# Section 4.17
## Growth-Inducing Impacts

This section summarizes the potential population, housing, and employment growth that may directly or indirectly occur due to the project. Information in this section is based on, and updated where appropriate from, the Growth-Inducing Impacts Technical Memorandum, which is incorporated into this Draft EIS/EIR as Appendix CC. The analysis herein compares the employment and population changes associated with the project to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projections for growth.

## 4.17.1 Regulatory Framework/Methodology

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires projects to examine the potential indirect or secondary effects that may occur as a result of a proposed federal activity or action. NEPA guidelines require an evaluation of reasonably anticipated growth in comparison to the population, households, and employment projections developed by a federally-designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO). SCAG is the federally-designated MPO for Los Angeles County and it has developed regional growth management plans that contain growth projections.

*The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* require an assessment of the ways in which the project could promote economic or population growth in the vicinity of the project [*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.2(d)]. Included in this are projects that would "remove obstacles to population growth." Growth inducement may occur if "the project fosters economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing either directly or indirectly." *CEQA Guidelines* also state that growth in any area should not be assumed to be necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

## 4.17.2 Affected Environment/Existing Conditions

### 4.17.2.1 Historic Growth

#### *4.17.2.1.1 Population and Households*

**Table 4.17-1** summarizes the population trends for the cities that comprise the project area, Los Angeles County, and the entire SCAG region. The current population of the SCAG region is approximately 18.8 million, of which 10.4 million live in Los Angeles County. Since 2000, the population of the region experienced an average annual growth rate of 1.4 percent, while the County and most of the cities within the project area had average annual growth rates of less than one percent. This indicates that the higher growth areas in the region are outside the project area and Los Angeles County.

As Table 4.17-1 also illustrates, the areas with the largest gains in the number of households between 2000 and 2010 were the SCAG region, Los Angeles County, and the city of Los Angeles by virtue of their much larger size. Among the smaller cities, Monterey Park and Rosemead added the most new households.

Table 4.17-1. Historic Population and Household Growth, 2000-2010

| | Population | | | | Household | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Area | 2000 | 2010 | 2000-2010 Change | Annual Average Change (%) | 2000 | 2010 | 2000-2010 Change | Annual Average Change (%) |
| Commerce | 12,568 | 13,581 | 1,013 | 0.81% | 3,377 | 3,456 | 79 | 0.23% |
| Los Angeles | 3,694,742 | 4,094,764 | 400,022 | 1.08% | 1,337,654 | 1,417,311 | 79,657 | 0.60% |
| Montebello | 62,150 | 65,781 | 3,631 | 0.58% | 19,416 | 19,598 | 182 | 0.09% |
| Monterey Park | 60,051 | 65,027 | 4,976 | 0.83% | 20,209 | 20,872 | 663 | 0.33% |
| Pico Rivera | 63,428 | 66,967 | 3,539 | 0.56% | 16,807 | 16,944 | 137 | 0.08% |
| Rosemead | 53,505 | 57,756 | 4,251 | 0.79% | 14,345 | 14,776 | 431 | 0.30% |
| Santa Fe Springs | 16,413 | 17,929 | 1,516 | 0.92% | 4,932 | 5,142 | 210 | 0.43% |
| South El Monte | 21,144 | 22,627 | 1,483 | 0.70% | 4,724 | 4,820 | 96 | 0.20% |
| Whittier | 83,639 | 87,128 | 3,489 | 0.42% | 28,958 | 29,087 | 129 | 0.04% |
| Los Angeles County | 9,519,330 | 10,441,080 | 921,750 | 0.97% | 3,270,906 | 3,431,588 | 160,682 | 0.49% |
| SCAG 6-County Area | 16,516,703 | 18,847,967 | 2,331,264 | 1.41% | 5,722,035 | 6,285,473 | 563,438 | 0.98% |

*Source: California Department of Finance, E-4: Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2001-2009 with 2000 Benchmark.*

#### *4.17.2.1.2 Employment*

**Table 4.17-2** summarizes the employment trends for the cities that comprise the project area, Los Angeles County, and the entire SCAG region. As seen in the table, the only area that experienced a growth in employment between 2000 and 2010 was the SCAG region. Los Angeles County and the cities within the project area lost jobs during this period. Given the average annual growth rates shown in Table 4.17-2, the employment loss experienced throughout the project area was generally similar among the cities.

