

## 3.14 Population, Housing, and Employment

### 3.14.1 Introduction

This section provides an overview of the population, housing, and employment resources known to occur within the study area associated with each component of the IRP and an analysis of impacts to population, housing, and employment associated with each of the components. The significance of impacts is analyzed for each of the four Project Alternatives and the No Project Alternative. Where applicable, mitigation measures to reduce the impacts associated with each Alternative are provided.

### 3.14.2 Environmental Setting

#### 3.14.2.1 General Setting

The HSA, City of Los Angeles, and the Southern California region in general cover a highly urbanized, densely populated area sustaining a robust level of growth over the last several decades. Table 3.14-1 provides 2000 Census population data for the County of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles, and each of the project-level component study areas. According to the 2000 Census, the total population in the County was approximately 9.5 million persons. The total population in the City was approximately 3.7 million persons over the same period. Information on ethnicity and income status is provided in Section 3.8 – Environmental Justice.

<b>Table 3.14-1. Existing Population* Integrated Resources Plan EIR</b>	
<b>Location</b>	<b>Total Population</b>
Los Angeles County	9,519,338
Los Angeles City	3,694,820
Hyperion Study Area	11,287
Tillman Study Area	31,146
LAG Study Area	25,914
NEIS II Study Area	78,825
GBIS Study Area	74,116
<p>*The total populations for the Study Areas are based on the census tracts that encompass or are located adjacent to the component. Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2001).</p>	

Table 3.14-2 provides 2000 Census housing data for the County of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles, and each of the project-level component study areas. Table 3.14-2 data compare the 3.3 million housing units of the County with the 3.3 million units in the City of Los Angeles (numbers are approximate).

**Table 3.14-2. Existing Housing Characteristics\*  
Integrated Resources Plan EIR**

<b>EIR Study Area</b>	<b>Total Units</b>	<b>Single Family</b>	<b>Single Family Units (as Percent of Total)</b>	<b>Multi-Family</b>	<b>Multi-Family (as Percent of Total)</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Other (as Percent of Total)</b>
Los Angeles County	3,270,909	1,835,087	56.1%	1,379,201	42.2%	56,621	1.7%
Los Angeles City	1,337,668	612,563	45.8%	716,023	53.5%	9,082	0.7%
Hyperion	4,969	2,556	51.4%	2,413	48.6%	0	0.0%
Tillman	11,650	4,951	42.5%	6,276	53.9%	423	3.6%
LAG	10,363	2,842	27.4%	7,495	72.3%	26	0.3%
NEIS II	28,012	11,549	41.2%	16,424	58.6%	39	0.1%
GBIS	37,741	11,972	31.7%	25,721	68.2%	48	0.1%

\*The total populations for the Study Area are based on the census tracts that encompass or are located adjacent to the component.  
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2001

The 2001 and 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) population projections for the City of Los Angeles, including the HSA, are provided in Table 3.14-3. The 2001 projections, from which the IRP Facilities Plan was developed, predicted an increase in population in the City of about 19 percent between 2000 and 2020, which is similar to the growth projected for the HSA for the same period (about 17 percent). The 2004 projections predict a somewhat lower increase in population growth in the City over the 2000 to 2020 period (13 percent). The difference is likely the result of more accurate forecasts from the 2000 Census that were used in the 2004 projections, compared with the 1990 census data that were used for the 2001 projections.

The 2001 RTP household projections for the City of Los Angeles, including the HSA, are not part of this analysis because they were not used in formulating the IRP Facilities Plan. The 2001 RTP population projections on which the household projections are based, however, were used for the IRP Facilities Plan and are provided in Table 3.14-3.

The 2000 Census does not include data on employment (i.e., the number of jobs in a given area) in particular geographic areas. The 2000 Census reports only data on persons who are employed (i.e., the number of persons with jobs), regardless of geographic area. The SCAG employment projections, however, account for the number of jobs in a given geographic area. Therefore, the 2001 RTP and 2004 RTP employment projections for the City of Los Angeles are provided in Table 3.14-4.



<b>Table 3.14-3. Summary of Population Projections (2000 – 2020)</b> <i>Integrated Resources Plan EIR</i>					
<b>Area</b>	<b>Population Projection for IRP</b>				
	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>
Hyperion Service Area (2001 RTP)	4,138,567	4,331,109	4,485,054	4,641,928	4,854,483
City of Los Angeles (2001 RTP)*	3,651,194	3,824,792	3,973,613	4,124,673	4,331,028
City of Los Angeles (2004 RTP)	3,711,969	3,950,347	4,090,125	4,147,285	4,203,702
<b>Area</b>	<b>Percent Increase in Population Compared to 2000</b>				
	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>
Hyperion Service Area (2001 RTP)	--	5%	8%	12%	17%
City of Los Angeles (2001 RTP)*	--	5%	9%	13%	19%
City of Los Angeles (2004 RTP)	--	6%	10%	12%	13%
*Excludes small portions of the City served by other wastewater agencies. Source: SCAG, 2001; City of Los Angeles, 2004					

The 2001 projections, from which the IRP Facilities Plan was developed, predict an increase in employment in the City of Los Angeles of about 12 percent between 2000 and 2020. This growth is about the same for the HSA for the same period (13 percent). The 2004 projections indicate that employment in the City of Los Angeles is expected to increase by about 19 percent between 2000 and 2020.

<b>Table 3.14-4. Summary of Employment Projections (2000 – 2020)</b> <i>Integrated Resources Plan EIR</i>					
<b>Area</b>	<b>Employment Projection for IRP</b>				
	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>
Hyperion Service Area (2001 RTP)	2,284,126	2,382,000	2,475,451	2,538,351	2,584,503
City of Los Angeles (2001 RTP)*	1,799,461	1,869,267	1,936,319	1,981,950	2,014,244
City of Los Angeles (2004 RTP)	1,781,863	1,800,766	1,994,358	2,057,435	2,117,623
<b>Area</b>	<b>Percent Increase in Employment Compared to 2000</b>				
	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>
Hyperion Service Area (2001 RTP)	--	4%	8%	11%	13%
City of Los Angeles (2001 RTP)*	--	4%	8%	10%	12%
City of Los Angeles (2004 RTP)	--	1%	12%	15%	19%
*Excludes small portions of the City served by other wastewater agencies. Source: SCAG, 2001 and 2004; City of Los Angeles, 2004					

### 3.14.2.2 Components

Demographic data for the components evaluated in this EIR at a project-level of detail were collected for the census tracts immediately surrounding each facility. Because the program-level components could be implemented in any number of locations throughout the study area, demographic data for the City and County of Los Angeles have been selected for review. These data are summarized below.

