

# 3.15

## POPULATION AND HOUSING

### 3.15.1 Introduction

This section addresses the environmental setting for population and housing and whether there would be impacts to these resources from implementation of the proposed Project and its alternatives. The Initial Study (see Appendix A) indicated that although impacts from growth-inducement are expected to be less than significant, they would be evaluated in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR). The Initial Study also indicated that there would be no other impacts for the proposed Project on population and housing. The impact analysis presented below is therefore limited to growth-inducement.

#### 3.15.1.1 Relationship to the 1992 Deep Draft Final EIS/EIR

The 1992 Deep Draft Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (FEIS/FEIR) (USACE and LAHD 1992) assessed, at a project-specific level, the significant impacts to population and housing that would result from navigation and landfill improvements associated with the construction of Pier 400. This includes the portions of the proposed Project located on Pier 400. The Deep Draft FEIS/FEIR also evaluated at a general, or programmatic, level the projected impacts associated with the development and operation of terminal facilities, including a marine oil terminal and associated infrastructure, planned for location on Pier 400.

The Deep Draft FEIS/FEIR concluded that the development and operation of terminal facilities located on Pier 400 would not result in any significant or unavoidable impacts to population and housing. Because no significant adverse impacts to population and housing were anticipated, no mitigation measures were required.

### 3.15.2 Environmental Setting

The Port of Los Angeles (Port) is located in Los Angeles County within the southernmost portion of the City of Los Angeles and is bordered to the west and north by the communities of San Pedro and Wilmington, respectively, and to the east by the Port of Long Beach. The Port area consists of 7,500 acres (3,800 acres of

water and 3,700 acres of land). The proposed Project, including the Marine Terminal, tank farms, and pipelines, would be located within the boundaries of the Port, with the exception of the terminus of Pipeline Segment 4, which is under the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles. The environmental setting is addressed individually for population and housing below.

### 3.15.2.1 Population

Table 3.15-1 presents population data for the proposed Project area. The population of Los Angeles County was over 9.9 million persons in 2004. In the same year, the population of the City of Los Angeles was over 3.9 million persons, San Pedro's population was 80,336 persons, and Wilmington-Harbor City's population was 78,841 persons. From 1990 to 2004, the population of Los Angeles County increased by 12.1 percent, compared to 12.6 percent in the City of Los Angeles, 8.3 percent in San Pedro, and 12.5 percent in Wilmington-Harbor City. Chapter 7 provides additional data on socioeconomic characteristics in the proposed Project area.

**Table 3.15-1. Population and Housing by Place and Community Plan Area (1990-2004)**

	1990	2000	2004	Percent Change 2000-2004	Percent Change 1990-2004	Annual Average Percent Change 2000-2004	Annual Average Percent Change 1990-2004
<b>Population</b>							
Los Angeles County	8,863,052	9,519,338	9,937,739	4.4%	12.1%	1.1%	0.8%
City of Los Angeles	3,485,398	3,694,820	3,925,999	6.3%	12.6%	1.5%	0.9%
Harbor Area Planning Commission	182,054	193,168	202,681	4.9%	11.3%	1.2%	0.8%
Harbor Gateway	36,011	39,685	41,608	4.8%	15.5%	1.2%	1.0%
Port of Los Angeles	1,785	1,804	1,900	5.3%	6.4%	1.3%	0.4%
San Pedro	74,175	76,173	80,336	5.5%	8.3%	1.3%	0.6%
Wilmington-Harbor City	70,083	75,506	78,841	4.4%	12.5%	1.1%	0.8%
City of Long Beach	429,433	461,522	463,885	0.5%	8.0%	0.1%	0.6%
<b>Housing</b>							
Los Angeles County	3,163,343	3,270,909	3,319,806	1.5%	4.9%	0.4%	0.3%
City of Los Angeles	1,300,024	1,337,654	1,353,209	1.2%	4.1%	0.3%	0.3%
Harbor Area Planning Commission	63,164	65,395	65,279	-0.2%	3.3%	0.0%	0.2%
Harbor Gateway	11,515	11,983	12,001	0.2%	4.2%	0.0%	0.3%
Port of Los Angeles	233	405	406	0.2%	74.2%	0.1%	4.0%
San Pedro	29,865	30,810	30,930	0.4%	3.6%	0.1%	0.3%
Wilmington-Harbor City	21,550	22,196	21,941	-1.1%	1.8%	-0.3%	0.1%
City of Long Beach	170,388	171,632	165,911	-3.3%	-2.6%	-0.8%	-0.2%
<i>Sources: City of Los Angeles 2005; U.S. Census Bureau 2006; U.S. Census Bureau 2007.</i>							

## 3.15.2.2 Housing

Table 3.15-1 presents housing data for the proposed Project area. In 2004, the number of housing units in Los Angeles County was over 3.3 million. In the same year, the City of Los Angeles contained over 1.3 million housing units, San Pedro 30,930 housing units, and Wilmington-Harbor City 21,941 housing units. Between 1990 and 2004, growth in the number of housing units varied, with Los Angeles County experiencing a 4.9 percent increase, the City of Los Angeles a 4.1 percent increase, San Pedro a 3.6 percent increase, and Wilmington-Harbor City only a 1.8 percent increase. Housing grew at a substantially lower rate than population during this time period. Chapter 7 includes additional information on socioeconomic characteristics in the proposed Project area, such as housing ownership and housing costs.