The fact that the SCAG region experienced employment gains during this period indicates that the Southern California region is still growing slightly and is attracting jobs; however, this growth has not been occurring within the project area.

Table 4.17-2. Historic Employment Growth, 2000-2010

| Area | 2000 | 2010 | 2000-2010 Change | Annual Average Change (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commerce | 4,500 | 4,400 | (100) | -0.22% |
| Los Angeles | 1,710,700 | 1,647,900 | (62,800) | -0.37% |
| Montebello | 25,700 | 24,800 | (900) | -0.35% |
| Monterey Park | 27,300 | 26,300 | (1,000) | -0.37% |
| Pico Rivera | 26,500 | 25,500 | (1,000) | -0.38% |
| Rosemead | 22,800 | 22,000 | (800) | -0.35% |
| Santa Fe Springs | 7,200 | 6,900 | (300) | -0.42% |
| South El Monte | 8,300 | 8,000 | (300) | -0.36% |
| Whittier | 40,600 | 39,200 | (1,400) | -0.34% |
| Los Angeles County | 4,424,900 | 4,262,300 | (162,600) | -0.37% |
| SCAG 6-County Area | 7,627,500 | 7,647,600 | 20,100 | 0.03% |

*Source: State of California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information, Custom Data Tables, 2011.*

## 4.17.2.2 Future Growth

The growth projections for the cities within the project area, Los Angeles County, and the SCAG region (see **Tables 4.17-3** and **4.17-4)** are provided in SCAG's adopted *2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Growth Forecast*. It is important to note that this forecast was adopted in 2012 and its development began during the middle of the most recent recession (2007-2009); therefore, the 2008 regional growth forecast methodology was revised and updated. It was adjusted for both short-term and long-term job growth and its potential impact on domestic and international migration. In addition, cities within the project area may create transit-oriented districts or other ordinances in response to the advent of light rail. According to the SCAG forecast, population and employment are expected to reach approximately 22.1 million and 9.4 million, respectively, by 2035. This represents a 23.4 percent increase in population and a 22 percent increase in employment between 2008 and 2035. Similarly, the household forecast for the SCAG region is expected to reach 7.3 million by 2035, a 26 percent increase from 2008.

In general, the SCAG forecasts for the project area show a slower rate of growth in population, households, and employment between 2010 and 2035 than in the larger SCAG region. Of the cities in the project area, only Los Angeles, Monterey Park, Pico Rivera, and Santa Fe Springs are expected to experience total population growth in excess of ten percent during the forecast period (14.6 percent, 29.3 percent, 11.4 percent, and 25.3 percent, respectively). Four project area cities (Los Angeles, Pico Rivera, Rosemead, and Santa Fe Springs) are projected to have total household growth in excess of ten percent during the forecast period, which is a slightly higher growth rate than the other project area cities but still well below that of the SCAG region as a whole.