#### *Project-Level Components*

##### *Hyperion*

The 2000 Census population data for Hyperion are reported in Table 3.14-1. The total population in the Hyperion study area in 2000 was 11,287 persons.

The 2000 Census housing data for Hyperion are reported in Table 3.14-2. The total number of housing units in the Hyperion study area in 2000 was 4,969 units.

##### *Tillman*

The 2000 Census population data for Tillman are reported in Table 3.14-1. The total population in the Tillman study area in 2000 was 31,146 persons.

The 2000 Census housing data for Tillman are reported in Table 3.14-2. The total number of housing units in the Tillman study area in 2000 was 11,650 units.

##### *LAG*

The 2000 Census population data for LAG are reported in Table 3.14-1. The total population in the five census tracts in the LAG study area in 2000 was 25,914 persons.

The 2000 Census housing data for LAG are reported in Table 3.14-2. The total number of housing units in the LAG study area in 2000 was 10,363 units.

##### *NEIS II*

The 2000 Census population data for NEIS II are reported in Table 3.14-1. The total population in the NEIS II study area in 2000 was 78,825 persons.

The 2000 Census housing data for NEIS II are reported in Table 3.14-2. The total number of housing units in the NEIS II study area in 2000 was 28,012 units.

##### *GBIS*

The 2000 Census population data for GBIS are reported in Table 3.14-1. The total population in the GBIS study area in 2000 was 74,116 persons.

The 2000 Census housing data for GBIS are reported in Table 3.14-2. The total number of housing units in the GBIS study area in 2000 was 37,741 units.

#### *Program-Level Components*

##### *VSLIS*

The VSLIS could use any number of alignments between Tillman and the west end of GBIS in the southern San Fernando Valley portion of the HSA. As such,

overall City demographic data provided under the General Setting (Section 3.13.2.1) would apply. Data from the Tillman and LAG study areas could provide some additional demographic information for this component.

***Recycled Water***

Recycled water distribution facilities could be situated at various places throughout the HSA; therefore, the City of Los Angeles demographic data provided under the General Setting (Section 3.13.2.1) apply. Because the recycled water distribution systems would be in areas surrounding the existing treatment plants, data from the Hyperion, Tillman, and LAG study areas could provide some additional demographic information for this component.

***Dry Weather Runoff - Low-Flow Diversions***

Because low-flow diversion could occur in coastal and inland places of the HSA, the City demographic data provided under the General Setting (Section 3.13.2.1) apply.

***Wet Weather Runoff - Onsite Management***

This component could be situated at various places throughout the HSA; therefore, the City of Los Angeles demographic data provided under the General Setting (Section 3.13.2.1) are relevant.

***Dry Weather Runoff - Urban Runoff Plants or Treatment Wetlands***

Because this component could be situated at various inland locations in the HSA, the City demographic data provided under the General Setting (Section 3.13.2.1) apply.

***Wet Weather Runoff - Urban Runoff Plants***

Wet weather URPs could be situated along the coastal portions of the HSA; therefore, the City demographic data provided under the General Setting (Section 3.13.2.1) are relevant.

***Dry Weather Runoff - Smart Irrigation***

Because this program-level component could be situated at various residential, commercial, and industrial structures throughout the HSA, the City of Los Angeles demographic data provided under the General Setting (Section 3.13.2.1) apply.

***Wet Weather Runoff - Non-Urban Regional Recharge***

This program-level component would require the installation of a large diameter pipeline through the north to northeastern part of the HSA; therefore, the City of Los Angeles demographic data provided under the General Setting (Section 3.13.2.1) are relevant. Because recharge would occur primarily at existing spreading grounds in the eastern San Fernando Valley, data from the Tillman and LAG study areas could provide some additional demographic information for this component.

### 3.14.3 Environmental Impacts

This section analyzes impacts to population, housing, and employment resources associated with each of the components. The significance of impacts is analyzed for each of the four Proposed Project Alternatives and the No Project Alternative. Mitigation to reduce the impacts associated with each alternative is provided where applicable.

#### 3.14.3.1 Background

Presented below are brief discussions of the regulatory framework, methodology, and thresholds of significance used to analyze each Alternative and program-level component.

#### *Regulatory Framework*

##### *Federal*

Other than federal Executive Order 12898 discussed in Section 3.8 – Environmental Justice, no federal laws, regulations, or policies would be relevant to population, housing, or employment resources and the IRP.

##### *State*

No state laws, regulations, or policies would be relevant to population, housing, or employment resources and the IRP.

##### *Local*

The *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* (City of Los Angeles, 2001) includes two policies of general relevance to the IRP. Policy 2.1.6 states that the City will “...monitor population, development, infrastructure and services capacities within the City and each community plan area, or other pertinent service area;” and Policy 2.3.2 states that the City will “...allow for the provision of sufficient public infrastructure and services to support the projected needs of the population and businesses of the City within the patterns of use established in the community plans. “ The City Housing Element also includes implementation programs of general relevance to the IRP. Program P-73 notes that the environmental reviews for each community plan update “...considered the estimated population growth for that community and the availability of the infrastructure to accommodate such growth.” Program P-79 indicates that the City will continue to prepare an annual monitoring report on growth and infrastructure “...which provides information to facilitate affordable housing and development predictability. “

Additional regional and local plans and policies are described in Section 3.11 – Land Use.

