# **Table of Contents**

# N.3 Employment, Housing and Population - Population

1.	INTRODUCTION	2082
2.	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	2082
	a. Geographical Areas Analyzed	
	(1) City of Los Angeles Subregion	2002 2082
	(2) Southeast San Fernando Valley	
	(3) Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass Community	2002
		2002
	Plan Area	
	b. SCAG Regional Growth Forecast	
	c. Population Scale and Characteristics	2085
2	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	2085
J.		
	a. Methodologyb. Thresholds of Significance	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	c. Project Design Features	
	d. Project Impacts	
	(1) Construction Impacts	
	(2) Operational Impacts	
	(3) Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario	2090
1	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	2001
4.	CONICEATIVE INITACTS	2091
5.	PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES AND MITIGATION MEASURES	2091
	a. Project Design Features	2091
	b. Mitigation Measures	
6.	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	2091

# **List of Tables**

197	SCAG Population Forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion	. 2084
198	City Population Estimates and SCAG Population Forecast for the Southeast San Fernando Valley	. 2084
199	Project Population Compared with Adopted SCAG Population Forecasts	. 2089
200	Project Population Plus "Related Projects" Population Compared With the Adopted SCAG Population Forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion	. 2092

# IV. Environmental Impact Analysis

# N.3 Employment, Housing and Population - Population

#### 1. Introduction

This section is based upon the technical report entitled *An Assessment of the Employment, Housing and Population Impacts of the NBC Universal Evolution Plan*, prepared by HR&A, Inc. (2010) and attached to this Draft EIR as Appendix P. This section describes current and future trends and projections of the size and characteristics of the population in the City of Los Angeles and the Southeast San Fernando Valley. It evaluates the Project in the context of the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) population growth forecasts for the City of Los Angeles Subregion and, for informational purposes, the Southeast San Fernando Valley. This section also discusses the population implications should the Project's proposed annexation and detachment proposals not be adopted.

## 2. Environmental Setting

#### a. Geographical Areas Analyzed

Due to the regional nature of the Project, and the scale at which employment and housing markets operate, the analysis of potential Project impacts is presented in terms of the following geographic areas.

#### (1) City of Los Angeles Subregion

SCAG divides its six-county planning area into 14 subregions. The Project Site is located within the City of Los Angeles Subregion. In addition to all areas within the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles, this subregion also includes the City of San Fernando, unincorporated Los Angeles County, and certain property owned by the state and federal governments.

#### (2) Southeast San Fernando Valley

The Southeast San Fernando Valley subarea of the City of Los Angeles is included in this discussion for informational purposes only as it has no official status as a planning area for SCAG or the City or County. The area referenced as the Southeast San Fernando

Valley is roughly bordered on the west by the San Diego Freeway (I-405), on the south by Mulholland Drive, on the north by the Metrolink right-of-way that runs from approximately Roscoe Boulevard southeast to Vanowen Street, and on the east by the City of Los Angeles border with the City of Burbank. This area corresponds to the City Community Plan areas of Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass; Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks; and North Hollywood-Valley Village.

# (3) Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass Community Plan Area

Most of the Project Site is an unincorporated area that is not included in the Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass Community Plan and therefore use of the Community Plan area alone is not appropriate for this analysis. As a result, the Community Plan is not addressed in the statistical analysis but is addressed in terms of policies.

#### b. SCAG Regional Growth Forecast

According to SCAG estimates, the City of Los Angeles Subregion had a population of about 3.79 million in 2000, and about 4.12 million in 2008. By 2030, SCAG forecasts a population increase to 4.41 million persons. The forecast from 2008 through 2030 envisions an additional growth of 294,000 persons (an increase of 7.3 percent), as shown in Table 197 on page 2084. 596

In the Southeast San Fernando Valley, which is included in the City of Los Angeles Subregion, the Department of City Planning forecasts a population increase to approximately 425,000 persons by 2030, from about 398,000 persons in 2008, representing a growth of about 27,000 additional persons (an increase of 6.7 percent), as shown in Table 198 on page 2084.<sup>597</sup>

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>596</sup> Southern California Association of Governments, 2004 Regional Transportation Plan, op cit.

