Chapter 7
Socioeconomics

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter characterizes the existing socioeconomic conditions of the proposed project area and vicinity, as well as the factors contributing to positive or adverse conditions affecting environmental quality. The socioeconomic topical areas described in Section 7.2 of this chapter include employment, income, population, and housing characteristics. The potential socioeconomic outcomes are evaluated in terms of the effects of the proposed Project and each of the alternatives on employment, population, and housing directly and indirectly related to construction and operation, as well as associated wages and tax revenues.

Chapter 7, Socioeconomics, provides the following:

- Employment and income conditions at the regional, county, and local levels;
- A discussion of the Port's role in the local and global economy, and the economic effects of its operations;
- Population characteristics at the regional, county, and local levels;
- A brief history of the Port and discussion of environmental programs and initiatives;
- A discussion on the methodology used to determine socioeconomic effects associated with the proposed Project and alternatives; and
- An evaluation of the socioeconomic effects associated with the proposed Project and alternatives.

Key Points of Chapter 7:

The proposed Project or alternatives would involve improvements to an existing container terminal and expenditures from construction activities and "Port Industry" operations, including associated jobs, output, and tax revenues related to cargo movement and handling. Long-term jobs associated with the proposed Project would include those directly related to cargo movement and handling operations at the Port, and those related to purchases of goods and services by Port Industry businesses and by workers employed by LAHD. The economic benefits would primarily occur within the Southern California region comprising Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties. While the economic impacts of the proposed Project would be beneficial, the increase in jobs attributable to the proposed Project would be relatively small compared to current and projected future employment in the larger economic region.

7.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the existing socioeconomic conditions of the proposed project area and surrounding vicinity in terms of employment and earnings, population, and housing, as well as the factors contributing to positive or adverse conditions affecting environmental quality. The socioeconomic character of the local area in the vicinity of the Port and the larger Southern California region is described using information detailing employment, earnings, population, and housing resources.

7.2 Environmental Setting

The environmental setting includes existing or baseline conditions and describes attributes of the human and built environment (including infrastructure) near the Port and within the larger region of Southern California. For the purposes of this analysis and as used in this section, Southern California refers to a five-county region comprising Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties. This region represents the area in which the bulk of the economic activity stimulated by the Port (directly and indirectly) occurs and for which economic modeling is appropriate.

7.2.1 Socioeconomic Topical Areas

Socioeconomics encompasses a number of topical areas, including employment, income, population, and housing. Within each of these areas, subtopics include an examination of conditions at different geographical scales that are relevant to the potential impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project or an alternative.

7.2.1.1 Employment and Income

Existing conditions with regard to employment and income are described from a number of perspectives. They include the following:

- Conditions at the regional (Southern California) level;
- Contribution to the regional economy made by international trade;
- Importance of the "logistics" sector of the economy;
- Role of the Port; and
- Conditions at the county and local levels (small geographical areas near the Port, including San Pedro, Wilmington, Carson, and Harbor City).

Southern California

Between 1992 and 2012, total civilian employment in Southern California increased by 1,222,100 jobs (from 6,607,200 jobs to 7,829,300 jobs) at an average annual rate of 0.9%. However, this growth rate has been uneven, with high annual increases occurring during periods of strong economic growth, and negative job growth occurring during economic downturns, such as 2008 through 2010. Table 7-1 presents the variation in job growth from 1992 to 2012 for each county and the region as a whole. Within the region, the most rapid increase in annual percentage employed over the 20-year period, with the

addition of over 317,200 jobs, took place in Riverside County, where employment grew at an annual average rate of 3.1% (approximately 62% over the 20-year period). San Bernardino County experienced the next-highest rate of growth (approximately 24% over the 20-year period, or 1.2% per year, on average) with an increase of 149,100 jobs. Orange County experienced the third-most rapid growth rate in employment of approximately 1.1% annually, with a 21% increase over the 20-year period. Ventura County experienced a 0.9% annual growth rate, with a 17% increase over the 20-year period, resulting in an increase of 59,400 jobs. Los Angeles County experienced the smallest increase in the growth rate, at an average of 0.6% annually, resulting in the creation of 437,200 jobs.

Based on projections prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for the 2012 to 2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, employment in Southern California will expand over the next decades, particularly in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties as indicated in Table 7-2 (SCAG 2012). These two counties are expected to experience growth rates far in excess of those of other counties. Of the selected cities in Los Angeles County for which information is presented in Table 7-2, Lakewood and Rancho Palos Verdes are expected to see their employment bases expand at a pace similar to the county as a whole (SCAG 2012). This is more rapid than the job growth projected for other cities in the area through 2035. However, in absolute terms, Rancho Palos Verdes would have some of the lowest numbers of new jobs created. The greatest absolute number of jobs created would occur in the cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

Unemployment levels in Southern California have closely mirrored the cyclical pattern of that of the State of California. In 1993, the state's unemployment rates peaked and then fell gradually throughout the remainder of the 1990s, with the rebound of the economy buoyed by the surge in dot-com activity and the residential construction boom. Following the exuberance of this period, unemployment rates rose for a few years before moving downward again for several years. Beginning in 2007, the rates began again to rise, and by 2010 were at their highest levels in the past two decades (12.4%), before beginning to drop in 2011 and 2012. Throughout these cycles, the unemployment rate in Orange County was consistently lower than that of other counties in Southern California, as well as the state (Table 7-3).

The total number of farm and non-farm jobs in Los Angeles County decreased over the period of 1990 to 2010 by approximately 370,800 jobs, or about 9% (Table 7-4). The greatest numeric decline took place in the manufacturing sector, with a decrease of 54%, or over 440,000 jobs. Manufacturing saw its share of total employment decline from almost 20% in 1990 to just under 10% in 2010. This decline in manufacturing employment, as well as small declines in other industries, was partially offset by large increases in education and health services, leisure and hospitality, and local government.

Table 7-1: Total Civilian Employment by County (1992–2012)

Year	County					Total
	Los Angeles	Orange	Riverside	San Bernardino	Ventura	
1992	4,006,700	1,241,500	507,600	604,100	339,400	**6,699,300**
1993	3,908,500	1,236,800	511,600	608,900	341,400	**6,607,200**
1994	3,898,600	1,257,500	534,000	612,900	350,400	**6,653,400**
1995	3,938,600	1,254,400	549,900	622,500	351,100	**6,716,500**
1996	3,967,800	1,280,400	563,100	634,300	349,600	**6,795,200**
1997	4,117,000	1,328,200	589,600	658,600	353,400	**7,046,800**
1998	4,246,100	1,385,300	615,900	680,100	364,500	**7,291,900**
1999	4,309,400	1,422,100	653,600	712,600	375,600	**7,473,300**
2000	4,424,900	1,429,100	644,200	704,000	374,900	**7,577,100**
2001	4,483,400	1,453,400	672,000	724,500	380,000	**7,713,300**
2002	4,447,100	1,456,500	701,800	743,200	384,600	**7,733,200**
2003	4,427,100	1,482,600	730,700	757,500	388,800	**7,786,700**
2004	4,454,100	1,508,000	771,600	784,400	391,600	**7,909,700**
2005	4,516,100	1,529,000	808,100	808,400	396,800	**8,058,400**
2006	4,578,700	1,547,300	839,000	820,700	402,500	**8,188,200**
2007	4,625,600	1,546,000	848,900	815,100	403,000	**8,238,600**
2008	4,566,900	1,533,100	835,200	794,600	402,700	**8,132,500**
2009	4,337,000	1,448,800	794,300	747,700	388,100	**7,715,900**
2010	4,294,200	1,441,500	802,300	739,400	388,100	**7,665,500**
2011	4,323,000	1,489,300	810,400	741,100	392,300	**7,756,100**
2012	4,345,700	1,496,000	828,800	758,000	400,800	**7,829,300**
Change from 1992–2012						
Change in Number of Jobs	339,000	254,500	321,200	153,900	61,400	1,130,000
Percent Change	8.46	20.50	63.28	25.48	18.09	16.87
Average Annual Percent Change	0.42	1.02	3.16	1.27	0.90	0.84

Source: CEDD 2013a.

Table 7-2: Total Civilian Employment Projection by County and City (2020–2035)

			Change (2020–2035)		
	2020	2035	Numeric	Percent	Average Annual Percent
Southern California (Five-County Region)	8,312,000	9,319,000	1,007,000	12.12	0.81
County					
Los Angeles County	4,558,000	4,827,000	269,000	5.90	0.39
Orange County	1,626,000	1,779,000	153,000	9.41	0.63
Riverside County	939,000	1,243,000	304,000	32.37	2.16
San Bernardino County	810,000	1,059,000	249,000	30.74	2.05
Ventura County	379,000	411,000	32,000	8.44	0.56
Area Cities (in Los Angeles County)					
Los Angeles	1,817,700	1,906,800	89,100	4.90	0.33
Carson	52,500	54,000	1,500	2.86	0.19
Palos Verdes Estates	3,400	3,400	0	0.00	0.00
Rancho Palos Verdes	6,700	7,100	400	5.97	0.40
Redondo Beach	30,600	31,600	1,000	3.27	0.22
Rolling Hills	40	40	0	0.00	0.00
Rolling Hills Estates	4,000	4,200	200	5.00	0.33
Torrance	109,100	113,300	4,200	3.85	0.26
Lakewood	16,800	17,800	1,000	5.95	0.40
Long Beach	176,000	184,800	8,800	5.00	0.33
Signal Hill	12,300	12,700	400	3.25	0.22

Source: SCAG 2012

Table 7-3: Unemployment Rate (%) by County (1993–2012)

	County					
Year	Los Angeles	Orange	Riverside	San Bernardino	Ventura	California
1992	9.9	6.7	11.9	9.7	9.0	9.4
1993	10.0	6.9	12.2	10.0	9.1	9.5
1994	9.3	5.7	10.6	8.7	7.9	8.6
1995	8.0	5.1	9.5	7.9	7.4	7.9
1996	8.3	4.2	8.4	7.4	7.3	7.3
1997	6.9	3.3	7.6	6.5	6.7	6.4
1998	6.6	2.9	6.7	5.7	5.6	6.0
1999	5.9	2.7	5.5	4.9	4.8	5.3
2000	5.4	3.5	5.4	4.8	4.5	4.9
2001	5.7	4.0	5.5	5.1	4.8	5.4
2002	6.8	5.0	6.5	6.0	5.8	6.7
2003	7.0	4.8	6.5	6.3	5.8	6.8
2004	6.5	4.3	6.0	5.8	5.4	6.2
2005	5.4	3.8	5.4	5.2	4.8	5.4
2006	4.8	3.4	5.0	4.8	4.3	4.9
2007	5.1	3.9	6.0	5.6	4.9	5.4
2008	7.5	5.3	8.5	8.0	6.3	7.2
2009	11.6	8.9	13.4	12.9	9.9	11.3
2010	12.6	9.5	14.5	14.2	10.8	12.4
2011	12.3	8.8	13.7	13.4	10.1	11.8
2012	10.9	7.6	12.2	12.0	9.0	10.5

Source: CEDD 2013a.