## 3.15.3 Applicable Regulations

Local and regional agencies have regulations and plans addressing growth and housing needs, which are addressed generally in Section 3.8, Land Use. There are no population and housing regulations specifically applicable for the population and housing analysis in this Draft SEIS/SEIR.

## 3.15.4 Impacts and Mitigations

### 3.15.4.1 Methodology

Based on the City of Los Angeles thresholds of significance, this analysis considers three different sets of thresholds and factors to determine the significance of impacts for population and housing growth. The analysis evaluates whether the proposed Project would cause growth (i.e., directly) by proposing new housing or employment generators, or accelerate development into undeveloped areas that exceeds projections/plans, and whether this in turn would result in an adverse physical change in the environment. The analysis also evaluates whether the proposed Project would introduce unplanned infrastructure (i.e., indirectly causing growth not previously planned for), for example through extension or expansion of roads or other infrastructure. Finally, in determining the level of impacts, the analysis considers the extent to which growth would occur without implementation of the proposed Project.

#### 3.15.4.1.1 CEQA Baseline

Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a project that exist at the time of the NOP. These environmental conditions would normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines whether an impact is significant. For purposes of this Draft SEIS/SEIR, the CEQA Baseline for determining the significance of potential impacts under CEQA is June 2004. CEQA Baseline conditions are described in Section 2.6.2.

1 The CEQA Baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time, with no project  
2 growth over time, and differs from the “No Federal Action/No Project” Alternative  
3 (discussed in Section 2.5.2.1) in that the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative  
4 addresses what is likely to happen at the site over time, starting from the baseline  
5 conditions. The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative allows for growth at the  
6 proposed Project site that would occur without any required additional approvals.

#### 7 **3.15.4.1.2 NEPA Baseline**

8 For purposes of this Draft SEIS/SEIR, the evaluation of significance under NEPA is  
9 defined by comparing the proposed Project or other alternative to the No Federal  
10 Action scenario (i.e., the NEPA Baseline and No Federal Action Alternative are  
11 equivalent for this project). Unlike the CEQA Baseline, which is defined by  
12 conditions at a point in time, the NEPA Baseline/No Federal Action is not bound by  
13 statute to a “flat” or “no growth” scenario; therefore, the USACE may project  
14 increases in operations over the life of a project to properly analyze the NEPA  
15 Baseline/No Federal Action condition.

16 The NEPA Baseline condition for determining significance of impacts is defined by  
17 examining the full range of construction and operational activities that are likely to  
18 occur without a permit from the USACE. As documented in Section 2.6.1, the  
19 USACE, the LAHD, and the applicant have concluded that no part of the proposed  
20 Project would be built absent a USACE permit. Thus, for the case of this project, the  
21 NEPA Baseline is identical to the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative (see  
22 Section 2.6.1). Elements of the NEPA Baseline include:

- 23 • Paving, lighting, fencing, and construction of an access road at Tank Farm  
24 Site 1 to allow temporary storage of chassis-mounted containers on the site  
25 by APM;
- 26 • Paving, fencing, and lighting at Tank Farm Site 2 to accommodate temporary  
27 wheeled container storage by APL or Evergreen; and
- 28 • Additional crude oil deliveries at existing crude oil terminals in the San  
29 Pedro Bay Ports.

30 Significance of the proposed Project or alternative is defined by comparing the  
31 proposed Project or alternative to the NEPA Baseline (i.e., the increment). The  
32 NEPA Baseline conditions are described in Section 2.6.1 and 2.5.2.1.

#### 33 **3.15.4.2 Thresholds of Significance**

34 The following criteria are based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los  
35 Angeles 2006) and are the basis for determining the significance of impacts  
36 associated with population and housing growth.

##### 37 **Population and Housing Growth**

38 **POP-1:** The degree to which the proposed Project would cause growth (i.e., new  
39 housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an  
40 undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of the

1 proposed Project occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse  
2 physical change in the environment.

3 **POP-2:** Whether the proposed Project would introduce unplanned infrastructure  
4 that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or  
5 General Plan.

### 6 **3.15.4.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation**

7 Population and housing impacts were evaluated based on increased direct and  
8 indirect (i.e., secondary) construction and operational jobs that would be created by  
9 the proposed Project, No Federal Action/No Project Alternative, and Reduced Project  
10 Alternative. Indirect jobs are attributable to related industry sectors, including firms  
11 in sectors that sell inputs to industries directly impacted (e.g., firms that supply goods  
12 to firms that make building materials) and sectors that benefit from changes in  
13 household spending as aggregate household income increases due to increased jobs  
14 (e.g., the retail sector). Projected job benefits are described in detail in Chapter 7,  
15 Socioeconomics, including the methodology and model used to estimate jobs.

16 In this analysis, unless specified otherwise, job numbers represent one year full-time  
17 equivalent jobs, expressed as FTE jobs or simply as jobs.