#### *Methodology*

To characterize and evaluate population, housing, and employment, two types of study areas were developed. For the project-level components, a study area was defined that includes those census tracts from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000) (hereinafter “2000 Census”) that either encompass or are located adjacent to some or all of each facility. For the program-level components, a broader study area was defined to encompass the entire City of

Los Angeles, which approximates the geographical range of the HSA. Demographic data are not reported specifically for the HSA, but the City of Los Angeles is representative of the HSA because the City comprises the majority of the HSA geography. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that demographic characteristics of the small remaining portions of the HSA outside the City are not substantially different than in the City due to proximity. For contextual purposes, demographic data were also reviewed for the County of Los Angeles, which includes the entire HSA. Data sources include the 2000 Census, the SCAG 2001 RTP projections of population and employment, and the SCAG 2004 RTP projections of population and employment. The IRP Facilities Plan was developed using the SCAG 2001 RTP data.

Impacts associated with growth and developments were determined qualitatively by assessing whether construction or operation of a component directly or indirectly would induce unplanned growth (i.e., growth not accounted for by local or regional plans). One factor influencing this assessment is the possibility that a component or Alternative would provide infrastructure capacity in excess of the amount required to accommodate planned levels of growth. In addition, the analysis considered the likelihood that a component would generate construction or operational employment opportunities that could not be accommodated by the current and planned levels of employment in the region and, therefore, would require construction of new housing and infrastructure systems.

The impacts that could result from the acquisition of private property and any associated displacement of residents, businesses, and employees were evaluated by first determining if a component would require the full and permanent acquisition of privately owned residences or businesses. If property acquisition would be necessary, then an assessment was made whether the amount of displaced residents, businesses, or employees would be so substantial as to require construction of new replacement homes and businesses.

The consistency of each component with adopted local and regional housing policies was made by determining whether any such policies were applicable to a component, and, if so, whether the component would conflict, support, or be irrelevant to the policies.

### *Thresholds of Significance*

The significance thresholds below are derived from the *City of Los Angeles Draft CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles, 1998) and the 2004 CEQA and *State CEQA Guidelines* (State of California, 2004). A Project Alternative would have a significant impact to population, housing, or employment if it would:

- PHE-1: Unplanned Growth – Cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area in excess of projected or planned levels for the buildout year.
- PHE-2: Acquisitions and Displacements – Cause a substantial number of residents, businesses, or employees to be displaced as a result of property acquisitions.



PHE-3: Consistency with Housing Plans and Policies – Conflict with adopted City and regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies.

### 3.14.3.2 Component Impacts

The proposed components are assessed below using the threshold of significance for population and housing.

#### *Project-Level Impacts*

##### *Hyperion Expansion to 500 mgd*

**Construction.** Construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, and would not involve the construction of any new housing. As discussed more fully in Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts, the total number of employment opportunities created both directly and indirectly by construction of the entire IRP under any Alternative would amount to approximately 2,745 direct jobs and 1,446 indirect jobs on an annual basis. That modest amount of new employment would not be anticipated to result in or induce substantial unplanned growth because nearly all of the new jobs could be filled by the existing and expected labor pool in the region, as evidenced by SCAG estimates of a surplus of unemployed persons and the very robust growth in employment over the next 15 years (see Table 3.14-4). By drawing upon employment already present or projected in the region, this component would not indirectly result in the need to construct new housing or accelerate development in undeveloped areas.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in an increase in staffing from 545 to 550 employees at Hyperion. The five additional employees likely would be from the current City work force or from the existing and projected regional labor pool already living in Southern California. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerate as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities associated with this component would be constructed and operated within the existing Hyperion facility on publicly owned property. No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur. No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component.

Operation of this component would be similar to existing operations at Hyperion, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

##### *Hyperion Process Upgrades*

**Construction.** Similar to the expansion of Hyperion to 500 mgd, construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and



would not induce unplanned growth. Consequently, construction of the Hyperion Process Upgrades component would not result in unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in an increase in staffing from 545 to 550 employees at Hyperion. Similar to the expansion of Hyperion to 500 mgd, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated. The acquisition of private property would not be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur under this component because new facilities associated would be constructed and operated within the existing Hyperion site.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing operations at Hyperion, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Tillman Expansion to 100 mgd***

**Construction.** Construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, and would not involve the construction of any new housing. As discussed in Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts, the new employment opportunities from constructing an entire Project Alternative would not induce unplanned growth. Consequently, construction of the component to expand Tillman to 100 mgd would not result in unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in an increase in staffing from 74 to 80 employees at Tillman. The six additional employees are expected to be from the current City work force or from the existing and projected regional labor pool already living in Southern California. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur under this component because new facilities would be constructed and operated within the existing Tillman site.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing operations at Tillman, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Tillman Expansion to 80 mgd***

**Construction.** Similar to the expansion of Tillman to 100 mgd, construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve

the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth. Consequently, this component would not result in unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in an increase in staffing from 74 to 79 employees at Tillman. Similar to the expansion of Tillman to 100 mgd, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated.

No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur under this component because new facilities associated would be constructed and operated within the existing Tillman site.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing operations at Tillman, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Tillman Process Upgrades***

**Construction.** Similar to the expansion of Tillman to 100 mgd, construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth; consequently, this component would not result in unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in an increase in staffing from 74 to 78 employees at Tillman. As with the expansion of Tillman to 100 mgd, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated. No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur under this component because new facilities associated with this component would be constructed and operated within the existing Tillman site.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing operations at Tillman, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Tillman Wastewater Storage***

**Construction.** Similar to the expansion of Tillman to 100 mgd, construction activities of this component would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth. Consequently, this component would not result in unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in no increase in staffing at Tillman. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped

areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur under this component because new facilities associated with this component would be constructed and operated within the existing Tillman site.

Neither City nor regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component type. However, operation of this component would be consistent with existing operations at Tillman, which are in turn consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***LAG Expansion to 30 mgd***

***Construction.*** Construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, and would not involve the construction of any new housing. As discussed in Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts, the new employment opportunities from constructing an entire Project Alternative would not induce unplanned growth. Consequently, construction of the component to expand LAG to 30 mgd likewise would not result in unplanned growth.