Table 7-4: Total Farm and Non-Farm Employment for Los Angeles County, California (1990–2010)

						Change (1990–2010)		
Industry Group	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	Number	Percent	Average Annual Percent
Total, All Industries	**4,149,500**	**3,754,600**	**4,079,800**	**4,031,600**	**3,778,700**	**-370,800**	**-8.94**	**-0.45**
Total Farm	13,700	8,000	7,700	7,400	6,200	-7,500	-54.74	-2.74
Total Nonfarm	4,135,800	3,746,600	4,072,100	4,024,200	3,772,500	-363,300	-8.78	-0.44
• Natural Resources and Mining	8,200	4,100	3,400	3,700	4,100	-4,100	-50.00	-2.50
• Construction	145,100	113,300	131,700	148,700	104,500	-40,600	-27.98	-1.40
• Manufacturing	813,400	629,800	615,000	473,800	373,200	-440,200	-54.12	-2.71
• Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	793,500	719,400	783,200	793,300	739,300	-54,200	-6.83	-0.34
• Information	186,200	190,900	243,700	207,600	191,500	5,300	2.85	0.14
• Financial Activities	279,000	222,700	222,800	242,100	209,500	-69,500	-24.91	-1.25
• Professional and Business Services	541,600	516,100	587,900	576,100	527,500	-14,100	-2.60	-0.13
• Educational and Health Services	385,700	373,400	418,500	473,200	522,000	136,300	35.34	1.77
• Leisure and Hospitality	306,700	309,800	344,700	377,800	384,800	78,100	25.46	1.27
• Other Services	136,700	131,300	140,000	144,300	136,700	0	0.00	0.00
• Government	539,800	535,700	581,300	583,700	579,600	39,800	7.37	0.37
○ Federal Government	71,900	63,400	57,900	53,500	51,600	-20,300	-28.23	-1.41
○ State and Local Governments	467,900	472,300	523,300	530,200	528,000	60,100	12.84	0.64
• State Government	69,900	70,500	77,100	78,200	80,700	10,800	15.45	0.77
• Local Government	398,100	401,800	446,200	452,000	447,300			0.62

Source: CEDD 2013b

Research conducted by SCAG demonstrates that the average per capita income and average payroll per job in the five counties of Southern California have declined over the last several decades when compared to other metropolitan areas in the nation. In the 1970s, the region had the fourth-highest per capita income among the 17 largest metropolitan regions in the county. In 1990, this dropped to the seventh-highest, and in 2005 it dropped to 16th (LAHD 2011). This deterioration began with the severe economic dislocation experienced in the high-paying aerospace and defense manufacturing sectors in the early 1990s during the post-Cold War recession. Although the region recovered from the employment loss in succeeding years, the quality (and salary) of the jobs created compared poorly with those lost (SCAG 2008).

Since 1990, many of the lost jobs have been in well-paying sectors such as manufacturing (aerospace, electronic instrument, computer and peripheral, machinery, and fabricated metal) and Department of Defense and other federal agencies. Although a significant number of well-paying jobs were added to the regional economy over the same time period (arts, entertainment, and recreation; wholesale trade; transportation and warehousing; construction; local government; and health care), the majority of new jobs were lower-paying positions in the service sector (office administration, employment, and food and drinking establishments) and local government and education sectors. The average annual wage level of the losing sectors was just over $45,000, while that of the gaining sectors was just over $33,000, which is almost 27% lower.

International Trade

The international trade sector is one of the growth engines of Southern California and is a key driver of goods movement in the region. With the exception of a plunge in global trade following the events of September 11, 2001, employment in this sector grew every year from 1999 to 2007. At the peak of international trade in 2007, there were an estimated 174,400 export-oriented trade jobs in Los Angeles County. However, the global recession resulted in a 14.2% decline in the number of jobs in international trade in 2008 and 2009. This decline exceeded the rate of decline for total non-farm employment, which during the same period saw a decline of 8.8%. Between 2009 and 2011, employment within international trade grew, and it is estimated that in 2010 approximately 157,200 jobs in Los Angeles County were associated with export-oriented trade (LAEDC 2012).

The Los Angeles Customs District (LACD) includes the Port of Los Angeles, Port of Long Beach, Port Hueneme, and Los Angeles International Airport. Of the total value of imports entering the LACD in 2011, over 87% were transported by marine vessels (LAEDC 2012). In the case of China (ranked first as trading partner for imports), over 90% of goods by value entered through the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. In the case of Japan (second-ranked origin of commodities), over 90% entered through the Ports. For South Korea (third-ranked origin of commodities), the proportion that entered through the Ports was just over 92%. In the case of exports leaving the LACD, over 63% (by value) were shipped through the Ports in 2011. Combined, the Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach ranked first in the United States and as the eighth largest (by volume) container port complex in the world in 2011, behind ports located in Asia (LAEDC 2012).

"Logistics" Sector of the Economy

Freight movement is a system of related and integrated businesses with components of infrastructure, equipment, personnel, and information and is often referred to as the "logistics" sector. The purpose of this system is to achieve the distribution of goods and commodities between origins and destinations, or suppliers and consumers, in an increasingly global economy. The system includes maritime vessels, trucks, railroads, aircraft, pipelines, warehouses, and terminals, all of which work collectively and cooperatively.

According to a study sponsored by SCAG, a number of factors important to companies have become especially costly in Southern California: workers compensation insurance, electrical energy, and housing (LAHD 2011). For companies that have considerable locational freedom, costs in Southern California negatively influence their decision to remain or expand in the region. For many companies, however, proximity to customers (the general population) and other factors such as facilities (ports and airports) and skilled workforce (motion picture industry) are of overriding importance. These industries include the services sector, transportation and warehousing, and the motion picture industry.

The logistics and distribution sector of the economy largely consists of industries that are tied to port and airport functions. This sector, which involves receiving, processing, storing, and moving goods, includes the following industrial sectors: wholesale trade, truck transportation, support services for transportation, non-local couriers, general warehousing, and air, rail, and water transportation. This group of industries has begun to provide large numbers of blue-collar jobs that have traditionally been found in manufacturing and, thus, provide an alternative employment source to replace well-paying manufacturing jobs that have left and continue to leave the region.

For more than the last decade, the nation's manufacturers and retailers have adopted "just-in-time" systems, which is a method of producing materials and goods in smaller batches to meet current demand and avoiding surplus or waste. This change in business practices has resulted in the distribution industry creating a series of large goods-holding centers, including in Southern California. Their location in Southern California is related to the fact that a high proportion of the nation's trade with Asian economies passes through the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. It is anticipated that the volume of this trade will continue to increase, especially with the projected use of post-Panamax container ships. These wide and deep-draft vessels can be accommodated on the west coast only at the larger ports, such as the Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Seattle.

The *Trade Impact Study* prepared for the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority (ACTA) and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach examined the economic impacts of the trade that passes through the Ports in San Pedro Bay (ACTA 2007). Impacts at the state, congressional district, and national levels were assessed. According to this study, state and local taxes generated throughout the nation from this trade activity grew from an estimated $6 billion in 1994 to more than $28 billion in 2005, $6.7 billion of which was in California. Although in the latter half of the 2000s the economy reached volatile highs and lows, state and local tax revenue is still estimated to be at about $6 billion as of March 2013 (POLA 2013). As of 2013, the value of containerized trade passing through the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach is estimated to be about $260 billion, $63 billion of which is in California. From 1994 to 2005, the number of jobs associated with the trade activity generated by the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach tripled, rising

from 1,100,000 jobs nationally in 1994 to 3,300,000 jobs in 2005. The *Trade Impact Study* prepared for ACTA estimated that the Ports support, directly and indirectly, 1,100,000 full- and part-time jobs throughout California and 3,300,000 jobs nationwide. Due to rising unemployment rates towards the end of the 2000s, there are an estimated 896,000 jobs associated with the Port in 2013. This employment translates into $63 billion annually towards the economy and $23 billion annually throughout the U.S. in state and local taxes (ACTA 2007). This report included the economic contributions of the logistics industries located at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, as well as at wholesalers, distributors, and retailers located off the Ports.

Port of Los Angeles

The Port of Los Angeles handled over 8,100,000 TEUs in 2012, up from 6,700,000 TEUs in 2009 but still less than the throughput peak of 8,500,000 TEUs in 2006. The top five containerized imports in 2012 in terms of TEU volume were furniture, apparel, auto parts, electronic products, and footwear. The top trading partners in terms of cargo value for 2012 were China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Vietnam. The top five containerized export categories in terms of TEU volume were wastepaper, animal feeds, scrap metal, cotton, and resins. The total value of the cargo was $271.1 billion in 2011, rising to $283.6 billion in 2012. The Port is one of the world's largest trade gateways, and the economic contributions to the regional and national economy are substantial. The Port facilitates tens of billions of dollars in industry sales each year in the Southern California region. These sales translate into jobs, wages and salaries, and state and local taxes. As of March 2013, it is estimated that the Port supports, directly and indirectly, 1,200,994 full- and part-time jobs throughout California and 3,600,994 jobs nationwide. The employment translates into $63 billion annually in state wages and salaries and $6 billion annually throughout California in state and local taxes (ACTA 2007). The major ways in which the Port contributes to the local and regional economy are through Port industries, Port users, and Port customers.

Port industries are businesses involved in the moving and handling of maritime cargo and include "users" and "customers" described in more detail below. It is estimated that for every dollar spent by Port industries, another 97 cents is generated in indirect sales in the region. Port industries account for approximately 16,360 direct jobs (85% of which are trucking and warehousing jobs) (LAHD 2011).

Port users are the biggest contributors to the economy. Port users are businesses that use the Port to receive imports or ship exports. Export manufacturers are among the major Port users, while others include local manufacturers who process imported, unfinished goods. Port users generate approximately $12.1 billion in sales and stimulate an additional $5.5 billion in local industry indirect sales. Local "respending" by workers employed by Port users and the industries they affect is estimated at approximately $4.1 billion. Each dollar of spending for Port user goods and services produces about 79 cents of additional industry sales in the five-county region (Port of Los Angeles 2014a).

Port customers are the retail and other non-cargo businesses in the Port. They are most important to communities near the Port as a source of jobs, recreation, and specialty consumer goods. Port customers contribute about $760,000,000 to the local economy. Direct jobs associated with Port customers numbered about 6,400, or roughly half of the jobs actually located in the Port. For every one of these Port customer jobs, nearly

1.7 additional jobs are created elsewhere in the five-county region (Port of Los Angeles 2014).

Geographical Distribution of Port Workers

The employment generated by maritime cargo activity at the marine terminals owned by the Port of Los Angeles can be categorized into trucking, International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), freight forwarders/customs house brokers, warehousing, steamship agents, chandlers, surveyors, and others. Approximately 43,397 jobs are directly generated by activities at the marine terminals (Martin Associates 2007).

Table 7-5 presents the geographical distribution of the 43,397 direct jobs by place of residency, based on the results of interviews with 721 firms. As this table indicates, 12.7% of the direct job holders reside in the City of Los Angeles (excluding Wilmington and San Pedro), 16.8% in the City of Long Beach, 13% in San Pedro, and 8.7% in Wilmington. Another 37% reside in other parts of Los Angeles County (Martin Associates 2007).

Table 7-5: Distribution of Direct Cargo Jobs by Place of Residency for the Port of Los Angeles

Jurisdiction	Share (in Percent)	Cargo Direct Jobs
City of Los Angeles (Excluding San Pedro and Wilmington)	12.66	5,495
City of Long Beach	16.78	7,280
San Pedro	13.06	5,669
Wilmington	8.73	3,790
Other Los Angeles County	36.97	16,042
Orange County	7.76	3,367
Riverside County	1.15	498
San Bernardino County	2.25	978
Ventura County	0.13	58
Other	0.51	220
Total	**100.00**	**43,397**

Source: Martin Associates 2007

Occupation by Place of Residence

Information regarding occupation (aggregated to industrial sectors similar to those addressed earlier) was obtained from the Census Bureau's website, American FactFinder, for the 5-year period between 2007 and 2011. The definition of the categories varies somewhat from those presented earlier in the document; however, these differences are minor. The occupational breakdown (for the employed civilian population 16 years of age and over) is available for small geographical areas, such as the zip code areas presented in Table 7-6. The zip code areas selected are those in the vicinity of the Port for the communities of Wilmington, San Pedro, and Harbor City, and the cities of Torrance, Carson, and Long Beach.