#### 18 **3.15.4.3.1 Proposed Project**

##### 19 **3.15.4.3.1.1 Construction Impacts**

20 **Impact POP-1.1: Proposed Project construction would not cause**  
21 **growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate**  
22 **development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned**  
23 **levels for the year of the proposed Project occupancy/buildout, and that**  
24 **would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.**

25 The proposed Project involves construction of a new Marine Terminal, tank farms,  
26 and pipelines. The proposed Project does not include any construction of housing.  
27 The proposed Project would generate temporary construction employment during the  
28 30-month construction period. Up to approximately 523 (peak) construction  
29 personnel would be employed at the various construction sites. The job benefit  
30 during the 2008-2011 construction timeframe would be 732 direct jobs and 1,035  
31 indirect jobs, for a total of 1,767 jobs.

32 Because the NEPA Baseline includes what would reasonably be expected to occur in  
33 the future if the proposed Project were not implemented, which would include some  
34 employment to construct the improvements at Tank Farm Site 1 and 2 described in  
35 Section 3.15.4.1.2, the employment effect of the proposed Project under NEPA is  
36 somewhat less than under CEQA. Under NEPA, jobs benefits from construction  
37 would be 692 direct and 979 indirect jobs, or 1,671 total jobs.

38 Due to the size of the regional economy and the mobile and temporary nature of  
39 construction work, this workforce would primarily come from people already living  
40 in the Los Angeles Basin.

1 The capital cost of the proposed Project is estimated to be \$400 million for the landside  
2 terminal elements, pipelines, and storage facilities. The wharf, utilities, and walkway  
3 would be designed and constructed by the Port; total capital cost is estimated to be \$50  
4 to \$55 million. These construction expenditures would also result in secondary  
5 increases in employment related to purchases from materials supply firms and their  
6 suppliers, and employment related to household expenditures by workers, referred to  
7 collectively as indirect employment. This workforce would also likely come from  
8 within the Los Angeles Basin. The proposed Project, therefore, is not anticipated to  
9 result in an increase in permanent population in the Project vicinity due to increased  
10 construction-related employment opportunities, and would not result in an  
11 incremental demand for housing.

12 The proposed Project would not accelerate development in an undeveloped area that  
13 exceeds projected/planned levels in the year of buildout. As described in Section 3.8,  
14 Land Use, proposed Project construction would be consistent with the adopted land  
15 use/density designations for the proposed Project area (**Impact LU-1**) and with the  
16 General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable  
17 plans (**Impact LU-2**). Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not  
18 accelerate development in an undeveloped area that would exceed projected/planned  
19 levels for the year of the proposed Project occupancy/buildout.

#### 20 **CEQA Impact Determination**

21 Because the proposed Project does not include construction of new housing, and also  
22 given the size of the existing workforce in the Los Angeles region, construction  
23 employment for the proposed Project would not result in in-migration to the region or  
24 relocation within the region that would lead to new development of housing or cause  
25 adverse physical changes to the environment. Therefore, impacts related to **POP-1.1**  
26 would be less than significant.

#### 27 *Mitigation Measures*

28 No mitigation is required.

#### 29 *Residual Impacts*

30 Less than significant impact.

#### 31 **NEPA Impact Determination**

32 Because the NEPA Baseline includes what would reasonably be expected to occur in  
33 the future if the proposed Project were not implemented, which would include some  
34 employment to construct the improvements at Tank Farm Site 1 and 2 described in  
35 Section 3.15.4.1.2, the employment effect of the proposed Project under NEPA is  
36 somewhat less than under CEQA. Under NEPA, jobs benefits from construction  
37 would be 692 direct and 979 indirect jobs, or 1,671 total jobs.

38 Because the proposed Project does not include construction of new housing, and also  
39 given the size of the existing workforce in the Los Angeles region, construction  
40 employment for the proposed Project would not result in in-migration to the region or  
41 relocation within the region that would lead to new development of housing or cause

1 adverse physical changes to the environment. Therefore, impacts related to **POP-1.1**  
2 under NEPA would be less than significant.

3 *Mitigation Measures*

4 No mitigation is required.

5 *Residual Impacts*

6 Less than significant impact.

7 **Impact POP-2.1: Proposed Project construction would not introduce**  
8 **unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the**  
9 **adopted Community Plan or General Plan.**

10 Infrastructure that would be constructed for the proposed Project primarily includes  
11 pipelines to transport crude oil from the terminal to the tank farms and then to the  
12 Ultramar/Valero Refinery and other Plains pipeline systems nearby. The City of Los  
13 Angeles General Plan, which includes the Port Plan, as well as the San Pedro and  
14 Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plans, contain goals and policies applicable to the  
15 proposed Project area. As described in Section 3.8.2.1, pipeline construction would be  
16 consistent with the goals and policies contained in applicable plans, because they would  
17 be located primarily in industrial areas or within right-of-way land uses. Therefore, the  
18 proposed Project would not introduce any infrastructure that is inconsistent with these  
19 plans. For a more detailed discussion of land use, see Section 3.8, Land Use.

20 **CEQA Impact Determination**

21 The proposed Project would not introduce any infrastructure that is inconsistent with  
22 applicable plans. Impacts related to **POP-2.1** would be less than significant.

23 *Mitigation Measures*

24 No mitigation is required.

25 *Residual Impacts*

26 Less than significant impact.

27 **NEPA Impact Determination**

28 The proposed Project would not introduce any infrastructure that is inconsistent with  
29 applicable plans. Impacts related to **POP-2.1** would be less than significant.