***Operation.*** Operation of this component would result in an increase in staffing from 45 to 48 employees at LAG. The three additional employees would be from the current City work force or from the existing and projected regional labor pool already living in Southern California. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerate as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur under this component because new facilities associated with this component would be constructed and operated within the existing Tillman site.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing operations at LAG, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***LAG Operational Storage***

***Construction.*** Similar to the expansion of LAG to 30 mgd, construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

***Operation.*** Operation of this component would result in no increase in staffing at LAG. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur under this component, because new facilities associated with this component would be constructed and operated within the existing Tillman site.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing operations at LAG, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***NEIS II West Alignment***

***Construction.*** Construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, and would not involve the construction of any new housing. As discussed in Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts, the new employment opportunities from constructing any one of the Project Alternatives (i.e., all components of an Alternative) would not induce unplanned growth. Consequently, construction of the NEIS II likewise would not result in unplanned growth.

***Operation.*** Operation of this component would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities (such as, shaft sites, conveyance systems, diversion structures, drop structures, maintenance holes, and air treatment facilities) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way and on publicly owned property. The acquisition of some underground easements would be necessary where the tunnel extends beneath or curves beneath private property, but the easements would not result in any surface expression or affect surface land uses. No acquisition of private property would be necessary aside from underground easements, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur. However, in the event that additional acquisition of private property were necessary, legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing wastewater collection system operations, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***NEIS II East Alignment***

***Construction.*** Similar to the NEIS II West Alignment, construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The acquisition of some underground easements would be necessary where the tunnel curves beneath private property, but the easements would not result in any surface expression or affect surface land uses. With two exceptions (the Verdant Street shaft site and the Brazil Street shaft site) the new facilities associated with this component (such as shaft sites, conveyance system, diversion structures, drop structures, maintenance holes, and ATFs) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way and on publicly owned property.

The construction of NEIS II would occur from shaft sites that include the Verdant Street shaft site, which would require the partial acquisition of one industrially zoned parcel, APN 5594006029. An ATF and drop structure also would be placed at this location. This parcel is currently vacant, and its acquisition would not result in displacements.

In addition, an ATF and drop structure are proposed for the Brazil Street shaft site, which would require the acquisition of three parcels, one zoned for open space (APN 5593011031) and two zoned for industrial uses (APN 5593011020 and 5593011018). With the exception of an abandoned warehouse, the parcels are vacant. Other than at the Verdant Street shaft site, the Brazil Street shaft site, and the underground easements, no acquisition of private property would be necessary. No displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur. However, in the event that additional acquisitions of private property were necessary, legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing wastewater collection system operations, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### **GBIS South Alignment**

**Construction.** Similar to the NEIS II Alignments, construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The acquisition of some underground easements would be necessary where the tunnel extends beneath or curves beneath private property, but the

easements would not result in any surface expression or affect surface land uses. With the exception of the Barham Boulevard shaft site (APN 5581003003), the new facilities associated with this component (shaft sites, conveyance system, diversion structures, drop structures, maintenance holes, and ATFs) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of-way and on publicly owned property. The Barham Boulevard shaft site would require the partial acquisition of the referenced parcel. This parcel currently is vacant, and no displacements would occur. No acquisition of private property, aside from underground easements and the Barham Boulevard shaft site parcel, would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur. However, in the event that additional acquisitions of private property were necessary, legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing wastewater collection system operations, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***GBIS North Alignment***

***Construction.*** Similar to the NEIS II West Alignment, construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

***Operation.*** Operation of this component would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The acquisition of some underground easements would be necessary where the tunnel extends beneath or curves beneath private property, but the easements would not result in any surface expression or affect surface land uses. With two possible exceptions (one of two sites may require acquisition for the placement of a drop structure in the vicinity of Vineland Avenue and Riverside Drive or Moorpark Street), the new facilities (i.e., shaft sites, conveyance systems, diversion structures, drop structures, maintenance holes, and ATFs) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of-way and on publicly owned property.

If Optional Alignment A of the GBIS North Alignment is selected, a drop structure in the vicinity of Vineland Avenue and Moorpark Street would require the acquisition of one parcel (APN 2423010013) located at 11003 West Moorpark Street. This parcel is developed as an automobile repair facility. Relocation assistance would be provided, or the parcel would be purchased at market rates.

If Optional Alignment B of the GBIS North Alignment is selected, a drop structure in the vicinity of Vineland Avenue and Riverside Drive could require





the acquisition of a surface parking lot located at 10928 West Riverside Drive. This parking lot contains four parcels (APNs 2423009020, 2423009022, 2423009022, and 2423009023). Relocation assistance would be provided, or the parcels would be purchased at market rates.

Other than the underground easements and the parcel identified above, no acquisition of private property would be necessary. Aside from relocation assistance or the purchase of the referenced parcels to be acquired, no additional displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur. However, in the event that additional acquisition of private property were necessary, legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing wastewater collection system operations, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

### ***Program-Level Component Impacts***

#### ***VSLIS***

***Construction.*** Similar to components described above, construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

***Operation.*** Operation of this component would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities (diversion structures, drop structures, maintenance holes, and ATFs) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of-way and on publicly owned property if constructed by open trench methods. If constructed by tunneling methods, there would be a potential for the acquisition of private property for tunnel shaft sites and permanent facilities, with an associated potential for displacement of residents, businesses, or employees. Legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing wastewater collection system operations, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Recycled Water***

***Construction.*** As with the components described above, construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in minimal, if any, increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities associated with this component (pipelines, pump stations, and storage tanks) mostly would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way and on publicly owned property, although the tanks may be constructed on one or more parcels, which would be acquired. The acquisition of private property likely would be necessary, with an associated potential for the displacement of residents, businesses, or employees. Legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing recycled water system operations, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Dry Weather Runoff – Smart Irrigation***

**Construction.** Similar to other components described above, construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities associated with this component (smart irrigation control devices) would be installed and operated on privately owned residential, commercial, and industrial property. However, installation of irrigation equipment fixtures would not require that the City obtain any interest in the property (for example, an easement or license). No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing water conservation programs and existing irrigation systems, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Dry Weather Runoff – Low-Flow Diversions***

**Construction.** Similar to other components described above, construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.