The proportion engaged in manufacturing between 2007 and 2011 was 11.2% for Los Angeles County and 6.5% for the City of Los Angeles (AFF 2013a). Four of the small

areas surrounding the Port had in excess of 15% of the employed persons working in manufacturing. They were Wilmington, Carson, part of the City of Torrance, and part of the City of Long Beach. All of the small areas have higher proportions of their residents employed in the transportation, warehousing, and utilities sector of the economy than is the case for Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles, which reported 5.2% and 4.1%, respectively. Several of the areas, especially Wilmington, San Pedro, Carson, part of Torrance, and part of Long Beach, have proportions that are twice that of the County and City, or more.

Income

The median household income (income received by all members [16 years old and over] of a household) reported by American FactFinder between 2007 and 2011 for Los Angeles County was just over $56,000. Riverside and San Bernardino counties had very similar values, while the value for Orange County was approximately $75,800 and for Ventura County was $76,700. By comparison, the median household income for the City of Los Angeles was $50,028 (Table 7-7). Of total aggregate income at the county level, by far the largest proportion (between approximately 75% and 81%) is contributed by private wage and salary workers.

Median family income (income received by members of a family household [consisting of a householder and one or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption] who are 16 years old and over) varied between approximately $61,500 and $86,300 across the five counties, and was about $54,200 for the City of Los Angeles. For the zip code areas near the Port (as presented in Table 7-6), values exhibited a wider range (between $39,847 and $105,342). The median family income was about $57,000 for part of San Pedro and approximately $39,800 for Wilmington (Table 7-8).

7.2.1.2 Population

Between 1990 and 2010, the number of residents in the five-county region increased by about 3,350,000, or an average annual rate of 1.15%. The most rapid rate of change and the largest numeric increase took place in Riverside County (4.35% annual average and just over 1,000,000 people) and San Bernardino County (2.17% annual average). Los Angeles County had the second-largest numeric increase (approximately 9,820,000 persons); however, the rate of change was the lowest of the counties (0.54% annually) (Table 7-9).

The population of the City of Los Angeles increased over the same time, but at a slower pace. The number of residents increased by more than 307,000, at an average annual rate of 0.44%. Four cities in the South Bay section of Southern California saw population increase at an average annual rate greater than that of the City of Los Angeles: Signal Hill (1.58%), Torrance (0.46%), Carson (0.46%), and Lakewood (0.44%).

Population projections prepared by the California Department of Finance forecast a growth rate over the 20-year period between 2010 and 2030 of approximately 0.82% annually for Southern California. The region is projected to increase by approximately 2,920,000 residents over this period. The highest growth rates are projected for Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The population of Los Angeles County is projected to increase by approximately 1,100,000 residents at an annual average rate of 0.57% (Table 7-10).

Table 7-6: Occupational Breakdown (%) by Place of Residence (Zip Code Area) 2007–2011 5-Year Estimate (employed civilian population 16 years and over)

	90501 Torrance	90502 Torrance	90710 Harbor City	90731 San Pedro	90732 San Pedro	90744 Wilmington	90745 Carson	90802 Long Beach	90806 Long Beach	90810 Long Beach	90813 Long Beach
Percent (%) by Occupation											
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	0.56	0.00	0.21	0.67	0.39	0.84	0.34	0.47	0.75	0.83	0.38
Construction	4.09	5.25	5.06	7.89	5.07	7.45	3.41	3.78	5.69	5.88	7.33
Manufacturing	16.89	12.15	10.11	7.87	13.04	15.88	16.81	9.28	11.65	13.84	15.09
Wholesale trade	3.83	3.78	3.79	2.73	5.95	4.33	3.55	3.40	2.62	4.03	5.26
Retail trade	9.56	10.93	11.42	10.49	6.54	11.23	10.57	10.87	11.68	8.49	10.93
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	5.70	8.45	6.26	11.68	15.29	10.35	9.16	5.29	6.13	10.85	6.37
Information	2.78	2.03	1.35	1.57	2.42	0.95	1.93	2.77	1.27	1.89	1.64
Finance, insurance, real estate and rental/leasing	6.57	5.71	6.09	5.20	5.94	2.78	4.59	6.84	4.66	2.08	2.91
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	14.01	13.58	13.55	11.67	7.91	10.73	7.67	14.07	9.97	11.07	10.19
Educational, health, and social services	19.22	20.51	21.26	19.35	22.10	14.57	26.41	21.94	25.25	22.95	14.44
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services	10.25	7.86	11.13	11.21	5.14	11.53	7.43	11.21	11.46	8.28	16.02
Other services (except public administration)	4.41	5.69	6.64	6.03	5.58	7.56	4.02	7.00	6.25	5.86	7.36
Public administration	2.15	4.05	3.14	3.64	4.64	1.79	4.11	3.06	2.62	3.93	2.09

Source: AFF 2013a.

Note: Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

1

Table 7-7: Household and Family Income by Source of Income by County, 2007–2011 5-Year Estimate

	Los Angeles County	Orange County	Riverside County	San Bernardino County	Ventura County	City of Los Angeles
Median household income ($)	56,266	75,762	58,365	55,853	76,728	50,028
Median family income ($)	62,595	85,009	65,457	61,525	86,321	54,243
Per capita income ($)	27,954	34,416	24,516	21,932	32,740	28,222
Contribution (%) to Total Aggregate Income from:						
Private Wage and Salary Workers	78.23	80.72	75.80	75.16	76.61	78.43
Self-Employed (in own, not incorporated business) Workers	9.28	8.02	8.53	6.98	8.96	11.34
Government Workers	12.32	11.07	15.49	17.70	14.21	10.07
Unpaid Family Workers	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.22	0.16

Source: AFF 2013b.

Notes:

Per capita income is the mean income computed for every man, woman, and child in a geographic area.

Household income is the sum of money income received by all household members 15 years old and over, including household members not related to the householder, people living alone, and other nonfamily household members. Because many households consist of only one person, average household income is usually lower than average family income.

Family Income is the incomes of all members of a family household (consisting of a householder and one or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption) 15 years old and over, summed and treated as a single amount.

1

Table 7-8: Household and Family Income by Source of Income by Zip Code, 2007–2011 5-Year Estimate

	90501 Torrance	90502 Torrance	90710 Harbor City	90731 San Pedro	90732 San Pedro	90744 Wilmington	90745 Carson	90802 Long Beach	90806 Long Beach	90810 Long Beach	90813 Long Beach
Median household income ($)	57,261	65,243	56,565	49,226	91,979	40,792	69,330	45,094	41,932	51,123	30,622
Median family income ($)	68,142	75,903	63,253	57,029	105,342	39,847	73,478	49,395	42,747	54,425	29,966
Per capita income ($)	26,907	28,441	24,715	24,318	42,402	13,992	22,373	31,253	17,160	17,477	12,508
Contribution (%) to Total Aggregate Income from:											
Private Wage and Salary Workers	81.90	79.61	80.00	75.33	78.09	81.93	77.73	81.86	79.18	76.83	83.91
Self-Employed (in own, not incorporated business) Workers	6.71	8.14	8.16	10.47	7.88	9.07	6.98	6.58	7.24	8.10	7.46
Government Workers	11.39	11.98	11.27	14.17	14.03	8.78	15.19	10.32	13.29	14.88	8.20
Unpaid Family Workers	0.00	0.28	0.56	0.03	0.00	0.23	0.10	0.05	0.29	0.18	0.42

Source: AFF 2013b.

Table 7-9: Population by Region, County, and Local Jurisdictions (1990–2010)

				Change (1990–2010)		
	1990 (Census)	2000 (Census)	2010 (Census)	Numeric	Percent (%)	Average Annual Percent
Southern California (5-County Region)	14,531,529	16,373,645	17,877,006	3,345,477	23.02	1.15
Counties						
Los Angeles County	8,863,052	9,519,338	9,818,605	955,553	10.78	0.54
Orange County	2,410,668	2,846,289	3,010,232	599,564	24.87	1.24
Riverside County	1,170,413	1,545,387	2,189,641	1,019,228	87.08	4.35
San Bernardino County	1,418,380	1,709,434	2,035,210	616,830	43.49	2.17
Ventura County	669,016	753,197	823,318	154,302	23.06	1.15
Local Jurisdictions						
City of Los Angeles	3,485,398	3,694,820	3,792,621	307,223	8.81	0.44
Carson	83,995	89,730	91,714	7,719	9.19	0.46
Lakewood	73,553	79,345	80,048	6,495	8.83	0.44
Long Beach	429,321	461,522	462,257	32,936	7.67	0.38
Palos Verdes Estates	13,512	13,340	13,438	-74	-0.55	-0.03
Rancho Palos Verdes	41,667	41,145	41,643	-24	-0.06	0.00
Redondo Beach	60,167	63,261	66,748	6,581	10.94	0.55
Rolling Hills	1,871	1,871	1,860	-11	-0.59	-0.03
Rolling Hills Estates	7,789	7,676	8,067	278	3.57	0.18
Signal Hill	8,371	9,333	11,016	2,645	31.60	1.58
Torrance	133,107	137,946	145,438	12,331	9.26	0.46

Source: AFF 2013c.

Table 7-10: Population Projections for Region and County (2010–2030)

				Projected Change (2010–2030)		
	2010	2020	2030	Numeric	Percent	Average Annual Percent
Southern California (5-County Region)	17,897,719	19,373,483	20,821,992	2,924,273	16.34	0.82
County						
Los Angeles County	9,824,906	10,441,441	10,950,335	1,125,429	11.45	0.57
Orange County	3,017,327	3,198,279	3,286,100	268,773	8.91	0.45
Riverside County	2,191,886	2,593,211	3,046,064	854,178	38.97	1.95
San Bernardino County	2,038,523	2,273,017	2,626,945	588,422	28.87	1.44
Ventura County	825,077	867,535	912,548	87,471	10.60	0.53

Source: DOF 2013.

7.2.1.3 Housing

Aspects of housing described in this section include construction trends, characteristics of the existing housing stock, and trends in housing prices.

Housing Construction

Housing construction typically exhibits a cyclical pattern in response to local, regional, and national economic conditions. In the case of Southern California, following a decline in the early 1990s, residential construction experienced a strong period of expansion between 1995 and 2004. A slight decline began in 2005, which continued in the following years. The steepest drops occurred in 2007 and 2008. This decline in activity was in response to a weakening housing market and onset of a severe economic recession. From a level of more than 90,000 units authorized for construction in 2004, the number fell to just below 14,000 in 2009, which is the lowest number of housing starts during the last 20-year period.

Over the 30-year period from 1992 to 2012, just under 1,000,000 housing units were issued permits for construction in Southern California. Of these units, the majority were constructed in Riverside County (30.8% of the regional total), followed closely by Los Angeles County (with 30.2% of the total). The other three counties accounted for just below 40% of the total (Orange County at 18.3%, San Bernardino County at 15.9%, and Ventura County at 4.8%.)