30 *Mitigation Measures*

31 No mitigation is required.

32 *Residual Impacts*

33 Less than significant impact.

1           **3.15.4.3.1.2 Operational Impacts**

2           **Impact POP-1.2: Proposed Project operations would not cause growth**  
3           **(i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate**  
4           **development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned**  
5           **levels for the year of the Project occupancy/buildout, and that would**  
6           **result in an adverse physical change in the environment.**

7           The proposed Project is estimated to create 48 permanent direct jobs attributable to  
8           operations in 2010, and 54 jobs in 2025-2040, with the increase in later years  
9           attributable to the increase in pilot and towing jobs due to more vessel calls, as well  
10          as maintenance and inspection that would occur after the first five to ten years of  
11          operations. These jobs include those associated with the terminal operations  
12          themselves as well as tugboat crews and Port pilots. In addition, linkages among  
13          economic sectors would result in the creation of 158 indirect jobs in related sectors,  
14          for a total of 212 jobs.

15          These increases in direct, indirect, and induced employment are expected to result in  
16          minimal migration to or within the region, given the size and nature of the regional  
17          economy relative to the number of workers associated with proposed Project  
18          operations. Operations employment (i.e., direct, indirect and induced employment)  
19          for the proposed Project would represent a negligible portion of regional  
20          employment: 212 workers, compared to more than 8 million workers in the region  
21          (see Table 7-1). Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would not cause  
22          growth that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.

23          The environmental analysis uses the assumption that every new barrel of crude oil  
24          demanded by southern California refineries would be received at the new Berth 408.  
25          This may not occur in practice, as competition will continue among marine oil  
26          terminals to bring in oil imports and deliver them to area refineries. However, for the  
27          analysis of most resources, this assumption provides for a conservative analysis of  
28          reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts (since it is reasonably foreseeable that  
29          due to the modern facility design, high offloading rates, and ability to accommodate  
30          VLCCs, the new Berth 408 could provide the lowest-cost receiving facility at the San  
31          Pedro Bay Ports). In the case of population and housing impacts, it is important to  
32          consider the possibility that the new Berth 408 may gain existing market share from  
33          existing terminals in the San Pedro Bay Ports that currently receive crude oil.  
34          However, if this were to occur, it is not expected that effects on the existing terminals  
35          would result in physical effects to the environment e.g., from non-operation or  
36          deterioration of facilities, because these facilities could be used in other ways, for  
37          example for refined products, specialty products, spot market, or contract arrangements  
38          with specific customers. It is important to note, in this regard, that California refineries  
39          lack sufficient distillation capacity to meet consumer demand for transportation fuels;  
40          thus, the state continues to import a portion of its refined blending components and  
41          finished gasoline and diesel to meet the growing demand (CEC 2007).

42          The proposed Project would not accelerate development in an undeveloped area that  
43          exceeds projected/planned levels in the year of buildout. As described in Section  
44          3.8.4.3, proposed Project would be consistent with the adopted land use/density  
45          designations for the Project area (**Impact LU-1**) and with the General Plan or

1 adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other applicable plans (**Impact**  
2 **LU-2**). Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would not accelerate  
3 development in an undeveloped area that would result in an adverse physical change  
4 in the environment.

### 5 **CEQA Impact Determination**

6 Compared to the CEQA Baseline, the proposed Project would generate  
7 approximately 212 direct and indirect jobs. Given the size and diversity of the  
8 existing workforce in the region, operations employment for the proposed Project  
9 would not result in in-migration to the region or relocation within the region that  
10 would not lead to new development of housing in an undeveloped area or cause  
11 adverse physical change to the environment. Therefore, impacts related to **POP-1.2**  
12 would be less than significant.

#### 13 *Mitigation Measures*

14 No mitigation is required.

#### 15 *Residual Impacts*

16 Less than significant impact.

### 17 **NEPA Impact Determination**

18 The NEPA Baseline includes what would reasonably be expected to occur in the future  
19 if the proposed Project were not implemented, which would include some employment  
20 associated with piloting and towing (tug activity) to support increased vessel calls at  
21 existing terminals in the San Pedro Bay Ports. Thus, the employment effect of the  
22 proposed Project under NEPA is somewhat less than under CEQA. Under NEPA, jobs  
23 benefits from operation of the proposed Project would include up to 42 direct jobs  
24 attributable to operations in 2040 and 126 indirect jobs or 168 total jobs.

25 Due to the size and diversity of the workforce in the region, the proposed Project  
26 operations employment would not necessitate in-migration to the region or relocation  
27 within the region that would result in new development of housing in an undeveloped  
28 area or cause adverse physical change to the environment. Therefore, impacts related  
29 to **POP-1.2** would be less than significant.

#### 30 *Mitigation Measures*

31 No mitigation is required.

#### 32 *Residual Impacts*

33 Less than significant impact.

34 **Impact POP-2.2: Proposed Project operations would not introduce**  
35 **unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the**  
36 **adopted Community Plan or General Plan.**

1 Pipeline construction for the proposed Project is addressed in Impact **POP-2.1** above.  
2 Proposed Project operations would not introduce any unplanned infrastructure.