Id., based on the sum of population forecast values for the group of census tracts that correspond to the boundaries of the Southeast San Fernando Valley, per the Department of City Planning specification of census tracts in the Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass, North Hollywood-Valley Village and Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan areas. The 2005 SCAG population estimate derived in this way (389,321) is very similar to the Department of City Planning's 2006 population estimate (396,336).

# Table 197 SCAG Population Forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion

Projection Year	Population
2000	3,788,752
2008 <sup>a</sup>	4,118,637
2010	4,176,079
2020	4,298,891
2030	4,413,000
Population Increase 2000 - 2008	329,885
Percentage Increase 2000 - 2008	8.71%
Population Increase 2008 - 2030	294,363
Percentage increase 2008 - 2030	7.30%

Based on a straight-line interpolation between 2005 and 2010 forecast values.

Source: Southern California Association of Governments 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Growth Forecast; HR&A, Inc., 2010; Matrix Environmental, 2010.

Table 198
City Population Estimates and SCAG Population Forecast for the Southeast San Fernando Valley

Projection Year	Sherman Oaks	No. Hollywood	Van Nuys	Total
2000 <sup>a</sup>	72,984	135,953	158,616	367,553
2008 <sup>b</sup>	79,166	146,996	171,919	398,081
2030 °	84,264	157,032	183,363	424,658
Estimated Households (2000 to 2008)	6,182	11,043	13,303	30,528
Estimated Increase (2000 to 2008)	8.5%	8.1%	8.4%	8.3%
Forecasted Households (2008 to 2030)	5,098	10,035	11,444	26,577
Forecasted Increase (2008 to 2030)	6.4%	6.8%	6.7%	6.7%

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Latest available estimates from City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, website: available at http://cityplanning.lacity.org.

Source: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning; Southern California Association of Governments; HR&A, Inc., 2010; Matrix Environmental, 2010.

b HR&A straight-line interpolation between 2005 estimate in SCAG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Forecast, adjusted for the ratio of City 2005 estimate to SCAG 2005 forecast value, and 2010 forecast from SCAG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Small Area forecast, for census tracts that correspond to the boundaries of the Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass, North Hollywood-Valley Village, and Van-Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan areas.

HR&A estimate from SCAG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Small Area forecast, adjusted for the ratio of City 2005 estimate to SCAG 2005 forecast value, for census tracts that correspond to the boundaries of the Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass, North Hollywood-Valley Village, and Van-Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan areas.

#### c. Population Scale and Characteristics

Population within the City of Los Angeles as of 2006 was approximately 3.8 million persons. With the City consisting of approximately 468 square miles, the average population density in the City is approximately 8,205 persons per square mile. In terms of age characteristics, almost 30 percent of the City's total population was 19 years of age or younger and over 18 percent of the population was 55 years of age or older. Reflecting the urban character of the City, 55 percent of the 2000 population was living in multi-family housing units, with the balance residing in single-family homes. Average household sizes range from 2.60 persons for multi-family housing units to 3.19 persons for single-family homes. The Citywide average household size, across all housing types, is 2.83 persons. In comparison to the County of Los Angeles, population density is much higher, whereas the age characteristics of the population and the overall average household size are generally comparable.

According to the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, the Southeast San Fernando Valley area included a population of 396,336 in 2006. The population of the Southeast San Fernando Valley has a higher density of approximately 10,700 persons per square mile, as compared to the Citywide average of 8,205 persons per square mile. As measured by the U.S. Census, in 2000, about 19 percent was school age (5 to 19 years), over half (57 percent) were adults age 20 to 55 years old, and about 16 percent was age 55 or older. This age profile is somewhat more weighted toward adults 20 to 55 years old than the Citywide age distribution. A higher proportion of households in the Southeast San Fernando Valley reside in multi-family housing than the City as a whole, and average household sizes are smaller.

# 3. Environmental Impacts

#### a. Methodology

Population growth impacts are assessed in terms of the Project's relationship to applicable adopted population growth forecasts only, because there are no other population growth policies *per* se in City, County or regional plans.