## Table 4.17-3. Population and Household Growth, 2008-2035

| Area | Population | | | Household | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2008 | 2035 | 2008-2035 Change (%) | 2008 | 2035 | 2008-2035 Change (%) |
| Commerce | 12,800 | 13,000 | 1.6% | 3,400 | 3,500 | 2.9% |
| Los Angeles | 3,770,500 | 4,320,600 | 14.6% | 1,309,900 | 1,626,600 | 24.2% |
| Montebello | 62,500 | 66,400 | 6.2% | 19,000 | 20,500 | 7.9% |
| Monterey Park | 60,100 | 77,700 | 29.3% | 19,900 | 21,700 | 9.0% |
| Pico Rivera | 62,900 | 70,100 | 11.4% | 16,600 | 18,700 | 12.7% |
| Rosemead | 53,600 | 58,100 | 8.4% | 14,200 | 15,800 | 11.3% |
| Santa Fe Springs | 16,200 | 20,300 | 25.3% | 4,800 | 5,800 | 20.8% |
| South El Monte | 20,100 | 21,800 | 8.5% | 4,600 | 5,000 | 8.7% |
| Whittier | 85,300 | 90,500 | 6.1% | 28,300 | 30,500 | 7.8% |
| Los Angeles County | 9,778,000 | 11,353,000 | 16.1% | 3,228,000 | 3,852,000 | 19.3% |
| SCAG 6-County Area | 17,895,000 | 22,091,000 | 23.4% | 5,814,000 | 7,325,000 | 26.0% |

*Source: SCAG, Adopted 2012 Regional Transportation Plan 2012-2035, Growth Forecast Appendix.*

## Table 4.17-4. Employment Growth, 2008-2035

| Area | 2008 | 2035 | 2008-2035 Change (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Commerce | 48,100 | 48,600 | 1.0% |
| Los Angeles | 1,735,200 | 1,906,800 | 9.9% |
| Montebello | 25,700 | 27,400 | 6.6% |
| Monterey Park | 30,400 | 33,700 | 10.9% |
| Pico Rivera | 16,100 | 16,900 | 5.0% |
| Rosemead | 16,400 | 17,600 | 7.3% |
| Santa Fe Springs | 49,600 | 50,500 | 1.8% |

Table 4.17-4. Employment Growth, 2008-2035 (continued)

| Area | 2008 | 2035 | 2008-2035 Change (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| South El Monte | 15,700 | 15,400 | -1.9% |
| Whittier | 31,300 | 34,800 | 11.2% |
| Los Angeles County | 4,340,000 | 4,827,000 | 11.2% |
| SCAG 6-County Area | 7,738,000 | 9,441,000 | 22.0% |

*Source: SCAG, Adopted 2012 Regional Transportation Plan 2012-2035, Growth Forecast Appendix.*

These population and household forecasts indicate that the primary areas of growth for the SCAG region are anticipated to be outside the project area. In terms of employment, the projected growth rates for the cities within the project area are generally less than half the forecasted growth for the SCAG region between 2008 and 2035.

# 4.17.3 Environmental Impacts/Environmental Consequences

**Table 4.17-5** summarizes the impacts associated with each alternative and describes why growth is not induced. The following sections present the evaluation and findings for each of the project alternatives.

## 4.17.3.1 No Build Alternative

### *4.17.3.1.1 Impact Analysis*

The intent of the No Build Alternative is to preserve existing service levels and projects included in Metro's 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan. There would be no opportunities to induce development in the project area. As a result, the No Build Alternative would not result in an adverse effect under NEPA or a significant impact under CEQA with regard to growth inducement.

The No Build Alternative does not have the potential to support jobs and income in the region, either directly or indirectly, through capital and operating and maintenance (O&M) expenditures. Since no construction expenditures are associated with the No Build Alternative, no construction jobs or additional infrastructure (i.e., housing, roads, and utilities) would be required. Therefore, the No Build Alternative would maintain the status quo for transit in the project area and would not directly or indirectly induce growth.

### *4.17.3.1.2 Mitigation Measures*

The No Build Alternative would not directly or indirectly induce growth. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required for the No Build Alternative.

### *4.17.3.1.3 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation*

#### NEPA Finding

The No Build Alternative would not result in any direct or indirect adverse growth-inducing effects.

#### CEQA Determination

The No Build Alternative would not significantly impact the communities in the project area. The No Build Alternative would not result in any significant direct or indirect growth-inducing impacts.