3 **CEQA Impact Determination**

4 Because no unplanned infrastructure would be added, there would be no impact  
5 related to **POP-2.2**.

6 *Mitigation Measures*

7 No mitigation is required.

8 *Residual Impacts*

9 No impact.

10 **NEPA Impact Determination**

11 Because no unplanned infrastructure would be added, there would be no impact  
12 related to **POP-2.2**.

13 *Mitigation Measures*

14 No mitigation is required.

15 *Residual Impacts*

16 No impact.

17 **3.15.4.3.2 No Federal Action/No Project Alternative**

18 Under the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative, proposed Project facilities  
19 would not be constructed or operated. As described in Section 2.5.2.1, the No  
20 Federal Action/No Project Alternative considers the only remaining allowable and  
21 reasonably foreseeable use of the proposed Project site: Use of the site for temporary  
22 storage of wheeled containers on the site of Tank Farm 1 and on Tank Farm Site 2.  
23 This use would require paving, construction of access roads, and installation of  
24 lighting and perimeter fencing.

25 In addition, for analysis purposes, under the No Federal Action/No Project  
26 Alternative a portion of the increasing demand for crude oil imports is assumed to be  
27 accommodated at existing liquid bulk terminals in the San Pedro Bay Ports, to the  
28 extent of their remaining capacities. Although additional demand, in excess of the  
29 capacity of existing marine terminals to receive it, may come in by rail, barge, or  
30 other means, rather than speculate about the specific method by which more crude oil  
31 or refined products would enter southern California, for analysis purposes, the impact  
32 assessment for the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative in this SEIS/SEIR is  
33 based on marine deliveries only up to the available capacity of existing crude oil  
34 berths. As described in Section 2.5.2.1, the impact assessment for the No Federal  
35 Action/No Project Alternative also assumes existing terminals would eventually  
36 comply with the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) Marine Oil Terminal

1 Engineering and Maintenance Standards (MOTEMS), that LAHD and the Port of  
2 Long Beach would renew the operating leases for existing marine terminals, and that  
3 existing terminals would comply with Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) measures as of  
4 the time of lease renewal (i.e., 2008 for Port of Long Beach Berths 84-87, 2015 for  
5 LAHD Berths 238-240, and 2023 for Port of Long Beach Berths 76-78).

6 The NEPA Baseline condition coincides with the No Federal Action/No Project  
7 Alternative for this project because the USACE, the LAHD, and the applicant have  
8 concluded that, absent a USACE permit, no part of the proposed Project would be built  
9 (Section 2.6.1). All elements of the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative are  
10 identical to the elements of the NEPA Baseline. Therefore, under a NEPA determination  
11 there would be no impact associated with the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative.

#### 12 **3.15.4.3.2.1 Construction Impacts**

13 **Impact POP-1.1: The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would**  
14 **not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or**  
15 **accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds**  
16 **projected/planned levels for the year of the Project occupancy/buildout,**  
17 **and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.**

18 Under this alternative, the small number of construction jobs needed for  
19 improvements at Tank Farm Site 1 and Tank Farm Site 2 (estimated at 40 direct  
20 jobs), plus 56 indirect jobs or 96 total jobs during the construction period, would  
21 likely be filled by existing residents in and adjacent to the area of the San Pedro Bay  
22 Ports or in the surrounding region. Therefore, construction of the No Project  
23 Alternative would not result in an increase in permanent population and would not  
24 result in an incremental demand for housing.

25 As documented in Section 3.8 Land Use (**Impact LU-2**), providing additional  
26 container storage would be consistent with the existing Port Master Plan (PMP). The  
27 construction of wheeled container storage that would occur under the No Federal  
28 Action/No Project Alternative would not increase throughput at existing terminals.  
29 Thus, it would neither directly nor indirectly accelerate development in an  
30 undeveloped area beyond the planned and allowed land use.

#### 31 **CEQA Impact Determination**

32 Because the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative does not include construction  
33 of new housing, and also given the size of the existing workforce in the Los Angeles  
34 Region, construction employment for the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative  
35 would not result in in-migration to the region or relocation within the region that  
36 would lead to new development of housing or cause adverse physical changes to the  
37 environment. Therefore, impacts related to **POP-1.1** would be less than significant.

#### 38 *Mitigation Measures*

39 No mitigation is required.

1                    *Residual Impacts*

2                    Less than significant.

3                    **NEPA Impact Determination**

4                    Because the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative is identical to the NEPA  
5                    Baseline in this project, the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would have no  
6                    impact related to **POP-1.1** for NEPA.

7                    *Mitigation Measures*

8                    No mitigation is required.

9                    *Residual Impacts*

10                   No impact.

11                   **Impact POP-2.1: The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would**  
12                   **not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously**  
13                   **evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.**

14                   The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative includes only site preparation and  
15                   construction to allow wheeled container storage at Tank Farm Site 1 and Tank Farm  
16                   Site 2. Use of the two sites for wheeled container storage would be allowed by the  
17                   PMP; that is, container storage is an allowed use (see Section 2.5.2.1 and Section 3.8,  
18                   Land Use).

19                   **CEQA Impact Determination**

20                   The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would not introduce unplanned  
21                   infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or  
22                   General Plan. There would be no impact related to **POP-2.1**.