**Operation.** Operation would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities associated with this component (pipelines, diversion structures, and pump stations) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way and on publicly owned property. No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be similar to existing low-flow diversions, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Dry Weather Runoff - Urban Runoff Plants or Treatment Wetlands***

**Construction.** Similar to other components described above, construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation of this component would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities (urban runoff plants, treatment wetlands, pipelines, diversion structures, temporary storage, and pump stations) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way, on publicly owned property, or possibly on private property, which would have to be acquired. A potential exists to displace residents, businesses, or employees. Legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation would be consistent with the existing operations of the storm drain system, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Wet Weather Runoff - Onsite Management***

**Construction.** Similar to other components described above, construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would

be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities (runoff capture and percolation systems, groundwater infiltrators, and storage cisterns) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way and on publicly owned property. No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be consistent with the existing operations of the storm drain system, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Wet Weather Runoff - Urban Runoff Plants***

**Construction.** Similar to other components described above, construction activities associated with this component would be temporary and short term in duration, would not involve the construction of any new housing, and would not induce unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation would result in a slight increase in City staffing for plant operations. The increase in staffing would be considered minimal and would be expected to be accommodated from the existing labor pool. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities (URPs, pipelines, diversion structures, temporary storage, and pumping stations) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way, on publicly owned property, and possibly on private property, which would have to be acquired. A potential exists to displace residents, businesses, or employees. Legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation would be consistent with the existing operations of the storm drain system, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

#### ***Wet Weather Runoff - Non-Urban Regional Recharge***

**Construction.** Construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, and would not involve the construction of any new housing. As discussed in Section 4.2 - Growth-Inducing Impacts, the new employment opportunities from constructing the entire IRP would not induce unplanned growth. Consequently, construction of wet weather non-urban runoff infrastructure likewise would not result in unplanned growth.

**Operation.** Operation would result in no increase in City staffing. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region.

The new facilities (pipelines to the spreading facilities) would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way and on publicly owned property. No acquisition of private property would be necessary, and no displacement of residents, businesses, or employees would occur.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be consistent with the existing operations of the storm drain system, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above.

### Summary of Component Impacts

Table 3.14-5 presents a summary of the population, housing, and employment impacts of the IRP facilities Plan Components.

<b>Table 3.14-5. Population, Housing, and Employment Component Impact Summary Table Integrated Resources Plan EIR</b>			
<b>Component</b>	<b>Component Impact</b>		
	<b>Unplanned Growth</b>	<b>Acquisitions and Displacements</b>	<b>Housing Plan Consistency</b>
<b>Project-Level</b>			
Hyperion Expansion to 500 mgd	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
Hyperion Process Upgrades	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
Tillman Expansion to 100 mgd	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
Tillman Expansion to 80 mgd	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
Tillman Process Upgrade	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
Tillman Wastewater Storage	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
LAG Expansion to 30 mgd	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
LAG Oper. Storage	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
NEIS II West Alignment	No unplanned growth	Underground easements	Consistent
NEIS II East Alignment	No unplanned growth	Underground easements Verdant Shaft Site: partial acquisition of vacant industrial parcel, no displacements	Consistent

<b>Table 3.14-5. Population, Housing, and Employment Component Impact Summary Table Integrated Resources Plan EIR</b>			
<b>Component</b>	<b>Component Impact</b>		
	<b>Unplanned Growth</b>	<b>Acquisitions and Displacements</b>	<b>Housing Plan Consistency</b>
		Brazil Street shaft site: full acquisition of one open space and two industrial parcels with an abandoned warehouse, no displacements	
GBIS South Alignment	No unplanned growth	Underground easements Barham Shaft Site: partial acquisition of one vacant parcel, no displacements	Consistent
GBIS North Alignment	No unplanned growth	Underground easements Optional Alignment A: acquisition of one parcel (auto repair) for drop structure near Vineland and Moorpark Optional Alignment B: acquisition of four parcels (parking lot) for drop structure near Vineland and Riverside	Consistent
<b>Program-Level</b>			
VSLIS	No unplanned growth	Possible acquisitions and displacements if constructed by tunneling	Consistent
Recycled Water	No unplanned growth	Possible acquisitions and displacements for water storage tanks	Consistent
DWR – Smart Irrigation	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
DWR – LF Divisions	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
DWR – URP or TW	No unplanned growth	Possible acquisitions and displacements for URPs or treatment wetlands	Consistent
WWR – Onsite Management	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent
WWR – Urban Runoff Plants	No unplanned growth	Possible acquisitions and displacements for URPs	Consistent
WWR – Non-Urban Recharge	No unplanned growth	None	Consistent

### 3.14.3.3 Alternative Impacts

#### *Alternative 1*

Alternative 1 components are described in Section 2.3.4.

#### *Impact PHE-1*

**Primary Impacts.** Construction activities would be temporary and short term in duration, and would not involve the construction of any new housing. Thus, construction of Alternative 1 would have no direct impact on growth.





Because the operation of Alternative 1 would not involve the construction of any new housing, no direct impact on growth would result.

**Secondary Impacts.** As discussed more fully in Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts, the total number of employment opportunities created both directly and indirectly by construction of the entire IRP under any Alternative would amount to approximately 2,745 direct jobs and 1,446 indirect jobs. That modest amount of new employment would not be anticipated to result in or induce substantial unplanned growth because nearly all of the new jobs could be filled by the existing and expected labor pool in the region, as evidenced by SCAG estimates of a surplus of unemployed persons and the very robust growth in employment over the next 15 years (see Table 3.14-4). By drawing upon employment already present or projected in the region, construction of new housing or accelerated development in undeveloped areas would not be needed.

Operation of Alternative 1 would result in a net increase of 9 employees at Hyperion and Tillman. These few additional employees would almost certainly come from the current City work force or from the existing and projected regional labor pool already living in Southern California. Consequently, no new housing or development in undeveloped areas would be induced or accelerated as a result of substantial numbers of new employees coming into the region, and no adverse indirect impact on growth would result.

As detailed in Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts, operation of any the Proposed Project Alternatives would have the potential to indirectly induce growth by providing excess infrastructure capacity. All of the Proposed Project Alternatives to the IRP would provide wastewater treatment plant capacity to handle the wastewater flows expected in 2020. Expansion and upgrade of the treatment plants under any of the Proposed Project Alternatives would be based on wastewater flow projections that are themselves a product of the SCAG projections of population and employment for the HSA (see Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts and IRP Facilities Plan). The proposed future treatment capacities at Hyperion, Tillman, and LAG have been sized to that which would safely accommodate the projected wastewater flows.