The contribution made to new housing (single-family and multi-family units) constructed in Southern California by each of the individual counties has varied over time. In the 1990s, the largest share of new housing was in Los Angeles County (36.8%), followed by Riverside County (22.5%), San Bernardino County (19.4%), Orange County (17.5%), and Ventura County (3.8%). During the period of rapid housing growth in the mid-1990s and early 2000s, the share of new housing in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties grew to a combined high of 59.2% in 2005 (39.9% and 19.3%, respectively), while the shares in Los Angeles, Orange, and Ventura Counties decreased. In 2006, the trends began to reverse, and by 2009 the shares of new housing by county were similar to those of 1990, with the greatest share again being in Los Angeles at 36.8%, followed by Riverside County (29.2%), San Bernardino County (16%), Orange County (15.3%), and Ventura County (2.5%). Between 2009 and 2012, the total number of new housing in Southern California slowly increased each year, with Los Angeles County accounting for about 45.2%, followed by Riverside and Orange Counties at 21.9% and 21.3%, respectively. San Bernardino and Ventura Counties comprised 9.9% and 1.7%, respectively, of new housing between 2009 and 2012 (U.S. Census 2013).

Housing Characteristics

In Los Angeles County, the proportion of owner-occupied housing units between 2007 and 2011 was 48%; 52% were renter-occupied. For the City of Los Angeles, the corresponding shares were approximately 38% and 62%. Within the zip code areas near the Port, the percentage of owner-occupied housing units varies from high values for western San Pedro and Carson to low values for Wilmington and areas of Long Beach (Table 7-11).

Table 7-11: Housing Characteristics (%) between 2007 and 2011

			Zip Code Area										
	Los Angeles County	City of Los Angeles	90501 Torrance	90502 Torrance	90710 Harbor City	90731 San Pedro	90732 San Pedro	90744 Wilmington	90745 Carson	90802 Long Beach	90806 Long Beach	90810 Long Beach	90813 Long Beach
Total housing units	3,437,584	1,412,641	15,165	6,103	9,408	24,067	8,539	14,611	15,440	22,034	13,044	10,063	17,916
Total occupied housing units	3,218,518	1,312,983	14,235	5,569	9,079	22,036	8,171	13,977	14,832	19,486	11,922	9,680	16,126
Percent owner-occupied	48.00	38.40	46.00	66.40	58.70	31.80	76.00	38.90	70.30	21.90	32.90	53.40	16.20
Percent renter-occupied	52.00	61.60	54.00	33.90	41.30	68.20	24.00	61.10	29.70	78.10	67.10	46.60	83.80
Vacancy rate (%)	6.40	7.10	6.10	8.70	3.50	8.40	4.30	4.30	3.90	12.60	8.60	3.80	10.00
Median number of rooms per unit	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.6	4.7	4.3	5.3	4.4	5.3	3.3	4.3	4.8	3.7
Number of Units in Structure													
Percent single detached units	49.9	39.2	46.4	46.8	43.5	36.1	53.4	51.2	63.5	4.8	41.5	63.4	21
Percent single attached units	6.6	6.2	7.7	11.8	7.6	7.9	14	8.9	11.7	3.2	5.4	7.5	7.8
Percent 2 units	2.4	2.7	3.1	1	1	4.6	0.2	2.9	1.3	2.5	4.2	2.8	4.4
Percent 3 or 4 units	5.7	6	9.4	5	5.9	18	4.1	6.4	2.5	8.8	13	6.1	16
Percent 5 to 9 units	7.9	8.7	9.8	11.9	8.9	14.6	7.6	11.7	2.5	11.7	18.4	5.7	14.7
Percent 10 to 19 units	7.8	10	8	1.1	10.9	9.4	4.7	5.7	1.5	23.7	11.4	3.4	21.2
Percent 20 or more	18.1	26.5	12.4	9.1	10.9	9.4	12.4	11.8	8.1	44.6	5.9	8.4	14.4
Percent mobile home	1.6	0.7	3.2	12.3	11.4	0.1	3.5	1	8.8	0.1	0.2	2.6	0.4
Percent boat, recreational vehicle (RV), van, etc.	0.1	0.1	0	0.9	0	0	0	0.3	0.2	0.6	0	0.1	0
Year structure Built (%)													
Percent Built 2005 or later	2.1	2.4	4.6	1.9	4.2	1.2	2	2	1.4	4.3	0.6	0.4	1.5
Percent Built 2000 to 2004	3.2	3	2.1	2	2.1	0.9	0.8	2.7	3.8	4.7	0.5	1.7	0.6
Percent Built 1990 to 1999	6.1	5.5	5.2	6.3	10.4	4.2	4.9	5.7	6.8	6.5	2.4	1.5	5.8
Percent Built 1980 to 1989	11.7	10.4	7.7	16.5	17.1	11.6	18.7	9.8	9.6	10.8	7	3.7	13.5
Percent Built 1970 to 1979	14.3	14	18.3	24.4	23.5	17.5	22.6	12.5	14.9	11.8	8.5	13.1	11.3
Percent Built 1960 to 1969	15.2	14.6	19.3	16.4	21.9	13.7	13.7	14.3	26.8	13.4	13.9	9.8	15.4
Percent Built 1950 to 1959	20.9	18.5	20.1	23.6	11.1	16.6	22.6	20.6	27.2	11.7	14	25.5	9.8
Percent Built 1940 to 1949	11.3	11.3	12.1	7.3	4.8	10.3	7	13.2	7.7	5	21.8	31.5	10.1
Percent Built 1939 or earlier	15.1	20.4	10.7	1.7	4.8	24	7.8	19.2	1.7	31.8	31.2	12.7	32.1
Housing units: median year structure built	1962	1960	1964	1970	1973	1959	1969	1959	1965	1961	1949	1952	1958
Median year householder moved into unit: Total	2002	2003	2002	2001	2003	2003	2001	2002	2000	2005+	2004	2002	2005+
Median year householder moved into unit: Owner-occupied	1996	1996	1997	1999	2000	1994	1998	1994	1996	2004	1997	1995	2002
Median year householder moved into unit: Renter-occupied	2005+	2005+	2005+	2005+	2005+	2005+	2005+	2005	2005+	2005+	2005+	2005+	2005+
Percent lacking complete plumbing facilities	0.6	0.8	0.3	1.7	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.2	1.7	0.6
Percent lacking complete kitchen facilities	1.6	2	1.5	1.3	0.6	1.6	1.4	1.1	0.5	1.2	1.4	2.1	1.8

Source: AFF 2013d.

This page intentionally left blank.

There are a number of similarities between San Pedro and Wilmington with respect to the characteristics of housing units and their occupants. The proportion of renters is high (68% for San Pedro and 61% for Wilmington). The median year that housing structures were built is 1954 for both areas. Homeowners are well established, generally having resided in the same house since 1994 in both San Pedro and Wilmington. The housing quality is somewhat lower in Wilmington based on a comparison of the proportion of housing units lacking adequate kitchen facilities (Table 7-11).

Residential Property Values

During the period from 2002 to 2012, the median home price (for existing homes) in Los Angeles County increased from $256,490 to $327,921, which is a rise of approximately 27.9%, or an average annual rate of 2.79%. Median prices for existing homes in the other four counties of Southern California also rose over the same 10-year period: 2.88% annually in Orange County, 1.82% annually in Ventura County, 0.76% annually in Riverside County, and 0.74% annually in San Bernardino County. This rate of increase in home prices, however, did not take place uniformly during the period. Over the period from 2002 to 2007, annual growth rates exceeded 10% annually in all counties. The annual growth rates slowed from 2007 to 2012, and the average home price fell in all five counties. The trends in prices of new homes closely mirrored those of existing homes (Table 7-12 and Table 7-13) (LAEDC 2013).

As illustrated in Table 7-14, median home prices at the community level also followed a similar pattern, with strong growth rates in the early to mid-2000s, followed by price drops towards the later 2000s. In some communities (i.e., Carson, Lomita, Wilmington, and San Pedro), the average prices began to drop in 2006 and 2007, while average prices in other communities continued to rise (i.e., Palos Verdes Estates, Manhattan Beach, and Hawthorne). By 2008, average home prices in all communities had fallen below 2007 levels. Overall, during the period from 2001 to 2012, all communities had positive average annual growth rates with the exception of Wilmington (-1.45%). Median single-family residence sales prices over the period from 2001 to 2012 for homes in the communities in the immediate vicinity of the Port were mixed, with a rise of approximately 2.3% annually on average in San Pedro and a decline of 1.3% annually on average in Wilmington (USACE and LAHD 2009 [2001–2005 data]; DQ News website 2013 [2006–2012 data]).

Table 7-12: Existing Home Sale Prices by County (2002–2012)

	County				
Year	Los Angeles	Orange	Riverside	San Bernardino	Ventura
2002	256,490	339,924	184,603	148,260	309,695
2003	313,469	407,729	230,903	179,316	370,850
2004	391,208	511,132	306,789	236,699	478,281
2005	471,015	583,411	373,549	316,697	556,920
2006	515,717	616,680	401,802	356,670	585,017
2007	537,011	616,424	380,375	345,442	559,687
2008	393,343	454,388	244,221	209,935	402,744
2009	315,131	416,100	175,366	140,890	358,138
2010	330,295	438,702	189,798	149,052	372,895
2011	312,541	416,571	185,262	147,325	354,022
2012	327,921	437,728	198,667	159,166	365,892
Change (2002–2007)					
Percent	109.37	81.34	106.05	133.00	80.72
Average Annual Percent	21.87	16.27	21.21	26.60	16.14
Change (2007–2012)					
Percent	-38.94	-28.99	-47.77	-53.92	-34.63
Average Annual Percent	-7.79	-5.80	-9.56	-10.78	-6.93
Change (2002–2012)					
Percent	27.85	28.77	7.62	7.36	18.15
Average Annual Percent	2.79	2.88	0.76	0.74	1.82

Source: LAEDC 2013

1

Table 7-13: New Home Sale Prices by County (2002–2012)

	County				
Year	Los Angeles	Orange	Riverside	San Bernardino	Ventura
2002	325,262	495,872	261,350	236,718	437,222
2003	393,247	545,765	291,565	263,673	532,349
2004	449,728	649,253	355,761	291,129	651,229
2005	449,374	705,917	411,707	364,224	696,102
2006	447,286	694,797	439,692	395,707	662,290
2007	503,757	600,074	410,557	383,482	612,913
2008	435,033	502,785	332,918	321,952	433,312
2009	406,681	609,780	273,522	285,561	379,553
2010	410,010	566,173	281,087	279,016	363,083
2011	388,644	564,952	286,678	253,610	358,919
2012	376,870	616,053	297,030	304,784	360,422

Table 7-13: New Home Sale Prices by County (2002–2012)

	County				
Year	Los Angeles	Orange	Riverside	San Bernardino	Ventura
Change (2002–2007)					
Percent	54.88	21.01	57.09	62.00	40.18
Average Annual Percent	10.98	4.20	11.42	12.40	8.04
Change (2007–2012)					
Percent	-25.19	2.66	-27.65	-20.52	-41.20
Average Annual Percent	-5.04	0.53	-5.53	-4.10	-8.24
Change (2002–2012)					
Percent	15.87	24.24	13.65	28.75	-17.56
Average Annual Percent	1.59	2.42	1.37	2.88	-1.76

Source: LAEDC 2013

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 7-14: Average Home Sale Prices by Community (2001–2012)