23                   *Mitigation Measures*

24                   No mitigation is required.

25                   *Residual Impacts*

26                   No impact.

27                   **NEPA Impact Determination**

28                   Because the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative is identical to the NEPA  
29                   Baseline in this project, under NEPA the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative  
30                   would have no impact related to **POP-2.1**.

31                   *Mitigation Measures*

32                   No mitigation is required.

1 *Residual Impacts*

2 No impact.

3 **3.15.4.3.2.2 Operational Impacts**

4 **Impact POP-1.2: The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would**  
5 **not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or**  
6 **accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds**  
7 **projected/planned levels for the year of the Project occupancy/buildout,**  
8 **and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.**

9 In the operation phase, no increase in throughput or employment would occur as a  
10 result of operation of the wheeled container storage. Accommodating increased  
11 demand for crude oil at existing liquid bulk terminals in the San Pedro Bay Ports,  
12 using existing infrastructure, would entail minimal new employment. This  
13 employment is estimated at approximately 12 new pilot and towing jobs to support  
14 increased numbers of tanker vessels. Due to linkages in economic sectors, these 12  
15 direct jobs would create about 32 indirect jobs, for a total of 44 jobs.

16 Due to the size and diversity of the regional workforce, these direct and indirect jobs  
17 would likely be filled by existing residents in the region. Therefore, the No Federal  
18 Action/No Project Alternative would not result in an increase in permanent  
19 population in the vicinity and would not result in an incremental demand for housing.

20 **CEQA Impact Determination**

21 Impacts related to **POP-1.2** would be less than significant.

22 *Mitigation Measures*

23 No mitigation is required.

24 *Residual Impacts*

25 Less than significant.

26 **NEPA Impact Determination**

27 Because the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative is identical to the NEPA  
28 Baseline in this project, under NEPA the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative  
29 would have no impact related to **POP-1.2**.

30 *Mitigation Measures*

31 No mitigation is required.

32 *Residual Impacts*

33 No impact.

1                   **Impact POP-2.2: The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would**  
2                   **not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously**  
3                   **evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.**

4                   The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would not introduce unplanned  
5                   infrastructure. Utilization of the Tank Farm Sites 1 and 2 for wheeled container  
6                   storage would be allowed by the PMP (i.e., container storage is an allowed use [see  
7                   Section 2.5.2.1 and Section 3.8, Land Use]) and would entail site preparation, paving,  
8                   installation of lighting and related improvements. No construction of infrastructure  
9                   would occur as a result of projected growth in throughput at the existing marine  
10                   terminals.

11                   **CEQA Impact Determination**

12                   There would be no impact related to **POP-2.2**.

13                   *Mitigation Measures*

14                   No mitigation is required.

15                   *Residual Impacts*

16                   No impact.

17                   **NEPA Impact Determination**

18                   Because the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative is identical to the NEPA  
19                   Baseline in this project, under NEPA the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative  
20                   would have no impact related to **POP-2.2**.

21                   *Mitigation Measures*

22                   No mitigation is required.

23                   *Residual Impacts*

24                   No impact.

25                   **3.15.4.3.3 Reduced Project Alternative**

26                   Under the Reduced Project Alternative, as described in Section 2.5.2.2, construction  
27                   and operation at Berth 408 would be identical to the proposed Project with the  
28                   exception of the lease cap limiting throughput in certain years. However, as  
29                   explained in Section 2.5.2.2, the lease cap would not change the amount of crude oil  
30                   demanded in southern California, and therefore the analysis of the Reduced Project  
31                   Alternative also includes the impacts of marine delivery of incremental crude oil  
32                   deliveries to existing liquid bulk terminals in the San Pedro Bay Ports in years where  
33                   demand exceeds the capacity of the lease-limited Berth 408.

34                   As described in Section 2.5.2.2, the impact assessment for the Reduced Project  
35                   Alternative also assumes existing terminals would eventually comply with the

1 MOTEMS, that the LAHD and the Port of Long Beach would renew the operating leases  
2 for existing marine terminals, and that existing terminals would comply with CAAP  
3 measures as of the time of lease renewal (i.e., 2008 for Port of Long Beach Berths 84-87,  
4 2015 for LAHD Berths 238-240, and 2023 for Port of Long Beach Berths 76-78).

### 5 **3.15.4.3.3.1 Construction Impacts**

6 **Impact POP-1.1: Construction of the Reduced Project Alternative would**  
7 **not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or**  
8 **accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds**  
9 **projected/planned levels for the year of the Reduced Project**  
10 **occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical**  
11 **change in the environment.**

12 Construction of the Reduced Project Alternative would be identical to that of the  
13 proposed Project. Thus, the Reduced Project Alternative would generate temporary  
14 construction employment during the 30-month construction period (see Figure 2-11). Up  
15 to approximately 523 (peak) construction personnel would be employed at the various  
16 construction sites. The aggregate job benefit during the 2008-2011 construction  
17 timeframe would be 732 direct jobs and 1,035 indirect jobs, for a total of 1,767 jobs.