Additionally, the improvements under any of the Proposed Project Alternatives would be implemented in accordance with certain trigger flows described in Section 2 that would establish the timing of facilities improvements. The trigger mechanisms represent a conservative scenario whereby the maximum level of implementation would be assumed for the buildout year (2020). Because the projections of population and employment on which the triggers are based historically have over-estimated and over-projected actual levels of growth in Southern California, the implementation of facilities improvements under the Proposed Project Alternatives potentially could occur more slowly, not reaching buildout levels as soon as expected. Additionally, because of the success of water conservation efforts and the

reduced wastewater flows that have resulted, the City currently has some available treatment capacity. No evidence suggests that this available capacity has affected growth in the City. For all of the foregoing reasons, then, operation of Alternative 1 would not result in any adverse indirect impact on growth.

**Mitigation.** No mitigation required.

**Impacts after Mitigation.** No impact.

#### **Impact PHE-2**

**Primary Impacts.** Impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements would be long-term operation impacts and are discussed below.

With two possible exceptions, the new facilities and improvements associated with Alternative 1 would be constructed and operated within existing public rights-of way and on publicly owned property. If the NEIS II East Alignment were implemented, the Verdant Street shaft site, drop structure, and ATF and the Brazil Street shaft site, drop structure, and ATF would occupy vacant parcels that would be acquired from private owners.

If the GBIS South Alignment were selected, the partial acquisition of a single parcel would be acquired for the Barham shaft site. If the GBIS North Alignment were implemented, one parcel would be acquired for the placement of a drop structure (Optional Alignment A), or four parcels would be acquired for the drop structure (optional Alignment B). Under Optional Alignment A, one automobile repair facility would be displaced and relocated, as applicable. Under Optional Alignment B, a surface parking lot would be displaced and relocated, as applicable.

For the program-level components, the potential exists for future property acquisitions associated with the VSLIS project and recycled water storage tanks. If the sites were occupied, some displacements would occur, and relocation assistance, as applicable, would be provided. Although no other displacements or relocations would be anticipated, in the event that some unanticipated private property acquisitions and displacements arise, legally required relocation assistance would be provided to eligible displacees.

Given the minor known property acquisitions, the minor potential for future acquisitions, and the availability of relocation assistance in the event that currently unanticipated acquisitions and displacements become necessary, Alternative 1 would result in no significant direct impacts related to acquisitions and displacements.

**Secondary Impacts.** Impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements would be long-term operation impacts and are discussed below.

Because only a very few property acquisitions would be required by Alternative 1, and no displacements would occur, construction of replacement

housing or businesses elsewhere would not be needed. Accordingly, Alternative 1 would result in no adverse indirect impacts related to acquisitions and displacements.

**Mitigation.** No mitigation is required.

**Impacts after Mitigation.** No impacts would occur.

**Impact PHE-3**

**Primary Impacts.** No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would be applicable to the construction activities associated with this Alternative.

No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would directly address this component. Operation of this component would be consistent with the existing operations of the wastewater, recycled water, and runoff system, which are consistent with the general policies and programs in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan, Housing Element* described above. Thus, operation of this Alternative would result in no adverse direct impacts related to housing plans and policies.

**Secondary Impacts.** No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would be applicable to the construction activities associated with Alternative 1.

Because operation of Alternative 1 would have no impacts on housing plans and policies that would be later in time or farther removed in distance, no adverse indirect impacts related to housing plans and policies would be anticipated.

**Mitigation.** No mitigation is required.

**Impacts after Mitigation.** No impacts would occur.

**Alternative 2**

Alternative 2 components are described in Section 2.3.5.

**Impact PHE-1**

**Primary Impacts.** As with Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 2 would have no direct impact on growth.

Similar to Alternative 1, the operation of Alternative 2 would not involve the construction of any new housing, and no direct impact on growth would result.

**Secondary Impacts.** Similar to Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 2 would not result in the need to construct new housing or accelerate development in undeveloped areas.

Operation of Alternative 2 would result in a net increase of 13 employees at Hyperion, Tillman, and LAG. As with Alternative 1, this minor increase in additional employees would not induce nor accelerate new housing or

development in undeveloped areas, and no adverse indirect impact on growth would result. Similar to Alternative 1, operation of Alternative 2 would not cause unplanned growth that could result in adverse indirect or secondary impacts.

**Mitigation.** No mitigation is required.

**Impacts after Mitigation.** No impacts would occur.

**Impact PHE-2**

**Primary Impacts.** Impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements would be long-term operation impacts and are discussed below.

Alternative 2 would include NEIS II and GBIS, as described under Alternative 1. Consequently, Alternative 2 would have the potential for acquisitions and displacements of the same properties as described under Alternative 1. Given the minor known property acquisitions, the minor potential for future acquisitions, and the availability of relocation assistance in the event that currently unanticipated acquisitions and displacements become necessary, Alternative 2 would result in no adverse direct impacts related to acquisitions and displacements.

**Secondary Impacts.** Impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements would be long-term operation impacts and are discussed below.

Because only a very few property acquisitions would be required by this Alternative, and no displacements would occur, construction of replacement housing or businesses elsewhere would not be needed. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would result in no adverse indirect impacts related to acquisitions and displacements.

**Mitigation.** No mitigation is required.

**Impacts after Mitigation.** No impacts would occur.

**Impact PHE-3**

**Primary Impacts.** No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would be applicable to the construction activities associated with Alternative 2.

As with Alternative 1, operation of Alternative 2 would not result in adverse direct impacts related to housing plans and policies.

**Secondary Impacts.** No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would be applicable to the construction activities associated with this Alternative.

Similar to Alternative 1, no adverse indirect impacts related to housing plans and policies would occur from the operation of Alternative 2.

*Mitigation.* No mitigation is required.

*Impacts after Mitigation.* No impacts would occur.

### **Alternative 3 Impacts**

Alternative 3 components are described in Section 2.3.6.