#### b. Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with the City of Los Angeles' CEQA Thresholds Guidelines (2006), and based on the factors within, the Project would have a significant impact on housing if:

- It would cause growth (i.e., new population), or accelerate development in an undeveloped area, that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of Project buildout and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment;
- It is not compatible with adopted local and regional employment, housing or population growth policies, including jobs/housing balance, as set forth in the County's General Plan, the City's General Plan and the Southern California Association of Government's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide.
- The Project would introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan; and
- The Project represents a substantial amount of growth which would not occur without implementation of the Project.

#### c. Project Design Features

No project design features are proposed with regard to population.

#### d. Project Impacts

#### (1) Construction Impacts

Due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely, to any significant degree, to relocate to an area as a consequence of the job opportunities presented by the Project. The construction industry differs from most other industry sectors in several important ways that are relevant to potential impacts on population:

- There is no regular place of work. Construction workers commute to job sites
  that change many times in the course of a year. These often lengthy daily
  commutes are made possible by the off-peak starting and ending times of the
  typical construction work day.
- Many construction workers are highly specialized (e.g., crane operators, steel workers, masons), and move from job site to job site as dictated by the demand for their skills.
- The work requirements of most construction projects are also highly specialized and workers are employed on a job site only as long as their skills are needed to complete a particular phase of the construction process.

It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Project-related construction workers would not relocate to the area as a consequence of working on the Project and no adverse population impacts are anticipated as a result of Project construction.

#### (2) Operational Impacts

#### (a) Population of Proposed Residential Development

The proposed Project includes development of an urban residential community comprised of 2,937 dwelling units within the Mixed-Use Residential Area portion of the Project Site. There is no existing residential population located at the Project Site. The target market for the residential component of the Project is a mix of first-time buyers, empty-nesters, move-up buyers, entertainment industry professionals, young professionals, and seniors, in households that are primarily singles, couples, and small families. Unit sizes are anticipated to range from studio to four bedrooms, but a specific mix has not yet been determined, and could change over the course of development in response to market demand. Most buildings would have 50 or more units per structure, but some would be lower-density townhomes. About 60 percent of the Project's new dwelling units would be condominiums and townhomes and about 40 percent would be rentals. <sup>598</sup>

Owner-occupied households in buildings with 20 to 49 units located within the City of Los Angeles, per the 2000 U.S. Census, had an average of 2.00 persons per unit, and renter-occupied households in multi-unit buildings with 20 to 49 units had an average of 2.49 persons per household. Applying these factors to the assumed distribution of for-sale (i.e., 60 percent of total units) and rental (i.e., 40 percent of total units) units planned for the Project results in an average household size of 2.20 persons per household. Thus, the Project's 2,937 units would yield a total population of 6,450 persons.

#### (b) Population of Non-Residential Development

It is predicted that the scale of any Project-related population impacts resulting from non-residential development would be proportional to the number of Project employee households who are likely to move closer to Universal City within one year after the employee takes a job at the Project. All other household moves would occur for reasons unrelated to the Project. As discussed in detail in Section IV.N.2, Housing, of this Draft EIR, based on the extrapolated results of the 2008 Employee Survey, it is estimated that 232 Project employee households would move closer to Universal City. To the extent that

This tenure type mix is for analytic purposes only. The actual tenure type mix will be in response to market conditions at the time of actual development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>599</sup> HR&A, Inc., An Assessment of the Employment, Housing and Population Impacts of the NBC Universal Evolution Plan, Tables V-4 and V-5. (See Appendix P of this Draft EIR.)

such demand is not met by the then-existing housing supply, including new housing planned as part of the Project, a resulting increase in the number of housing units and, hence population, may occur. As a conservative estimate, if all such employees form themselves into separate households, equal in size to the overall average forecasted by SCAG in 2030 (i.e., 3.0 persons/household), the Project's resulting numerical indirect population impact would total 696 new persons.