18 Due to the size of the regional economy and the mobile and temporary nature of  
19 construction work, this workforce would primarily come from people already living  
20 in the Los Angeles Basin. The Reduced Project Alternative, therefore, is not  
21 anticipated to result in an increase in permanent population in the vicinity due to  
22 increased construction-related employment opportunities, and would not result in an  
23 incremental demand for housing.

24 The Reduced Project Alternative would not accelerate development in an  
25 undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels in the year of buildout. As  
26 described in Section 3.8, Land Use, construction would be consistent with the  
27 adopted land use/density designations for the Project area (**Impact LU-1**) and with  
28 the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies contained in other  
29 applicable plans (**Impact LU-2**). Therefore, construction related to the Reduced  
30 Project Alternative would not accelerate development in an undeveloped area that  
31 would exceed projected/planned levels for the year of the occupancy/buildout.

#### 32 **CEQA Impact Determination**

33 Because the Reduced Project Alternative does not include construction of new  
34 housing, and also given the size of the existing workforce in the Los Angeles region,  
35 construction employment for the Reduced Project Alternative would not result in im-  
36 migration to the region or relocation within the region that would lead to new  
37 development of housing or cause adverse physical changes to the environment.  
38 Therefore, impacts related to **POP-1.1** would be less than significant.

#### 39 *Mitigation Measures*

40 No mitigation is required.

1 *Residual Impacts*

2 Less than significant impact.

3 **NEPA Impact Determination**

4 Because the NEPA Baseline includes what would reasonably be expected to occur in the  
5 future if the Reduced Project Alternative (or proposed Project) were not implemented,  
6 which would include some employment to construct the improvements at Tank Farm  
7 Site 1 and 2 described in Section 3.15.4.1.2, the employment effect of the Reduced  
8 Project Alternative under NEPA is somewhat less than under CEQA. Under NEPA, jobs  
9 benefits from construction would be 692 direct and 979 indirect jobs, or 1,671 total jobs.

10 Because the Reduced Project Alternative does not include construction of new  
11 housing, and also given the size of the existing workforce in the Los Angeles region,  
12 construction employment would not result in in-migration to the region or relocation  
13 within the region that would lead to new development of housing or cause adverse  
14 physical changes to the environment. Therefore, impacts related to **POP-1.1** under  
15 NEPA would be less than significant.

16 *Mitigation Measures*

17 No mitigation is required.

18 *Residual Impacts*

19 Less than significant impact.

20 **Impact POP-2.1: Construction of the Reduced Project Alternative would**  
21 **not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously**  
22 **evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.**

23 Infrastructure that would be constructed for the Reduced Project Alternative  
24 primarily includes pipelines to transport crude oil from the terminal to the tank farms  
25 and then to the Ultramar/Valero Refinery and other Plains pipeline systems nearby.  
26 The City of Los Angeles General Plan, which includes the Port Plan, as well as the  
27 San Pedro and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plans, contain goals and policies  
28 applicable to the Project area. As described in Section 3.8.2.1, pipeline construction  
29 would be consistent with the goals and policies contained in applicable plans,  
30 because they would be located primarily in industrial areas or within right-of-way  
31 land uses. Therefore, the Reduced Project Alternative would not introduce any  
32 infrastructure that is inconsistent with these plans. For a more detailed discussion of  
33 land use, see Section 3.8, Land Use.

34 **CEQA Impact Determination**

35 The construction of the Reduced Project Alternative would not introduce any  
36 infrastructure that is inconsistent with applicable plans. Impacts related to **POP-2.1**  
37 would be less than significant.

1                    *Mitigation Measures*

2                    No mitigation is required.

3                    *Residual Impacts*

4                    Less than significant impact.

5                    **NEPA Impact Determination**

6                    The construction of the Reduced Project Alternative would not introduce any  
7                    infrastructure that is inconsistent with applicable plans. Impacts related to **POP-2.1**  
8                    would be less than significant.

9                    *Mitigation Measures*

10                   No mitigation is required.

11                   *Residual Impacts*

12                   Less than significant impact.

13                   **3.15.4.3.3.2 Operational Impacts**

14                   **Impact POP-1.2: Operations associated with the Reduced Project**  
15                   **Alternative would not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment**  
16                   **generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that**  
17                   **exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of the Reduced Project**  
18                   **occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical**  
19                   **change in the environment.**

20                   The Reduced Project Alternative is estimated to create 48 permanent direct jobs  
21                   attributable to operations in 2010, and 61 jobs in 2025-2040 (with the increase in  
22                   later years attributable to the increase in pilot and towing jobs due to more vessel  
23                   calls, as well as maintenance and inspection that would occur after the first five to ten  
24                   years of operations). Note that the increase in jobs in 2025-2040 is slightly higher  
25                   than that for the proposed Project, which is due to the assumption of increased vessel  
26                   calls at existing crude oil receiving facilities (and therefore increased need for pilots  
27                   and tugboat crews). Linkages among economic sectors would result in the creation of  
28                   178 indirect jobs in related sectors, for a total of 239 jobs.

29                   These increases in direct, indirect, and induced employment are expected to result in  
30                   minimal migration to or within the region, given the size and nature of the regional  
31                   economy relative to the number of workers associated with Reduced Project  
32                   Alternative operations. Operations employment (i.e., direct, indirect and induced  
33                   employment) for the Reduced Project Alternative would represent a negligible portion  
34                   of regional employment: 239 workers, compared to more than 8 million workers in the  
35                   region (see Table 7-1). Therefore, operation of the Reduced Project Alternative would  
36                   not cause growth that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.