Community	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percent Change (2001–2006)	Percent Change (2007–2012)	Average Annual Percent
Carson	225,000	250,000	318,500	410,000	465,000	515,000	507,500	362,000	297,000	305,000	285,000	280,000	128.89	-44.83	2.22
El Segundo	N.A.	N.A.	535,000	781,250	N.A.	770,000	782,500	718,500	657,000	691,500	653,750	652,500		-16.61	2.00
Gardena	196,500	250,000	310,000	370,000	515,000	498,500	490,000	380,000	298,500	300,000	282,000	290,000	153.69	-40.82	4.33
Hawthorne	226,000	260,000	322,000	410,000	520,000	530,000	540,000	412,500	325,000	345,000	329,500	335,000	134.51	-37.96	4.38
Hermosa Beach	544,000	570,000	750,000	976,500	N.A.	1,077,500	1,165,000	1,149,000	977,500	915,000	978,500	957,000	98.07	-17.85	6.90
Inglewood	182,500	233,500	243,750	380,000	470,000	500,000	450,000	323,250	245,500	235,000	230,000	230,000	173.97	-48.89	2.37
Lawndale	193,000	237,000	313,500	379,500	532,500	505,000	483,000	365,500	291,500	300,000	305,000	320,000	161.66	-33.75	5.98
Lomita	300,000	359,000	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	561,000	556,000	481,000	435,000	406,000	402,000	390,750	87.00	-29.72	2.75
Manhattan Beach	680,000	797,000	1,100,000	1,250,000	1,425,000	1,550,000	1,649,000	1,575,000	1,330,000	1,400,000	1,330,000	1,379,000	127.94	-16.37	9.34
Marina Del Ray	562,500	457,000	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	785,000	789,000	771,000	600,000	607,500	612,500	633,000	39.56	-19.77	1.14
Palos Verdes Estates	631,500	685,000	1,065,000	1,117,500	N.A.	1,380,000	1,395,000	1,300,000	1,151,000	N.A.	1,162,000	1,225,000	118.53	-12.19	8.54
Playa Del Rey	279,000	345,000	352,000	475,000	N.A.	524,500	515,000	496,000	468,750	449,500	395,000	372,500	87.99	-27.67	3.05
Rancho Palos Verdes	610,000	615,500	742,500	900,000	1,056,364	1,073,000	1,010,000	1,000,000	862,250	860,000	840,000	862,500	75.90	-14.60	3.76
Redondo Beach	420,000	475,000	580,000	717,000	780,000	770,000	780,000	715,000	645,000	650,000	635,000	640,000	83.33	-17.95	4.76
San Pedro	262,500	320,000	379,500	454,000	539,000	541,500	520,000	437,500	385,000	390,000	335,000	330,000	106.29	-36.54	2.34
Torrance	327,750	380,000	439,250	527,000	610,000	600,000	601,500	520,000	471,000	490,000	445,000	455,000	83.07	-24.36	3.53
Wilmington	N.A.	N.A.	275,000	355,000	N.A.	469,500	450,000	325,000	250,000	251,000	235,000	235,000	N.A.	-47.78	-1.32

Source: POLA 2013 (2001–2005 data); DQ News website 2013 (2006–2010 and 2011–2012 data)

1

This page intentionally left blank.

7.2.2 Environmental Quality and the Role of the Port

"Environmental quality" refers to an aggregative set of factors that contribute to the overall condition of the natural, physical, and human environment. In the context of an urban setting, some key contributing factors include visual quality and aesthetics, land use compatibility and encroachment, socioeconomic conditions, real property values and attributes, air and water quality, hazardous materials and waste sites, and the adequacy of public facilities and services. Socioeconomic conditions and real property values are addressed in this chapter. The remaining factors are addressed in corresponding resource-specific sections of this Draft EIS/EIR.

7.2.2.1 Port History

The Port of Los Angeles was created in 1907 with the establishment of the Los Angeles Harbor Commission (see Section 3.4, Cultural Resources, for additional detail). Port growth was relatively slow until after World War I. Growing exports of local oil and lumber, shipbuilding, fishing, and cannery activities resulted in the construction of numerous warehouses and sheds between 1917 and 1930. In 1917, an extensive railroad was established for transporting goods from the Harbor throughout the United States. Port growth continued during the Depression of the 1930s, with new cargo and passenger terminal construction, in some cases, replacing outdated wooden cargo structures. Containerized cargo handling and storage at the Port was modernized in the late 1950s.

As commerce and technology have changed, the function of the Port has shifted from its earlier focus on fishing, shipbuilding, and cargo uses to one where the predominant use is container shipping. These changes also have affected off-site land uses, transportation infrastructure, and employment. For example, different kinds of storage and transport facilities are required than previously. As the volume of cargo moving through the Port has increased, highway and rail system improvements have been required (for example, the Alameda Corridor). Much of the incoming container cargo consists of finished goods from Asia that are transported to other parts of California and beyond. These types of goods do not require assembly in the region, and may be transported to warehouses or distribution centers beyond the Port area. In contrast, imported oil (non-containerized) may be refined in nearby refineries before being transported elsewhere. Local refineries also have supported oil production near the Port or in other parts of California. Ancillary uses have also changed, including shipping suppliers, goods recyclers, and various light industrial uses. As a result, uses may have become outmoded or less economically viable, in some cases resulting in the need for economic revitalization and redevelopment.

7.2.2.2 Port Community Programs and Redevelopment

LAHD has implemented and continues to implement and fund a variety of programs and events that are designed to improve quality of life in nearby communities. These special events and ongoing community programs are provided to benefit the public and encourage surrounding communities to experience the Port and learn about its operations.

Special events sponsored by LAHD include educational boat tours, summer concerts, parades, festivals, and outdoor movies. LAHD also offers diverse community programs that educate children and adults about a variety of Port topics. A Speakers Bureau Program allows organizations to schedule speakers to discuss the history of the Port,

current projects, and topical Port issues. Historical guides and audiocasts are available for guests to download to facilitate their exploration of historical sites in the harbor area. The TransPORTer, a 53-foot mobile museum, brings a comprehensive Port of Los Angeles exhibit to surrounding communities to inform them about the impact the Port has on the local and global economies. (Port of Los Angeles 2014b.)

In addition to ongoing public involvement initiatives, the Port Community Mitigation Trust Fund was established in 2008 as a result of the settlement between the Port of Los Angeles and the City of Los Angeles known as the TraPac Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The Harbor Community Benefit Foundation, the nonprofit established to operate the Port Community Mitigation Trust Fund, addresses the negative cumulative environmental and public health impacts created by the business operations at the Port. The mission of the Harbor Community Benefit Foundation is "to carry out public benefit projects that assess, protect, and improve public health, quality of life, and the natural environment of the local communities." The Harbor Community Benefit Foundation carries out its mission by overseeing grants and addressing, through mitigation projects, off-port impacts from existing and future operations at the Port of Los Angeles in the communities of Wilmington and San Pedro. (Harbor Community Benefit Foundation 2014.) LAHD is also in the process of implementing several development projects, including the San Pedro Waterfront Master Plan and Wilmington Waterfront Master Plan. These development programs are aimed at strengthening economic development and enhancing community amenities. Specifically, objectives of the San Pedro Waterfront Master Plan include increasing public waterfront access, enhancing commercial opportunities, improving transportation and non-vehicular mobility around the waterfront, and growing the Port in a sustainable manner. Project elements include the creation of new harbors and a public pier, new commercial development, enhancement of visitor attractions, development of a waterfront promenade and open space, and a variety of transportation improvements. The EIS/EIR for the San Pedro Waterfront Master Plan was certified in September 2009, and by July 2012, several projects had been implemented, including Crafted at the Port of Los Angeles, which is an arts and crafts market.

Objectives of the Wilmington Waterfront Development Project include connecting the community with the waterfront, creating open space, enhancing the livability and economic viability of the Los Angeles Harbor area by promoting sustainable economic development, and developing an environmentally responsible project. Project elements include commercial and industrial development and creation of visitor amenities, such as open space, plazas, a waterfront promenade, and a Waterfront Red Car Museum. The EIR for the Wilmington Waterfront Development Project was certified in June 2009. Also, as recently as June 2013, the Port approved $450,000 in health care grants to reduce asthma and promote health education of respiratory health through San Pedro and Wilmington community-based programs.

In addition to the community programs and special events, LAHD's Environmental Management Policy is intended to improve the quality of life for surrounding communities by reducing the environmental impacts of Port operations. A more detailed description of the Environmental Management Policy and associated measures that have been planned and implemented is provided in Chapter 1, Section 1.7.

The Environmental Management Policy for the Port was approved by the Harbor Commission on April 11, 2005. The purpose of the Environmental Management Policy

is to provide an introspective, organized approach to environmental management, further incorporate environmental considerations into day-to-day Port operations, and achieve continual environmental improvement. Numerous initiatives and programs under the Environmental Management Policy relate to impacts of Port operations on environmental quality in nearby communities. They include programs aimed at improving the efficiency of cargo handling, reducing cargo storage time, use of electric cranes, use of electric and alternative fuel vehicles, on-dock rail systems and use of the grade-separated Alameda Corridor, reducing truck traffic during daytime peak periods, and sharing technologies with other ports to continue improving pollution-control technologies. One plan under the policy, the San Pedro Bay's Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP), specifically aims to reduce public health risk from Port operations in nearby communities (POLA and POLB 2006). The Clean Trucks Program, a subcomponent of CAAP, was approved in 2007 and aims to reduce the pollution from diesel-powered trucks in the Port. To help protect water and air quality in the Harbor, LAHD developed a Clean Marinas Program (CMP), which advocates that marina operators and boaters use best management practices or environmentally friendly alternatives to some common boating activities that may cause pollution or contaminate the environment. A Water Resources Action Plan (WRAP) was initiated in 2008. This is a comprehensive program that targets remaining waterside and landside sources of water and sediment pollution in San Pedro Bay. Other Port initiatives for environmental quality that are underway include Cabrillo Beach Water Quality Improvements, Consolidated Slip Remediation, Oil Spill Prevention, Sediment Quality Improvement Programs, Watershed and Stormwater Management, and Water Quality Monitoring. More recently, in July 2012, the Port began their voluntary Environmental Ship Index (ESI) Program to reward vessel operators for reducing particulate matter and nitrogen oxide emissions from their vessels in advance of regulations. The program includes three incentives for applicants who register with LAHD that are awarded based on a point system. Incentives are distributed quarterly.

7.3 Project Effects Related to Socioeconomics

This section evaluates the effects of the proposed Project and alternatives on employment, population, and housing along with a detailed description of the impact methodology used in the analysis.

7.3.1 Impact Methodology

The initial step in estimating socioeconomic impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project is to link construction and operational activities to measurable socioeconomic indicators such as jobs and income. Economic impact modeling techniques (described below) can then be used to assess the economic impacts that implementation of the proposed Project could have on the regional and local economy using a number of criteria such as net changes in regional employment, output, wages, tax revenue, and value added. Attention is focused here on employment, income, and tax revenues within the five-county Southern California region.

The primary catalyst for changes to socioeconomic resources is a change in economic activity (that is, industrial output [value of goods and services], employment, and income). Changes in employment in an area have the potential to affect population and housing. This is especially the case when the additional job opportunities created through

implementation of the proposed Project (during the construction and operational phases) cannot be satisfied by the local workforce. Such a situation can trigger a movement of workers to the area to fill the supply of new jobs. Such an influx may be temporary, as in the case of short-lived construction activity, or permanent, as in the case where workers move to an area to fill long-term jobs. The movement of workers (and sometimes their accompanying family members) into an area depends mainly on the number of job opportunities made available by the proposed Project and the number and skill mix of workers available in the local labor force.