## 4.17.3.2 TSM Alternative

### *4.17.3.2.1 Impact Analysis*

The intent of the TSM Alternative is to improve bus service levels to help accommodate the forecasted growth in the region's population and workforce. The TSM Alternative would not induce development in the project area. The TSM Alternative would not provide new opportunities for land use connections, transit-oriented developments (TODs), higher-density development patterns, or compliance with federal guidance for transportation investments.

## Table 4.17-5. Summary of Potential Growth-Inducing Impacts

| Impact Measures | No Build Alternative | TSM Alternative | SR 60 LRT Alternative[1] | Washington Blvd. LRT Alternative |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operation** | 3,728 recurring jobs supported in the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) | 4,438 recurring jobs supported in the MSA | 4,908 recurring jobs (4,911 for North Side Design Variation) supported in the MSA | 5,249 recurring jobs (5,249 with Aerial Crossings) supported in the MSA |
| **Travel Time Savings** | No mobility savings | $81.6M in annual savings | $128.9M in annual savings ($128.3M for North Side Design Variation) | $125.5M in annual savings ($125.5M with Aerial Crossings) |
| **Economic Development** | The improvements would not be enough to induce development in the project area or act as a catalyst for appropriate economic development | The TSM improvements would not be enough to induce development in the project area or act as a catalyst for appropriate economic development | While development would not be induced, there are opportunities where the alternative could serve as a catalyst for economic revitalization and growth in areas where growth has already occurred | While development would not be induced, there are opportunities where the alternative could serve as a catalyst for economic revitalization and growth in areas where development has already occurred |
| **Land Use** | Would not provide new opportunities for land use connections, transit-oriented development, or higher-density development patterns | Would not provide new opportunities for land use connections, transit-oriented development, or higher-density development patterns | The opportunities for economic revitalization and growth are consistent with (not in addition to) the applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over the project area, including the Whittier Narrows Dam Basin Master Plan with the implementation of the mitigation plan | The opportunities for economic revitalization and growth are consistent with (not in addition to) the applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over the project area |
| **Growth-Inducing** | Not a significant generator of new jobs or development opportunities; therefore, not adverse (NEPA)/less than significant (CEQA) | Offers limited mobility improvements, but is not a significant generator of new jobs or development opportunities; therefore, not adverse (NEPA)/less than significant (CEQA) | Offers mobility improvements, but is not a significant generator of new jobs or development (beyond that planned for the project area); therefore, not adverse (NEPA)/less than significant (CEQA) | Offers mobility improvements, but is not a significant generator of new jobs or development (beyond that planned for the project area); therefore, not adverse (NEPA)/less than significant (CEQA) |

*Notes:*

*[1] Results are for both the SR 60 LRT Alternative as well as the SR 60 LRT North Side Design Variation.*

As a result, the TSM Alternative would not result in an adverse effect under NEPA or a significant impact under CEQA with regard to growth inducement.

The TSM Alternative does not have the potential to substantially support jobs and income in the region, either directly or indirectly, through capital and O&M expenditures. The TSM Alternative is not designed to induce growth; rather, the intent is for the TSM Alternative to improve service levels to help accommodate the forecasted growth in the region's population and workforce. Therefore, the TSM Alternative improvements would not be enough to induce development in the project area.

#### *4.17.3.2.2 Mitigation Measures*

The TSM Alternative would not directly or indirectly induce growth. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required for the TSM Alternative.

#### *4.17.3.2.3 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation*

**NEPA Finding**

The TSM Alternative offers modest mobility improvements relative to the No Build Alternative but less than the build alternatives, as it does not have a dedicated ROW. The TSM Alternative would not result in any direct or indirect adverse growth-inducing effects.

**CEQA Determination**

The TSM Alternative would implement modest mobility improvements relative to the No Build Alternative but less than the build alternatives, as it would not have a dedicated ROW. The TSM Alternative would not result in any significant direct or indirect growth-inducing impacts.