#### **Impact PHE-1**

*Primary Impacts.* As with Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 3 would have no direct impact on growth.

As with Alternative 1, the operation of Alternative 3 would not involve the construction of any new housing, and no direct impact on growth would result.

*Secondary Impacts.* Similar to Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 3 would not result in the need to construct new housing or accelerate development in undeveloped areas.

Operation of Alternative 3 would result in a net increase of 11 employees at Hyperion and Tillman. This minor increase in additional employees would not induce nor accelerate new housing or development in undeveloped areas, and no adverse indirect impact on growth would result. Similar to Alternative 1, operation of Alternative 3 would not cause unplanned growth that could result in adverse indirect or secondary impacts.

*Mitigation.* No mitigation is required.

*Impacts after Mitigation.* No impacts would occur.

#### **Impact PHE-2**

*Primary Impacts.* Impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements would be long-term operation impacts and are discussed below.

Alternative 3 would include NEIS II and GBIS, as described under Alternative 1. Consequently, Alternative 3 would have the potential for acquisitions and displacements of the same properties as described under Alternative 1. Given the minor known property acquisitions, the minor potential for future acquisitions, and the availability of relocation assistance in the event that currently unanticipated acquisitions and displacements become necessary, Alternative 3 would result in no adverse direct impacts related to acquisitions and displacements.

*Secondary Impacts.* Impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements would be long-term operation impacts and are discussed below.

Because only a very few property acquisitions would be required by Alternative 3 and no displacements would occur, construction of replacement housing or businesses elsewhere would not be needed. Accordingly,

Alternative 3 would result in no adverse indirect impacts related to acquisitions and displacements.

**Mitigation.** No mitigation is required.

**Impacts after Mitigation.** No impacts would occur.

**Impact PHE-3**

**Primary Impacts.** No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would be applicable to the construction activities associated with Alternative 3.

As with Alternative 1, operation of Alternative 3 would not result in adverse direct impacts related to housing plans and policies.

**Secondary Impacts.** No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would be applicable to the construction activities associated with this Alternative.

Similar to Alternative 1, no adverse indirect impacts related to housing plans and policies would occur from the operation of Alternative 3.

**Mitigation.** No mitigation required.

**Impacts after Mitigation.** No impacts would occur.

**Alternative 4**

Alternative 4 components are described in Section 2.3.7.

**Impact PHE-1**

**Primary Impacts.** As with Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 4 would have no direct impact on growth.

As with Alternative 1, the operation of Alternative 4 would not involve the construction of any new housing, and no direct impact on growth would result.

**Secondary Impacts.** Similar to Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 4 would not result in the need to construct new housing or accelerate development in undeveloped areas.

Operation of Alternative 4 would result in a net increase of 11 employees at Hyperion and Tillman. This minor increase in additional employees would not induce or accelerate new housing or development in undeveloped areas, and no adverse indirect impact on growth would result. Similar to Alternative 1, operation of Alternative 4 would not cause unplanned growth that could result in adverse indirect or secondary impacts.

As with Alternative 1 and as discussed in Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts and the IRP Facilities Plan, construction of Alternative 4 would not induce growth. Consequently, significant cumulative impacts would not be anticipated.



*Mitigation.* No mitigation is required.

*Impacts after Mitigation.* No impacts would occur.

**Impact PHE-2**

*Primary Impacts.* Impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements would be long-term operation impacts and are discussed below.

Alternative 4 would include NEIS II and GBIS, as described under Alternative 1. Consequently, Alternative 4 would have the potential for acquisitions and displacements of the same properties as described under Alternative 1. Given the minor known property acquisitions, the minor potential for future acquisitions, and the availability of relocation assistance in the event that currently unanticipated acquisitions and displacements become necessary, Alternative 4 would result in no adverse direct impacts related to acquisitions and displacements.

*Secondary Impacts.* Impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements would be long-term operation impacts and are discussed below.

Because only a very few property acquisitions would be required by Alternative 4, and no displacements would occur, construction of replacement housing or businesses elsewhere would not be needed. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would result in no adverse indirect impacts related to acquisitions and displacements.

*Mitigation.* No mitigation is required.

*Impacts after Mitigation.* No impacts would occur.

**Impact PHE-3**

*Primary Impacts.* No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would be applicable to the construction activities associated with Alternative 4.

As with Alternative 1, operation of Alternative 4 would not result in adverse direct impacts related to housing plans and policies.

*Secondary Impacts.* No City or regional housing policies, including affordable housing plans and policies, would be applicable to the construction activities associated with Alternative 4.

Similar to Alternative 1, no adverse indirect impacts related to housing plans and policies would occur from the operation of Alternative 4.

*Mitigation.* No mitigation is required.

*Impacts after Mitigation.* No impacts would occur.

### ***No Project Alternative***

The No Project Alternative, for purposes of this EIR, is no action. Under this Alternative, integrated improvements to the wastewater treatment and collection system, recycled water system, or runoff system will not occur.

Individual wastewater, recycled water, or runoff projects still are likely to be necessary to meet regulatory requirements and future demands, but such individual projects will be designed and constructed as the needs arise rather than being planned for in a systemwide integrated manner. Each individual project will be subject to its own environmental clearance in the future.

#### ***Impact PHE-1***

***Primary Impacts.*** Because this Alternative will make no integrated improvements to the wastewater treatment and collection system, recycled water system, or runoff system, no direct impacts related to growth would be anticipated. Any individual wastewater, recycled water, or runoff projects necessary to meet regulatory requirements and future demands will be subject to their own environmental clearance in the future. Any direct impacts related to growth from those individual projects will be addressed as part of that environmental documentation process.

***Secondary Impacts.*** Because this Alternative will make no integrated improvements to the wastewater treatment and collection system, recycled water system, or runoff system, no direct impacts related to growth would be anticipated. Any individual wastewater, recycled water, or runoff projects necessary to meet regulatory requirements and future demands will be subject to their own environmental clearance in the future. Any indirect impacts on growth as a result of the construction and operation employment generated by those individual projects will be addressed as part of that environmental documentation process.