As discussed further in Section 7.3.1.4 below, under CEQA, social and economic effects are not treated as significant effects on the environment; however, where a physical change is caused by economic or social effects of the proposed Project, the physical change may be regarded as a significant impact (pursuant to Section 15064(e) and Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines). Therefore, the potential for physical changes as a result of socioeconomic changes are also considered. This may include the need for new construction, infrastructure, and transportation facilities to accommodate an influx of new population and/or businesses, or physical blight related to falling property values and movement of people out of an area.

NEPA considers social effects that have causal relationships to the environment, which may be direct, indirect, and cumulative. Socioeconomic effects are most often indirect, growth-inducing effects that induce changes in the patterns of land use, population density, or growth rate. The primary catalyst is a change in economic activity (i.e., employment, income, and tax revenues).

7.3.1.1 Economic Effects of Port Operations

The "Port Industry" is considered to be any regional economic activity directly associated with the movement of waterborne cargo and passengers. This includes expenditures associated with vessels, terminals, cargo and passenger transactions, and inland transport. For example, cargo movement transactions include documentation, financing, brokering, and other essential services that are directly required for the movement of waterborne cargo. Table 7-15 provides a detailed breakdown of Port Industry activities related to cargo movement.

Table 7-15: Port Industry Activities Associated with Cargo Movement

Vessel Expenditures	Terminal Expenditures	Transaction Expenditures	Inland Expenditures
Waterside Services:	Loading/Discharging:	Government Requirements:	Inland Movement:
• Tugs	• Stevedoring	• Customs	• Long Distance Truck
• Pilotage	• Clerking and Checking	• Entrance/Clearance	• Short Distance Truck
• Line Hauling	• Watching/Security	• Immigration	• Barge
• Launch	• Cleaning/Fitting	• Quarantine	• Air
• Radio/Radar	• Equipment Rental	• Fumigation	• Rail
• Surveyors	In-Transit Storage:	Other:	• Pipeline
• Dockage	• Wharfage	• Banking	
• Lighterage	• Yard Handling	• Freight Forwarding	
Suppliers:	• Demurrage	• Insurance	
• Chandler/Provisions	• Warehousing	• Brokers	
• Laundry	• Auto and Truck Storage		
• Medical	• Grain Storage		
• Waste Handling	• Refrigerated Storage		
Bunkers:	Cargo Packing:		
• Oil	• Export Packing		
• Water	• Container Stuffing and Stripping		

Source: U.S. Maritime Administration 2000

Because the revenues and employment associated with Port Industry activities could cease to exist if a port were to close down or become less efficient and lose its cargo base, this employment base is directly impacted by port activities. A much larger group of business that is less directly related to a port includes businesses that produce, consume, or take to retail sale the products that move through the port, such as exporters and importers that use the marine terminals for shipment and receipt of cargo. These businesses are often called "Related Users." Both the Port Industry and Related Users have a "ripple effect" by which expenditures in one sector contribute more output and jobs than the direct expenditure alone.

Vessels, terminals, transportation providers, and other Port Industry businesses purchase goods and services from industries to support their operations. These suppliers, in turn, purchase supplies and services to support their operations. These purchases continue to ripple through the regional economy and impact the surrounding communities. In economic impact terms, this set of expenditure ripples is known as the *indirect effect*.

In addition to the indirect effect of expenditure ripples, workers employed by the Port Industry and its suppliers also generate economic impacts. Employees of the Port Industry and its suppliers spend their wages and salaries on such purchases as food, clothing, retail items, and vehicles. The economic ripples generated by employee spending are known as the *induced effect*.

The total economic impact of each economic sector associated with port operations consists of direct, indirect, and induced effects. The sum of indirect and induced effects is also referred to as the *secondary effect*.

7.3.1.2 Direct, Indirect, and Induced Jobs

Similar to the direct, indirect, and induced effects described above, the new jobs associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project and the alternatives are categorized in terms of *direct jobs*, *indirect jobs*, and *induced jobs.* Together the indirect and induced jobs are referred to as *secondary jobs*. In terms of construction, direct jobs are those jobs created by construction activities. Indirect construction jobs are related to purchases from materials supply firms and their suppliers, and induced jobs are related to household expenditures by workers. For operations, the three categories are defined as follows:

- ***Direct jobs*** are those jobs that would not exist if activity at the Port were to cease. Direct jobs created by marine cargo activity are jobs with the firms that directly provide cargo handling and vessel services, such as trucking companies, terminal operators and stevedores, members of the ILWU, stevedores and customs house brokers, vessel agents, pilots and tug assist companies, and shippers directly dependent upon the use of the Port.
- ***Indirect jobs*** are created throughout the region as the result of purchases of goods and services by the firms directly impacted by the Port's cargo activity. Indirect jobs are measured based on actual local purchase patterns of the directly dependent firms, and include industries such as utilities, office supplies, contract service providers, maintenance and repair, and insurance and construction.
- ***Induced jobs*** are jobs created in the region by the purchases of goods and services by those individuals directly employed by the Port's cargo activity. These jobs are based on the local purchase patterns of residents in the region, and include the local housing/construction industry and transportation services, as well as wholesalers providing goods to the retailers.

The employment effects of the proposed Project and alternatives relative to construction are presented in terms of direct and secondary jobs, and total jobs (direct and secondary combined) over the 22-month construction period.

The employment effects of the proposed Project and alternatives relative to operations are presented in terms of direct and secondary jobs, and total jobs (direct and secondary combined) for model years 2017, 2020, and 2026. These data are presented in tables that show net jobs (new jobs created as a result of the proposed Project or alternative), and gross jobs, which is the combined total of net jobs and jobs associated with existing operations. The number of jobs associated with existing operations increases over time in conjunction with forecasted increases in cargo throughput for each of the study years. This projected increase, which would occur with or without the proposed Project, is reflected in the gross employment tables. This increase in jobs associated with the growth of existing operations is equivalent to the job growth that would occur under the NEPA baseline.

The CEQA baseline represents a fixed point in time; thus, any increase in employment associated with existing operations subsequent to the January to December 2012 period represents an increase over the CEQA baseline.

7.3.1.3 Construction and Operations Model Description

LAHD uses two primary tools for calculating the economic impacts of Port expansion projects. For impacts related to the ongoing operations of a cargo terminal, LAHD relies on a Cargo Impact Model, which was based on a detailed survey of the actual economic impacts of operations at the Port of Los Angeles in 2007. For impacts related to construction and other activities for which LAHD does not have detailed survey data available, LAHD relies on the IMPLAN (IMpact analysis for PLANning) economic impact modeling system. Both models are described below.

Construction Impacts: IMPLAN Model

The economic impact analysis of the construction phase was prepared using the IMPLAN model to evaluate potential changes in regional economic activity. Originally developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service to assist with land and resource management planning, the IMPLAN model is a widely used model employed to assess the regional economic impacts of private and public projects.

The heart of IMPLAN is an input-output model. Input-output accounting describes commodity flows from producers to intermediate and final consumers. The total industry purchases of commodities, services, employment compensation, value added, and imports are equal to the value of the commodities produced. Purchases for final use (final demand) drive the model. Industries produce goods and services for final demand and purchase goods and services from other producers. These other producers, in turn, purchase goods and services. This buying of goods and services (indirect purchases) continues until leakages from the region (imports and value added) stop the cycle.

These indirect and induced effects (the effects of household spending) can be mathematically derived. The derivation is called the *Leontief inverse*. The resulting sets of multipliers describe the change of output for each and every regional industry caused by a one-dollar change in final demand for any given industry.

Creating regional input-output models requires a tremendous amount of data. The costs of surveying industries within each region to derive a list of commodity purchases (production functions) are prohibitive. IMPLAN was developed as a cost-effective means to develop regional input-output models. The IMPLAN accounts closely follow the accounting conventions used in the "Input-Output Study of the U.S. Economy" by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (2000) and the rectangular format recommended by the United Nations.

The IMPLAN model used by LAHD is based on 2011 regional data for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura, and results are expressed in 2013 dollars. The model calculates the direct, indirect, and induced effects of construction projects based on the estimated changes in final demand across industries, as shown in the projected design and construction costs.

It should be understood that, although input-output analysis is a widely used approach to estimating the local and regional economic effects of implementing projects, it is not without its limitations. The information represents a snapshot at a specific time. In the case of the current model, the technical coefficients are based on 2011 data. Over time, the relationships between industries in an economy change, and their dependency on each other shifts. Input-output modeling does not account for economies of scale. Thus, the

input required by an industry does not vary proportionately even though the final demand that is entered in the model varies.

Operations Impacts: Cargo Impact Model

In 2007, LAHD retained the services of Martin Associates to evaluate the economic impacts generated by waterborne cargo and other activity at the Port. The study employed methodology and definitions that have been used by Martin Associates to measure the economic impacts of seaport activity at more than 250 ports in the United States and Canada, and at the leading airports in the United States. Martin Associates developed a Cargo Impact Model for the Port based on data developed through an extensive interview and survey program of the firms participating in lines of business operated by LAHD. Specific re-spending models have been developed for the five-county region to reflect the unique economic and consumer profiles of the regional economy. The Cargo Impact Model calculates direct jobs, indirect jobs, induced jobs, wages, and tax impacts; unlike input-output models, which must attempt to regionalize national multipliers, the survey-based Cargo Impact Model uses the actual observed operational impacts of the Port of Los Angeles in 2006 as the basis for its calculations.

The Cargo Impact Model is designed to test the sensitivity of impacts to changes in such factors as marine tonnage levels, seaport productivity and work rules, new marine facilities development, inland distribution patterns of marine cargo, number of vessel calls, and the introduction of new ocean carrier service. The Cargo Impact Model can also be used to assess the impact of developing a parcel of land as a marine terminal versus other non-cargo land uses. Finally, the marine Cargo Impact Model can be used to assess the economic benefits of increased maritime activity due to infrastructure development and the opportunity cost of not undertaking specific maritime investments, such as dredging, new terminal development, or warehouse development.

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 normally would constitute the baseline physical conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines if an impact is significant. The NOP for the proposed Project was published in April 2013. For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the CEQA baseline takes into account the throughput for the 12-month calendar year preceding NOP publication (January through December 2012) in order to provide a representative characterization of activity levels throughout the complete calendar year preceding release of the NOP. In 2012, the YTI Terminal encompassed approximately 185 acres under its long-term lease, supported 14 cranes (10 operating), and handled approximately 996,109 TEUs and 162 vessel calls. The CEQA baseline conditions are also described in Section 2.7.1 and summarized in Table 2-1.

The CEQA baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time. The CEQA baseline differs from the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) in that the No Project Alternative addresses what is likely to happen at the proposed project site over time, starting from the existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative allows for growth at the proposed project site that could be expected to occur without additional approvals, whereas the CEQA baseline does not.

NEPA Baseline

For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the evaluation of significance under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or other alternative to the NEPA baseline. The NEPA baseline conditions are described in Section 2.7.2 and summarized in Table 2-1. The NEPA baseline condition for determining significance of impacts includes the full range of construction and operational activities the applicant could implement and is likely to implement absent a federal action, in this case the issuance of a USACE permit.

Unlike the CEQA baseline, which is defined by conditions at a point in time, the NEPA baseline is not bound by statute to a "flat" or "no-growth" scenario. Instead, the NEPA baseline is dynamic and includes increases in operations for each study year (2015, 2016, 2017, 2020, and 2026), which are projected to occur absent a federal permit. Federal permit decisions focus on direct impacts of the proposed Project to the aquatic environment, as well as indirect and cumulative impacts in the uplands determined to be within the scope of federal control and responsibility. Significance of the proposed Project or the alternatives under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or the alternatives to the NEPA baseline.