### 4.17.3.3 SR 60 LRT Alternative

#### *4.17.3.3.1 Impact Analysis*

The SR 60 LRT Alternative, with or without the North Side Design Variation, would not involve infrastructure (e.g., housing, roads, and utilities) that would directly or indirectly induce growth in the area.

The intent of the SR 60 LRT Alternative is to accommodate forecasted growth in the region's population and workforce and meet future demand for transit. It would not remove a barrier to growth or induce growth beyond that already planned for the project area. The development opportunities would be separate from this proposed transit project.

While development would not be induced, there are opportunities where the SR 60 LRT Alternative could serve as a catalyst for economic revitalization and growth in areas where growth has already occurred. The Land Use and Development Opportunities Technical Memorandum, Appendix N, of this Draft EIS/EIR identifies many opportunities within the project area for joint development at station locations, as well as other public/private transit-oriented development opportunities along the proposed alignment. These are summarized below.

- **Garfield Avenue Station**: Potential development would be limited to the redevelopment of existing land uses. Land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations imposed by the city of Montebello would limit the intensity of redevelopment.
- **Shops at Montebello Station**: There is potential for additional net new development. Land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations imposed by the city of Montebello would limit the intensity of net new development.
- **Santa Anita Avenue Station**: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) manages the property where this proposed station and associated facilities could be built. The property's use as a flood control basin and the USACE's development policies for this type of use are likely to limit the potential for development at this site.

- **Peck Road Station**: Potential development would be limited to the redevelopment of existing land uses. Land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations imposed by the city of South El Monte would limit the intensity of redevelopment.

Regarding the development opportunities discussed above, it is important to note that this growth is consistent with current development and land use plans and is not in addition to these plans. While this alternative would not create any new land uses, some land uses would be converted or cities may create transit-oriented development districts, but not in ways that are inconsistent with current land use plans or incompatible with the surrounding areas. The proximity of light rail stations would encourage land uses that are not auto dependent and not as likely to induce auto trips, which is also consistent with regional and local environmental goals. The Land Use and Development Opportunities Technical Memorandum, Appendix N, of this Draft EIS/EIR states that the opportunity for future development along the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment is less than that associated with the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment. This is due to the fewer number of stations proposed under the SR 60 LRT Alternative, with or without the North Side Design Variation, compared with the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative, and also because of the USACE's development restrictions at the Santa Anita Avenue station site.

Overall, the SR 60 LRT Alternative would have long-term benefits for the communities it traverses and would further goals and policies for revitalization and investment within the project area. The project's operation would have long-term mobility benefits for the communities in terms of travel time cost savings; however, these benefits would not be great enough to induce development beyond the development opportunities associated with the land use plans, policies, and regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over the project area. As a result, the SR 60 LRT Alternative, with or without the North Side Design Variation, would not result in an adverse effect under NEPA or a significant impact under CEQA with regard to growth inducement.

#### *4.17.3.3.2 Mitigation Measures*

While the SR 60 LRT Alternative, with or without the North Side Design Variation, would not create any new land uses, some land uses would be converted, but not in ways that are inconsistent with current land use plans or incompatible with the surrounding areas. The beneficial impacts associated with the alternative would not induce direct or indirect growth in excess of that already anticipated for the project area and region. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required for the SR 60 LRT Alternative, with or without the North Side Design Variation.

#### *4.17.3.3.3 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation*

**NEPA Finding**

The potential for transit-oriented development at the proposed stations along the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment would be less than that associated with the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment because fewer stations are proposed under this alternative. The SR 60 LRT Alternative, with or without the North Side Design Variation, would not result in any direct or indirect adverse growth-inducing effects and would improve mobility through travel time and cost savings.

**CEQA Determination**

The potential for transit-oriented development at the proposed stations along the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment would be less than that associated with the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment because fewer stations are proposed under this alternative. The SR 60 LRT Alternative, with or without the North Side Design Variation, would not result in any significant direct or indirect growth-inducing impacts and would improve mobility through travel time and cost savings.

