan."

## Mitigation Measures

### *Construction Mitigation Measures*

No construction mitigation measures are required.

### *Operational Mitigation Measures*

No operational mitigation measures are required.

#### Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

##### *NEPA Finding*

Effects would not be adverse.

##### *CEQA Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

### Alternative 2 – Median-Running BRT

The construction, operational, and cumulative growth-inducement impacts of Alternative 2 – Median-Running BRT would be the same as the impacts described above for Alternative 1 – Curb-Running BRT.

## 4.18.3.4 Rail Alternatives (Build Alternatives 3 and 4)

### Alternative 3 – Low-Floor LRT/Tram

#### Construction Impacts

Construction impacts would be the same as impacts described for the BRT Alternatives above.

#### Operational Impacts

##### *Direct Impacts*

Alternative 3 – Low-Floor LRT/Tram would not include the development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce growth. This alternative would result in new permanent employment opportunities (train operators and maintenance and storage facility [MSF] employees). However, this anticipated increase in long-term employment would be relatively minor and would not result in a significant increase in the project study area population. Therefore, this alternative would not directly induce substantial residential or employment population growth.

##### *Indirect Impacts*

This alternative would provide a new method of travel within the corridor and improve the efficiency of the existing transportation network, which may be a catalyst for economic growth that would benefit existing area businesses and encourage other businesses to relocate to the project study area. As described in the Existing Conditions section of the Growth-Inducing Impacts Report (see Appendix Y), the relevant City of Los Angeles community plans encourage development near transit stations and promote housing and mixed-use projects in transit corridors. Implementation of Alternative 3 would be consistent in supporting these goals and objectives. Therefore, this alternative may indirectly result in growth along the corridor and within the project study area. However, this alternative would not extend transit service to undeveloped areas and would be located in a developed urban area that contains a limited number of vacant or underutilized parcels. As a consequence, it would not indirectly induce growth that would substantially change existing land use and development patterns at the corridor level or induce substantial new growth or development beyond what is projected in regional or local plans.

### Cumulative Impacts

The rail alternatives would not include the development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce growth. Therefore, neither rail alternative would directly contribute to cumulative growth inducement effects in the study area. However, as acknowledged in the impacts discussions above, proposed project improvements to the transit system and increases in transportation network efficiency and connectivity could be a catalyst for new development in the project study area. The indirect growth inducement effects of the rail alternatives could contribute to the growth-inducement effects of other infrastructure projects and new residential and business development projects in the cumulative impacts study area. This induced growth could be substantial and result in significant adverse impacts to the environment. However, it should be noted that in general, this cumulative induced growth is accounted for in local (i.e., City of Los Angeles community plans and City of San Fernando General Plan) and regional (i.e., SCAG RCP and RTP/SCS) plans (see Tables 4.18-2 through 4.18-4, above). Pursuant to Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines, "no further cumulative impacts analysis is required when a project is consistent with a general, specific, master or comparable programmatic plan where the lead agency determines that the regional or areawide cumulative impacts of the proposed project have already been adequately addressed, as defined in section 15152(f), in a certified EIR for that plan."

### Mitigation Measures

#### *Construction Mitigation Measures*

No construction mitigation measures are required.

#### *Operational Mitigation Measures*

No operational mitigation measures are required.

### Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

#### *NEPA Finding*

Effects would not be adverse.

#### *CEQA Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

## Alternative 4 – LRT

### Construction Impacts

Construction impacts would be the same as the impacts described for the BRT Alternatives. Although the LRT Alternative would be the most costly and take the longest to construct, and consequently it would generate the greatest number of construction jobs, it is not expected to result in a substantial increase in the project study area population.

## Operational Impacts

### *Direct Impacts*

Impacts would be the same as those anticipated to occur under Alternative 3 – Low-Floor LRT/Tram. Therefore, this alternative would not directly induce substantial residential or employment population growth.

### *Indirect Impacts*

The LRT Alternative would provide a new mode of transit that would be an important link in the regional transportation network, increasing overall system efficiency. Impacts would be the same as impacts anticipated to occur under Alternative 3. Implementation of the LRT Alternative could attract transit-supportive development, providing new employment opportunities and services. The pattern of land development could be affected by a greater concentration and intensity of land use activities along the project alignment, particularly near proposed station areas, which could become centers of neighborhood activity, including increased pedestrian and bicycle activity. Underutilized parcels or buildings in the project study area may increase in desirability. However, as noted for the other build alternatives, this alternative would not extend transit service to an undeveloped area and the alignment would be located in a developed urban area with a limited number of vacant or underutilized parcels. Therefore, this alternative would not indirectly induce growth that would result in a substantial change in land use development patterns or indirectly result in substantial increases in employment or residential populations beyond what is projected in regional or local plans.

## Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts anticipated to occur under this alternative would be the same as the cumulative impacts expected to occur under Alternative 3 described above.

## Mitigation Measures

### *Construction Mitigation Measures*

No construction mitigation measures are required.

### *Operational Mitigation Measures*

No operational mitigation measures are required.

## Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

### *NEPA Finding*

Effects would not be adverse.

### *CEQA Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.