#### (c) Project Population Impacts

The Project would generate a direct residential population of 6,450 persons and an indirect population impact from non-residential development of 696 persons, by 2030, for a total of 7,146 persons. The Project's total population impact would represent approximately 0.2 percent of the population forecast for 2030 in the City of Los Angeles Subregion and just over two percent (2.4 percent) of the remaining population growth forecast between 2008 and 2030 in the subregion. This population would also represent less than two percent (1.7 percent) of the forecast population of the Southeast San Fernando Valley in 2030. The Project's population impact would also represent approximately 25 percent of the remaining population growth forecast between 2008 and 2030 for the Southeast San Fernando Valley. The Project is compared to the adopted SCAG population forecasts in Table 199 on page 2089.

#### (d) Conclusion

The Project's proposed direct and indirect population increase of 7,146 persons would provide approximately two percent of the growth in SCAG's population forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion between 2008 and 2030. The Project also represents approximately 25 percent of the population forecasted for the Southeast San Fernando Valley between 2008 and 2030, based on data generated as part of SCAG's regional growth forecast.

To the extent that the Mixed-Use Residential Area is annexed into the City of Los Angeles, the Project would assist the City in meeting its fair share of regional housing need, maintain the subregional jobs-housing balance, provide new housing opportunities, and conform with new City policy supporting higher density, compact, infill housing development that adds to the City's housing supply, while meeting other "smart growth" environmental objectives. These same benefits would accrue to the County if the annexation and detachments do not occur.

Due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely, to any notable degree, to relocate as a consequence of the job opportunities presented by the Project. Even assuming some new Project permanent employees would relocate closer to

Table 199
Project Population Compared with Adopted SCAG Population Forecasts

Projection Year	Population
SCAG Forecasts  SCAG City of Los Angeles Subregion 2030 SCAG City of Los Angeles Subregion 2008 - 2030 Growth Southeast San Fernando Valley 2030 Southeast San Fernando Valley 2008 - 2030 Growth	4,413,000 294,363 424,658 26,577
Project Population Direct (on-site housing) Indirect (employee demand) To	6,450 696 <b>tal 7,146</b>
Percentage of SCAG Forecasts  Share of SCAG City of Los Angeles Subregion 2030  Share of SCAG City of Los Angeles Subregion 2008 - 2030 Growth  Share of Southeast San Fernando Valley 2030  Share of Southeast San Fernando Valley 2008 - 2030 Growth	0.16% 2.43% 1.68% 26.89%
Source: Southern California Association of Governments; HR&. Environmental, 2010.	A, Inc., 2010; Matrix

the Project Site to be closer to work, these persons, plus those in the Project's new dwelling units, would still fall within applicable forecasts of population growth. Therefore, no indirect population growth impacts are predicted due to new employment jobs at the Project Site.

With regard to infrastructure-induced population growth, the roads planned for the Project are planned primarily for internal circulation and would not open any large undeveloped areas for new use. Similarly, utility and other infrastructure upgrades planned for the Project are intended primarily to meet Project-related demand.

The Project households' demand for commercial goods and services will be met by new retail, service, and other resources included as part of the Project or already located within proximity of the Project Site. No new development specifically to meet the Project's scale of household or commercial demand would be needed.

It should also be noted that substantial population growth is forecasted by SCAG as well as the City and County of Los Angeles to occur over the next 20-25 years. It is possible that some or all of the population at the Project would be accommodated elsewhere in the County in response to future employment and household growth even if the Project had not been proposed. It is unlikely, however, that the concentration of population planned for the Project, if located elsewhere, would have the same direct access to employment and regional transportation as would occur at the Project Site.

Furthermore, the Project represents a new opportunity to develop residential uses at urban densities in an underdeveloped area. As the Southeast San Fernando Valley region is highly developed and has little vacant land available for new development, the Project would inevitably constitute a notable percentage of the Southeast San Fernando Valley's forecasted growth. Since population growth at the Project Site supports regional and city policies regarding the location of new population in areas with access to public transit and existing infrastructure, the Project constituting a notable percentage of the forecasted growth within the Southeast San Fernando Valley does not constitute a significant impact, and moreover, may actually constitute a beneficial effect because it realizes growth within a regional center that was forecasted to grow but lacks current and specific development proposals that realize the forecasted growth.