As described in Section 4.2 – Growth-Inducing Impacts, the No Project Alternative will not implement an integrated wastewater, recycled water, or runoff program. In the long-term, however, various wastewater, recycled water, and runoff projects will be necessary to protect public health and safety or meet regulatory requirements. In the absence of an integrated resources planning process for the City wastewater system, projects still will be implemented individually. The individual projects, however, will be constructed at unknown future dates and will not benefit from incremental consideration of various trigger mechanisms (discussed in Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, and 2.4.3) for maximizing efficiencies based on objectives of the IRP. It is not clear if these individual efforts will provide capacity sufficient to meet the projected flows through the buildout year.

A possible lack of treatment capacity in the future could cause land use limitations to be imposed or other growth restrictions to be implemented as a means of keeping wastewater flows at volumes capable of being handled by the conveyance and treatment system. Whether such restrictions will by themselves have an adverse impact on population and employment growth is

uncertain, since other factors (e.g., economic conditions, birth and death rates, and new technologies) will also influence growth both adversely and beneficially. For this reason, any attempt to characterize the indirect impact of the No Project Alternative on growth would be speculative and largely the product of conjecture at this point. It would, however, be reasonable to assume that, in comparison to the integrated infrastructure improvements and capacity offered by the Proposed Project Alternatives, a series of individual and incremental improvements probably will be less capable of and/or less efficient in managing and accommodating the projected growth in Los Angeles and the HSA.

*Mitigation.* No mitigation is required.

*Impacts after Mitigation.* No impacts will occur.

#### ***Impact PHE-2***

***Primary Impacts.*** Because this Alternative will make no integrated improvements to the wastewater treatment and collection system, recycled water system, or runoff system, no direct impacts related to acquisitions and displacements are anticipated. Any individual wastewater, recycled water, or runoff projects necessary to meet regulatory requirements and future demands will be subject to their own environmental clearance in the future. Any direct impacts related to acquisitions and displacements that result from those individual projects will be addressed as part of that environmental documentation process; however, given that the Proposed Project Alternatives do not have a significant impact related to acquisition and displacements, it is unlikely that the No Project Alternative will result in significant acquisition-related impacts.

***Secondary Impacts.*** Because this Alternative will make no integrated improvements to the wastewater treatment and collection system, recycled water system, or runoff system, no indirect impacts related to acquisitions and displacements are anticipated. Any individual wastewater, recycled water, or runoff projects necessary to meet regulatory requirements and future demands will be subject to their own environmental clearance in the future. Any indirect impacts related to acquisitions and displacements that result from those individual projects will be addressed as part of that environmental documentation process; however, given that the Proposed Project Alternatives do not have a significant impact related to acquisition and displacements, it is unlikely that the No Project Alternative will result in significant acquisition-related impacts.

*Mitigation.* No mitigation is required.

*Impacts after Mitigation.* No impacts will occur.

#### ***Impact PHE-3***

***Primary Impacts.*** Because this Alternative will make no integrated improvements to the wastewater treatment and collection system, recycled water system, or runoff system, no direct impacts related to housing plans and

policies are anticipated. Any individual wastewater, recycled water, or runoff projects necessary to meet regulatory requirements and future demands will be subject to their own environmental clearance in the future. Any direct impacts related to housing plans and policies that result from those individual projects will be addressed as part of that environmental documentation process; however, given that the Proposed Project Alternatives do not have a significant impact related to housing plan and policy inconsistencies, it is unlikely that the No Project Alternative will result in significant acquisition-related impacts.

**Secondary Impacts.** Because this Alternative will make no integrated improvements to the wastewater treatment and collection system, recycled water system, or runoff system, no indirect impacts related to housing plans and policies are anticipated. However, to the extent that the No Project Alternative results in wastewater capacity limitations in the future that result in limitations in housing approvals, impacts to housing policies could occur. Any individual wastewater, recycled water, or runoff projects necessary to meet regulatory requirements and future demands will be subject to their own environmental clearance in the future. Any indirect impacts related to housing plans and policies that result from those individual projects will be addressed as part of that environmental documentation process.

**Mitigation.** No mitigation is required.

**Impacts after Mitigation.** No impacts will occur.

#### 3.14.3.4 Cumulative Impacts

Construction of any of the Project Alternatives would not induce growth in the City of Los Angeles or in the HSA. Although other related projects also would be constructed and would result in employment opportunities, the existing and projected labor pool of construction workers in the City of Los Angeles and region would be expected to accommodate new cumulative construction employment opportunities. In addition, an existing pool of unemployed persons in the City of Los Angeles and region would be expected to accommodate the demand for construction employment of any of the Project Alternatives in combination with the related projects. Furthermore, construction of the Alternatives would not result the displacement of a substantial number of persons or businesses. None of the related projects would result in a substantial number of displacements. Consequently, construction of the Alternatives would not be expected to result in significant impacts to cumulative population or housing.

Operation of the Alternatives would provide wastewater treatment capacity, wastewater conveyance capacity, and recycled water to the residents, employees, and industries projected for the HSA by 2020. Whereas, the City of Los Angeles General Plan and general plans of other jurisdictions would provide policies and mechanisms for meeting the land-based needs (such as housing, land use development, urban form, and transportation policies) of the future population of the City of Los Angeles, the IRP would provide the facilities for meeting the wastewater, recycled water, and runoff needs of the same population.

General plans in Southern California are based on projections of population and employment developed by SCAG. Similarly, the wastewater treatment capacity proposed under the IRP also is based on SCAG population projections. Implementation of that treatment capacity would occur only if and when the capacity were needed and would be based on triggers described in Section 2. In addition, other related plans such as the Wastewater Capital Improvement Program and the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan are intended to facilitate the management of wastewater and runoff, respectively.

Operation of any of the Alternatives in concert with the related projects would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of persons or businesses. None of the related projects would result in a substantial number of displacements. Operation of any Alternative also would accommodate or support projected future housing growth and housing policies by providing the required wastewater capacity, increasing potable water supply options through increased water recycling, and better runoff management.

Because of the above, implementation of the Alternatives, when considered in conjunction with the City of Los Angeles General Plan, general plans of other jurisdictions, the Wastewater Capital Improvement Program, and the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan, would not result in significant cumulative impacts to population or housing.