## 4.17.3.4 Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative

### *4.17.3.4.1 Impact Analysis*

The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would not involve infrastructure (e.g., housing, roads, utilities, schools) that would directly or indirectly induce growth in the area.

The intent of the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative is to accommodate forecasted growth in the region's population and workforce and meet future demand for transit. It would not remove a barrier to growth or induce growth beyond that already planned in the project area. The development opportunities would be separate from this proposed project.

While development would not be induced, there are opportunities where the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative could serve as a catalyst for economic revitalization and growth in areas where development has already occurred. The Land Use and Development Opportunities Technical Memorandum, Appendix N, of this Draft EIS/EIR identified many opportunities within the project area for joint development at station locations and other public/private transit-oriented development opportunities along the proposed alignments. These are summarized below.

- **Garfield Avenue Station**: Potential development would be limited to the redevelopment of existing land uses. Land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations imposed by the city of Montebello would limit the intensity of redevelopment.
- **Whittier Boulevard Station**: The opportunity exists to redevelop lower-density commercial uses to higher-density commercial and transit-oriented uses. Land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations imposed by the city of Montebello would limit the intensity of redevelopment.
- **Greenwood Avenue Station**: The opportunity exists to redevelop lower-density commercial uses to higher-density commercial and transit oriented uses. Land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations imposed by the city of Montebello would limit the intensity of redevelopment.
- **Rosemead Boulevard Station**: Much redevelopment has already occurred; as a result, limited opportunities remain. Land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations imposed by the city of Pico Rivera would limit the intensity of redevelopment.
- **Norwalk Boulevard Station**: Potential development would be limited to the redevelopment of existing land uses and a few vacant sites. Los Angeles County's existing land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations would limit the intensity of redevelopment.
- **Lambert Road Station:** Potential development would be limited to redevelopment of existing land uses and a few vacant sites. The city of Whittier's land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations would limit the intensity of redevelopment.

Regarding these development opportunities, it is important to note that this growth is consistent with current development and land use plans and is not in addition to these plans. While this alternative would not create any new land uses, some land uses would be converted or cities may create transit-oriented development districts, but not in ways that are inconsistent with current land use plans or incompatible with the surrounding areas. The proximity of rail stations would encourage land uses that are not auto dependent and not as likely to induce auto trips, which is also consistent with regional and local environmental goals. Greater opportunity exists for future development along the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment than along the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment, given the higher number of stations proposed under the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative and the

development restriction at the Santa Anita Avenue station site for the SR 60 LRT Alternative.

Overall, the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would have long-term benefits for the communities it traverses and would further goals and policies for revitalization and investment within the project area. The project's operation would have long-term mobility benefits for the communities in terms of travel time cost savings; however, these benefits would not be great enough to induce development beyond the development opportunities associated with the land use plans, policies, and regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over the project area. As a result, the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would not result in an adverse effect under NEPA or a significant impact under CEQA with regard to growth inducement.

### *4.17.3.4.2 Mitigation Measures*

While the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would not create any new land uses, some land uses would be converted, but not in ways that are inconsistent with current land use plans or incompatible with the surrounding areas. These beneficial impacts associated with the alternative would not induce direct or indirect growth in excess of that already anticipated for the project area and region. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required for the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative.

### *4.17.3.4.3 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation*

#### NEPA Finding

The potential for transit-oriented development at the proposed stations along the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment would be greater than that associated with the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment because more stations are proposed under this alternative. The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would not result in any direct or indirect adverse growth-inducing effects and would improve mobility through travel time and cost savings.

#### CEQA Determination

The potential for transit-oriented development at the proposed stations along the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment would be greater than that associated with the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment because more stations are proposed under this alternative. The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would not result in any significant direct or indirect growth-inducing impacts and would improve mobility through travel time and cost savings.