1 The Reduced Project Alternative would not accelerate development in an  
2 undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels in the year of buildout. As  
3 described in Section 3.8.4.3, the Reduced Project Alternative operations would be  
4 consistent with the adopted land use/density designations for the project area (**Impact**  
5 **LU-1**) and with the General Plan or adopted environmental goals or policies  
6 contained in other applicable plans (**Impact LU-2**). Therefore, operation of the  
7 Reduced Project Alternative would not accelerate development in an undeveloped  
8 area that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.

9 **CEQA Impact Determination**

10 Given the size of the existing workforce in the region, operations employment for the  
11 Reduced Project would not result in in-migration to the region or relocation within  
12 the region that would lead to new development of housing in an undeveloped area or  
13 cause adverse physical change to the environment; therefore, impacts related to  
14 **POP-1.2** would be less than significant.

15 *Mitigation Measures*

16 No mitigation is required.

17 *Residual Impacts*

18 Less than significant impact.

19 **NEPA Impact Determination**

20 Because of the size of the workforce in the region the Reduced Project Alternative  
21 operations would not necessitate in-migration of employees to the region or  
22 relocation within the region that would result in new development of housing in an  
23 undeveloped area or cause adverse physical change to the environment; therefore,  
24 impacts related to **POP-1.2** would be less than significant.

25 Impacts related to **POP-1.2** would be less than significant.

26 *Mitigation Measures*

27 No mitigation is required.

28 *Residual Impacts*

29 Less than significant impact.

30 **Impact POP-2.2: Reduced Project Alternative operations would not**  
31 **introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in**  
32 **the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.**

33 Pipeline construction for the Reduced Project Alternative is addressed in Impact  
34 **POP-2.1**. Reduced Project Alternative operations would not introduce any  
35 unplanned infrastructure at the Project site or the three existing marine terminals.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Reduced Project Alternative operations would not introduce any unplanned infrastructure at the Project site or the three existing marine terminals. There would be no impact related to **POP-2.2**.

*Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

*Residual Impacts*

No impact.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Reduced Project Alternative operations would not introduce any unplanned infrastructure at the Project site or the three existing marine terminals. There would be no impact related to **POP-2.2**.

*Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

*Residual Impacts*

No impact.

**3.15.4.3.4 Summary of Impact Determinations**

Table 3.15-2 summarizes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations of the proposed Project and its alternatives related to Population and Housing, as described in the detailed discussion in Sections 3.15.4.3.1 through 3.15.4.3.3. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the potential impacts of the proposed Project and its alternatives with respect to this resource. Identified potential impacts may be based on Federal, State, or City of Los Angeles significance criteria, Port criteria, and the scientific judgment of the report preparers.

For each type of potential impact, the table describes the impact, notes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the residual impacts (i.e., the impact remaining after mitigation). All impacts, whether significant or not, are included in this table. Note that impact descriptions for each of the alternatives are the same as for the proposed Project, unless otherwise noted.

**3.15.4.4 Mitigation Monitoring**

As no significant population and housing impacts would occur as a result of proposed Project development, no mitigation or mitigation monitoring is required.

**Table 3.15-2. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Population and Housing Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

<i>Alternative</i>	<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impacts after Mitigation</i>
<b>3.15 Population and Housing</b>				
Proposed Project	<b>POP-1.1:</b> Proposed Project construction would not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of the proposed Project occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact
	<b>POP-2.1:</b> Proposed Project construction would not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plans.	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact
	<b>POP-1.2:</b> Proposed Project operations would not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of the Project occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact
	<b>POP-2.2:</b> Proposed Project operations would not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.	CEQA: No impact  NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: No impact  NEPA: No impact

1

**Table 3.15-2. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Population and Housing Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives (continued)**

<i>Alternative</i>	<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impacts after Mitigation</i>
<b>3.15 Population and Housing (continued)</b>				
No Federal Action/No Project Alternative	<b>POP-1.1:</b> The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of the Project occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: No impact
	<b>POP-2.1:</b> The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.	CEQA: No impact  NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: No impact  NEPA: No impact
	<b>POP-1.2:</b> The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of the Project occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: No impact
	<b>POP-2.2:</b> The No Federal Action/No Project Alternative would not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.	CEQA: No impact  NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: No impact  NEPA: No impact

**Table 3.15-2. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Population and Housing Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives (continued)**

<i>Alternative</i>	<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impacts after Mitigation</i>
<b>3.15 Population and Housing (continued)</b>				
Reduced Project Alternative	<b>POP-1.1:</b> Construction of the Reduced Project Alternative would not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of the Reduced Project occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact
	<b>POP-2.1:</b> Construction of the Reduced Project Alternative would not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact
	<b>POP-1.2:</b> Operations associated with the Reduced Project Alternative would not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of the Reduced Project occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact  NEPA: Less than significant impact
	<b>POP-2.2:</b> Reduced Project Alternative operations would not introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.	CEQA: No impact  NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required  Mitigation not required	CEQA: No impact  NEPA: No impact