The NEPA baseline, for purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, is the same as the No Federal Action Alternative. Under the No Federal Action Alternative (Alternative 2), no dredging, dredged material disposal, in-water pile installation, or crane installation/extension would occur. Expansion of the TICTF and extension of the crane rail would also not occur. The No Federal Action Alternative includes only backlands improvements consisting of slurry sealing, deep cold planning, asphalt concrete overlay, restriping, and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. These activities do not change the physical or operational capacity of the existing terminal.

The NEPA baseline assumes that by 2026 the terminal would handle up to approximately 1,692,000 TEUs annually, accommodate 206 annual ship calls at two berths, and be occupied by 14 cranes (10 operating).

7.3.1.4 Thresholds of Significance

The primary catalyst for change to socioeconomic resources is a change in economic activity (i.e., employment, income, and tax revenues). A change in employment in an area has the potential to affect population, housing, and associated community services and infrastructure. This is especially true when the additional job opportunities created through implementation of a project (during both the construction and operation phases) cannot be satisfied by the local workforce. Such a situation can trigger a movement of workers to the area to fill the new jobs. Such an influx may be temporary, as in the case of short-lived construction activity, or permanent, as in the case where workers move to an area to fill long-term jobs. The movement of workers (and sometimes their accompanying family members) into an area depends mainly on the number of job opportunities made available by the proposed project and the number and skill mix of workers available in the local labor force.

Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines states that social and economic effects shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. However, an EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the

economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.

Therefore, a socioeconomic significance conclusion under NEPA does not necessarily require a significance conclusion under CEQA unless those socioeconomic effects could be traced to a physical change in the environment. NEPA considers social effects that have causal relationships to the environment, which may be direct, indirect, and cumulative. Socioeconomic effects are most often indirect, growth-inducing effects that induce changes in the patterns of land use, population density, or growth rate. The primary catalyst is a change in economic activity (i.e., employment, income, and tax revenues). Displacement of people or housing could also result in changes to patterns of land use, population density, or growth rate. However, as no people or housing would be displaced as a result of the proposed Project or alternatives, this issue is not discussed further. There are no federal standards that define significance thresholds for socioeconomic impacts. However, the following criteria are being applied to this socioeconomic evaluation:

1. The proposed Project/alternative would have a socioeconomic effect if it would induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

2. The proposed Project/alternative would have a socioeconomic effect if it would cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force.

3. The proposed Project/alternative would have a socioeconomic effect if it would cause substantial change in revenue for local businesses, government agencies, or Indian tribes.

4. The proposed Project/alternative would have a socioeconomic effect if it would cause a substantial decrease in property values.

7.3.2 Impact Determination

7.3.2.1 Proposed Project

The proposed Project would deepen Berths 214–216 and 217–220 with dredging and pile installation, replace/modify/extend up to 10 cranes, extend the existing 100-foot gauge crane rail, expand the TICTF on-dock rail, repair the backlands, and add a concrete runway at the existing YTI Terminal. Under this alternative, four new cranes would be added to the wharves for a total of 14 operating cranes. Total terminal acreage would remain at approximately 185 acres.

The proposed Project is expected to operate its throughput capacity of 1,913,000 TEUs in 2026. This would translate into 206 annual ship calls.

The following presents direct and secondary employment, income (wages), and local and state tax revenues for construction and operations of the proposed Project, as derived using the IMPLAN model and Cargo Impact Model (discussed in Section 7.3.1.3). It is anticipated that effects associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project

would be experienced mostly in the five-county Southern California region, and it is this geographical area for which effects are reported.

Implementation of the proposed Project would involve improvements to Port facilities in two phases, with construction commencing in mid-2015 and lasting for approximately 22 months, until the end of 2016. Construction of the proposed Project would entail expenditures of approximately $44,300,000 over a 22-month period, commencing with project approval, during which time purchases of construction labor, materials, supplies, services, and equipment would be made.

Direct or Indirect Inducement of Substantial Population Growth

The proposed Project would not induce substantial direct population growth through construction of new homes or new businesses that would encourage large numbers of new workers to migrate to the region, nor would it induce substantial indirect population growth through extension of roads or other supporting infrastructure that support new development in previously undeveloped areas.

During construction, the proposed Project would generate approximately 750 direct and secondary jobs. Operation of the proposed Project would result in an increase of 2,241 net jobs in the year 2026, which represents a very small portion (less than 0.1%) of overall regional employment. As discussed in greater detail below, given the large existing labor pool in the region, regional transportation infrastructure, and the highly integrated nature of the Southern California economy, there is a prevalence of cross-county and inter-community commuting by workers between their places of work and places of residence. Therefore, it is unlikely that many of the new construction or operations workers would change their places of residence in response to employment opportunities associated with the proposed Project. Thus, in the absence of changes in places of residence by a substantial number of new employees, distributional effects to population are not likely to occur.

The proposed Project would stimulate a certain amount of economic growth in the immediate area through both direct and indirect construction and operational effects. For example, the proposed Project would indirectly increase earnings to businesses and households throughout the region as proposed project expenditures are spent throughout the region and new employee wages are spent. While this increase in earnings may contribute to the expansion of existing or creation of new businesses, this growth would occur in a highly urbanized area with a large and integrated economy and local workforce. Overall, the long-term effects would be small relative to the size of the regional economy, and they would not significantly affect population distribution in the local area and region as a whole. Therefore, the proposed Project would not be associated with directly or indirectly inducing substantial population growth.

CEQA Determination

Since the proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of the proposed Project; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Since the proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of the proposed Project; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under NEPA.

Changes to the Local Employment or Labor Force

Construction of the proposed Project would generate approximately 410 direct temporary construction jobs over the 22-month construction period. With the ramp-up and ramp-down and the completion of different tasks at different times, the construction workforce at any one time would vary. As shown in Table 7-16, construction would also generate approximately 340 secondary (i.e., indirect and induced) jobs. Together, direct and secondary jobs would total 750 jobs associated with the proposed Project during the construction period.

Table 7-16: Proposed Project: Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Construction Period

Period	Employment (Number of Jobs)
2012–2013	
Direct	0.3
Secondary	0.3
Subtotal	**0.6**
2013–2014	
Direct	6
Secondary	6
Subtotal	**12**
2014–2015	
Direct	14
Secondary	11
Subtotal	**25**
2015–2016	
Direct	180
Secondary	147
Subtotal	**327**
2016–2017	
Direct	2
Secondary	2
Subtotal	**4**
Totals	
Direct	410
Secondary	340
GRAND TOTAL	**750**

Impacts to regional employment associated with construction activity can be assessed by comparing existing regional employment and effects of the proposed Project. For instance, the 750 jobs added would represent less than 0.1% of the projected number of 8,300,000 jobs in the five-county region in 2020. The construction workforce would be composed primarily of people already living in the Los Angeles Basin, given the large existing construction industry workforce, the highly integrated nature of the Southern California economy, and the prevalence of cross-county and inter-community commuting by workers between their places of work and places of residence. Much of the indirect workforce would also likely come from within the Los Angeles Basin. The proposed Project, therefore, is not anticipated to result in either in-migration or relocation of construction employees to satisfy the need for increased temporary, construction-related employment.

As shown in Table 7-17, the proposed Project is estimated to create net permanent direct jobs attributable to operations in 2017, 2020, and 2026. Linkages among economic sectors would result in the creation of additional secondary jobs in related sectors. The secondary net jobs in 2017 are projected to be 473, for a total of 747 jobs. The secondary net jobs in 2026 are projected to be 1,419, for a total of 2,241 jobs at build-out. Tables 7-17 and 7-18 present the number of net and gross employment. Total gross jobs under the proposed Project would number 13,993 in 2017, 16,182 in 2020, and 19,395 in 2026.

Similar to the short-term construction employees discussed above, the workforce would likely come from within the Los Angeles Basin, and no significant influx of employees into the local communities is anticipated. Most of the direct jobs generated by operations at the Terminal would be in the transportation and public utilities industrial sector of the regional economy. Secondary jobs, however, would be generated in all industrial sectors.

Effects to regional employment associated with implementation of the proposed Project are assessed through a comparison between baseline conditions and proposed project effects. The net increase in employment attributable to the proposed Project (direct and indirect) would be 7,993 jobs in the year 2026. This compares to a projected number of jobs in the five-county region of approximately 9,319,000 in 2035 (see Table 7-2). Thus, the proposed Project represents less than 0.1% of projected regional employment at build-out.

Table 7-17: Proposed Project: Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment

	Employment (Number of Jobs)		
	2017	2020	2026
Direct	274	616	821
Secondary	473	1,065	1,419
Total	**747**	**1,681**	**2,241**

Table 7-18: Proposed Project: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment

	Employment (Number of Jobs)		
	2017	2020	2026
Direct	5,128	5,930	7,108
Secondary	8,865	10,252	12,287
Total	**13,993**	**16,182**	**19,395**

Thus, while the proposed Project would provide new job opportunities, it represents a very small portion (less than 0.1%) of overall projected regional employment. Given the large labor pool found throughout the region, the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in substantial in-migration or relocation of employees. Therefore, the proposed Project would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force.

CEQA Determination

Since the proposed Project would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of the proposed Project; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Since the proposed Project would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of the proposed Project; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under NEPA.

Property Values

The proposed Project would not displace any housing and does not propose construction of housing or development of a previously undeveloped area, nor would it result in major infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development. As discussed above, the direct and secondary jobs during the construction period and long-term increases in direct and secondary employment from operation of the proposed Project would not change existing population in-migration and relocation patterns because of the large existing labor pool in the region. The proposed Project would stimulate a certain amount of economic growth in the immediate area. However, as discussed above, the effects of this economic growth would not significantly affect employment levels or population distribution in the local area and region as a whole. No measurable change in population distribution is likely to occur as a result of the proposed Project; thus, no change to housing demand on a regional or local scale would occur. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in negligible changes in demand for additional housing, and it is unlikely that the proposed Project would exert upward pressure on property values in the local communities.

Should some relocation of new employees occur within the local communities or the region as a whole, existing housing stock would be available as shown in Table 7-11. Between 2007 and 2011, approximately 7.10% of housing units (or 99,658 units) in the City of Los Angeles were vacant. In the San Pedro and Wilmington communities, approximately 3,033 units (or 6.42%) were vacant. In 2026, 7,108 direct and 12,287 secondary jobs are expected as a result of the proposed Project, which represent a net

increase of 2,241 direct and secondary jobs compared to the No Project Alternative. Given the large size of the existing workforce in the area, it is anticipated that the workers would already be living in the area and thus would not relocate. Therefore, any workers that do relocate as a result of new jobs generated by the proposed Project could be accommodated by the existing housing stock without affecting the demand for housing or property values. Further, as indicated in Tables 7-11 and 7-14, the housing stock in the region includes units of varying sizes and price ranges to meet a variety of income levels.