Furthermore, the additional housing units planned for the site represent new population at a location where housing was not previously contemplated, and this could cause some reduction in population in adjacent areas. Considering the scale of future housing demand associated with the regional growth forecast, any such local shift in population would not be expected to alter the overall housing, or employment demand-supply balance. On the contrary, the Project's co-location of new jobs, housing and population in close proximity to the Universal City Metro Red Line Station on Lankershim Boulevard would be beneficial in that it would help realize SCAG, City, and County goals with regard to the environmental and other benefits of reducing vehicle miles traveled and associated air quality impacts of long-distance home-to-work commutes.

In conclusion, notwithstanding the proposed General Plan amendment and zone change, the Project would respond to, but satisfy only a portion of, unmet population growth, rather than inducing population growth. The Project would help achieve the population growth forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion, and would be consistent with regional policies to reduce urban sprawl, efficiently utilize existing infrastructure, reduce regional congestion, and improve air quality through the reduction of VMT. These conclusions apply regardless of whether the portion of the Mixed-Use Residential Area currently within the County is annexed into the City of Los Angeles, because in either case, the Project Site is located in the City of Los Angeles Subregion. For all these reasons, the Project's population impacts would be beneficial rather than adverse and less than significant. Other impacts related to Project population (e.g., schools, public services, transportation) are addressed in the applicable sections of this Draft EIR.

#### (3) Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The conclusions presented above apply regardless of whether the portion of the Mixed-Use Residential Area currently within the County is annexed into the City of Los Angeles, because in either case, the Project Site is located in the City of Los Angeles

Subregion. Thus, impacts under the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

### 4. Cumulative Impacts

Table 200 on page 2092 shows the cumulative population impact of direct Project population (i.e., from new dwelling units and an allowance for additional units generated by new employment demand) in combination with all other forecasted population growth for the City of Los Angeles Subregion between 2008 and 2030. The 2008-2030 forecasted population growth is used as a proxy for "related projects," because the population impacts of individual developments that may actually occur between 2008 and 2030 cannot be reasonably foreseen over the period of Project buildout. Table 200 compares the resulting total of direct Project population and the forecasted population growth in the Subregion with the number of people forecasted to reside in the Subregion in 2030.

Table 200 shows that: (1) Project population represents <u>0.16</u> percent of the population in the Subregion in 2030; (2) Project population represents 2.43 percent of forecasted population growth in the Subregion between 2008 and 2030; and (3) cumulative population (i.e., Project population plus 2008-2030 forecasted population growth in the Subregion) represents 6.83 percent of the forecasted population in the Subregion in 2030. Thus, the Project's incremental population effect is not "cumulatively considerable" within the meaning of CEQA, and hence its cumulative population impact is less than significant.

#### 5. Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures

#### a. Project Design Features

No project design features are proposed with regard to population.

#### b. Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required as proposed Project impacts with regard to population would be less than significant.

### 6. Level of Significance After Mitigation

Neither, the Project nor the Project in combination with related projects would exceed SCAG's population forecasts for the City of Los Angeles Subregion or the Southeast San Fernando Valley. In addition, the Project would be consistent with adopted policies of the 1996 Regional Comprehensive Plan & Guide, the Los Angeles County General Plan, and the City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework and Housing Element.

Table 200
Project Population Plus "Related Projects" Population Compared With the Adopted SCAG Population Forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion

	Population
SCAG City of Los Angeles Subregion Population, 2030	4,413,000
SCAG City of Los Angeles Subregion Population Growth, 2008 - 2030	294,363
Project Population	7,146
"Related Projects" Population	294,363
Cumulative Population (Project + Related Projects Population)	301,509
Project Population Share of Subregional Population, 2030	0.16%
Project Population Share of Subregional Population Growth 2008 - 2030	2.43%
Cumulative Population Share of Subregional Population, 2030	6.83%
<del></del>	
urce: HR&A, Inc., 2009.	

Therefore, the Project would not result in any significant environmental impacts with respect to population under either the proposed Project or the No Annexation scenario.