Changes in property value are dependent on numerous factors unrelated to the Port, including monetary interest rates, ease of access to employment centers, availability of quality education, and historic and existing land uses. While proximity of the Port may historically have led to lower residential property values in communities nearest the Port compared to other communities in area such as Redondo Beach and Rancho Palos Verdes, residential property values in communities near the Port grew through the early 2000s. As shown in Table 7-14, home prices increased in all communities regardless of price levels between 2001 and 2006. Those communities with the highest growth rates were often communities with the lowest home prices. However, a housing market slump occurring in the late 2000s led to decreased property values throughout California, a trend mirrored in the study area and the nearby communities. The proposed Project would involve improving an existing container terminal over one mile from the nearest residential community within a working port environment, and it is not anticipated that the proposed Project would change residential property trends in the areas immediately adjacent to the Port. Further, the proposed Project would not cause building code violations, dilapidation and deterioration, defective design or physical construction adjacent to residential communities, faulty or inadequate utilities, or other similar factors that could lead to a lowering of property values. Additionally, LAHD has implemented a number of projects and programs designed to enhance community quality of life and provide public access to visually stimulating and historically relevant developments within and adjacent to the Port.

The proposed Project would increase the number of jobs and income in the region and result in other economic benefits, and it would not adversely influence residential property values in the areas immediately adjacent to the Port. Therefore, no substantial decrease to property values would occur.

CEQA Determination

Since the proposed Project would not cause a substantial change in local property values, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of the proposed Project; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Since the proposed Project would not cause a substantial decrease in local property values, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of the proposed Project; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under NEPA.

7.3.2.2 Alternative 1 – No Project

Under Alternative 1, no further LAHD action or federal action would occur. LAHD would not implement any terminal improvements. No new cranes would be added, and no dredging would occur. The No Project Alternative would not include the 100-foot gauge crane rail extension, expansion of the TICTF on-dock rail yard, or backland repairs.

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing YTI Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 185-acre container terminal. Based on the throughput projections, the No Project Alternative would operate at its existing capacity of approximately 1,692,000 TEUs by 2026.

The No Project Alternative would not preclude future improvements to the proposed project site. However, any future changes in use or new improvements with the potential to significantly impact the environment would be analyzed in a separate environmental document.

Direct or Indirect Inducement of Substantial Population Growth

Under Alternative 1, no new construction or other improvements would occur; however, there would be an increase in container terminal operations as throughput demands increase. As discussed in greater detail below, this increase in container terminal operations would be accompanied by modest increases in direct and indirect employment. As with the proposed Project, new employees are expected to be hired from the local area; thus, Alternative 1 would not result in large numbers of new workers migrating to the region. The growth in terminal operations would also stimulate economic growth in the immediate area, though to a lesser degree than the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, the long-term effects in population growth would be small relative to the size of the regional economy and it would not significantly affect population distribution in the local area and region as a whole. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not be associated with substantial population growth.

CEQA Determination

Since Alternative 1 would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would not have a significant impact under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Analysis of the No Project Alternative is required by CEQA. The analysis of this alternative is not required under NEPA. NEPA requires the analysis of a No Federal Action Alternative (Alternative 2 in this document).

Changes to the Local Employment or Labor Force

No construction would occur under Alternative 1; thus, there would be no construction jobs created. Growth in annual TEUs for Alternative 1 that would occur under existing operations would represent 36% of TEUs under the proposed Project in 2026 (1,692,000 TEUs under Alternative 1 versus 1,913,000 TEUs under the proposed Project). This increase in TEUs would result in increases in direct and indirect jobs. Table 7-19

presents the gross increase in jobs, which totals 13,247 jobs in 2017 and 17,154 jobs in 2026.

Table 7-19: Alternative 1: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment

	Employment (Number of Jobs)		
	2017	2020	2026
Direct	4,855	5,315	6,287
Secondary	8,392	9,187	10,867
Total	**13,247**	**14,502**	**17,154**

Alternative 1 would provide new job opportunities at reduced levels than the proposed Project, and would represent a very small portion (less than 0.1%) of overall regional employment. Given the large labor pool throughout the region, Alternative 1 is not anticipated to result in substantial in-migration or relocation of employees.

As with the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force, and impacts would be less than significant.

CEQA Determination

Since Alternative 1 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would not have a significant impact under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Analysis of the No Project Alternative is required by CEQA. The analysis of this alternative is not required under NEPA. NEPA requires the analysis of a No Federal Action Alternative (Alternative 2 in this document).

Property Values

Under Alternative 1, no new construction or other improvements would occur at the terminal; however, there would be an increase in container terminal operations as throughput demands increase. Alternative 1 would not displace any housing, develop a previously undeveloped area, or result in major infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development. New employees are expected to be hired from the local area to meet the modest increases in direct and indirect employment resulting from increased terminal operations, similar to the proposed Project, as discussed in Section 7.3.2.1. As such, Alternative 1 would not change residential property trends in the areas immediately adjacent to the Port, and thus would not adversely affect property values. Further, Alternative 1 would not cause building code violations, dilapidation and deterioration, defective design or physical construction near residential communities, faulty or inadequate utilities, or other similar factors that could lead to a lowering of property values. Therefore, no substantial decrease to property values would occur.

CEQA Determination

Since Alternative 1 would not cause a substantial change in local property values, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would not have a significant impact under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Analysis of the No Project Alternative is required by CEQA. The analysis of this alternative is not required under NEPA. NEPA requires the analysis of a No Federal Action Alternative (Alternative 2 in this document).

7.3.2.3 Alternative 2 – No Federal Action

Alternative 2 is a NEPA-required no-action alternative for purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR. This alternative includes the activities that would occur absent a USACE permit and could include improvements that require a local permit. Absent a USACE permit, no dredging, dredged material disposal, in-water pile installation, crane rail extension, or crane installation/extension would occur. Expansion of the TICTF and extension of the crane rail also would not occur. The No Federal Action alternative includes only backlands improvements consisting of slurry sealing; deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay; restriping; and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. These activities would not change the throughput capacity of the existing terminal.

The site would continue to operate as an approximately 185-acre container terminal where cargo containers are loaded to/from vessels, temporarily stored on backlands, and transferred to/from trucks or on-dock rail. Based on the throughput projections, the YTI Terminal is expected to reach its existing operating capacity of approximately 1,692,000 TEUs with 206 ship calls by 2026.

Direct or Indirect Inducement of Substantial Population Growth

Under Alternative 2, only minor terminal improvements would be implemented that would not affect the throughput capacity of the terminal. However there would be an increase in throughput up to existing throughout capacity as demands increase through 2026. As discussed in greater detail below, this would be accompanied by modest increases in direct and indirect employment. As with the proposed Project, new employees are expected to be hired from the local area; thus, Alternative 2 would not result in large numbers of new workers migrating to the region. The growth in terminal operations would also stimulate economic growth in the immediate area, though to a lesser degree than the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, the long-term effects to population growth would be small relative to the size of the regional economy and they would not significantly affect population distribution in the local area and region as a whole. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not be associated with substantial population growth.

CEQA Determination

Since Alternative 2 would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 2. Alternative 2 would not have a significant impact under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

The No Federal Action Alternative would have the same impact as the NEPA baseline, as explained in Section 2.7.2 in Chapter 2; therefore, there would be no incremental difference between Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no impact under NEPA.

Change in the Local Employment or Labor Force

Construction of Alternative 2 would generate approximately 78 direct temporary construction jobs over the construction period. As shown in Table 7-20, construction would also generate approximately 64 secondary jobs. Together, direct and secondary jobs would total 142 jobs associated with Alternative 2 during the construction period. Table 7-21 shows the gross increase in jobs over the same period, which would total 13,247 jobs in 2017 and 17,154 jobs in 2026.

Table 7-20: Alternative 2: Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Construction Period

	Employment (Number of Jobs)
Direct	78
Secondary	64
Total	**142**

Table 7-21: Alternative 2: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment

	Employment (Number of Jobs)		
	2017	2020	2026
Direct	4,855	5,315	6,287
Secondary	8,392	9,187	10,867
Total	**13,247**	**14,502**	**17,154**

Although Alternative 2 would provide new job opportunities at reduced levels compared to the proposed Project, it would represent a very small portion (less than 0.1%) of overall regional employment. Given the large labor pool throughout the region, Alternative 2 is not anticipated to result in substantial in-migration or relocation of employees.

As with the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force, and impacts would be less than significant.

CEQA Determination

Since Alternative 2 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 2. Alternative 2 would not have a significant impact under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

The No Federal Action Alternative would have the same impact as the NEPA baseline, as explained in Section 2.7.2 in Chapter 2; therefore, there would be no incremental difference between Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no impact under NEPA.

Property Values

Alternative 2 would not displace any housing, nor would it involve construction of housing, develop a previously undeveloped area, or result in major infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development. Job growth and economic growth occurring under Alternative 2 would be similar to but reduced from that of the proposed Project. As such, Alternative 2 would not change residential property trends in the areas immediately adjacent to the Port, and thus would not adversely affect property values.

Additionally, as discussed for the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would involve improvements to an existing container terminal over one mile from the nearest residential community within a working port environment. Therefore, it is not anticipated that Alternative 2 would change residential property trends in the areas immediately adjacent to the Port, nor would it cause building code violations, dilapidation and deterioration, defective design or physical construction near residential communities, faulty or inadequate utilities, or other similar factors that could lead to a lowering of property values. Therefore, no substantial decrease to property values would occur.

CEQA Determination

Since Alternative 2 would not cause a substantial change in local property values, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 2. Alternative 2 would not have a significant impact under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

The No Federal Action Alternative would have the same impact as the NEPA baseline, as explained in Section 2.7.2 in Chapter 2; therefore, there would be no incremental difference between Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no impact under NEPA.

7.3.2.4 Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Improve Berths 217–220 Only

Alternative 3 does not include conducting dredging and pile driving at Berths 214–216. The following components of the proposed Project are unchanged under the Reduced Project Alternative:

- modifying up to six existing cranes;
- replacing up to four existing non-operating cranes;
- 6,000 cy of dredging from a depth of -45 to -47 feet MLLW (with an additional 2 feet of overdredge depth, for a total depth of -49 feet MLLW), and installing 1,200 linear feet of sheet piles and king piles to support and stabilize the existing wharf structure at Berths 217–220;

- disposal of dredged material at LA-2, the Berths 243–245 CDF, another site in the Port, or in an upland disposal area outside of the Port;
- extending the existing 100-foot gauge landside crane rail through Berths 217–220;
- performing ground repairs and maintenance activities in the backlands area; and
- expanding the TICTF on-dock rail by adding a single rail loading track.

Under this alternative, there would be three operating berths after construction, similar to the proposed Project, but Berths 214–216 would remain at their existing depth. This alternative would require less dredging (by approximately 21,000 cy) and pile driving and a shorter construction period than the proposed Project. Based on the throughput projections, this alternative is expected to operate at its capacity of approximately 1,913,000 TEUs by 2026, similar to the proposed Project. However, while the terminal could handle similar levels of cargo, the reduced project alternative would not achieve the same level of efficient operations as achieved by the proposed Project. This alternative would not accommodate the largest vessels (13,000 TEUs). The depth achieved at Berths 217–220 would only be capable of handling vessels up to 11,000 TEUs, requiring additional vessels to call on the terminal to meet future growth projections up to the capacity of the terminal. Therefore, under this alternative, 232 vessels would call on the terminal in 2020 and 2026, compared to 206 vessels for the proposed Project. Additionally, because of the higher number of annual vessel calls, this alternative would result in a maximum of five peak day ship calls (over a 24-hour period) compared to four for the proposed Project.

Direct or Indirect Inducement of Substantial Population Growth

As discussed in greater detail below, direct and indirect employment would increase under Alternative 3. As with the proposed Project, new employees are expected to be hired from the local area; thus, Alternative 3 would not result in large numbers of new workers migrating to the region. The growth in terminal operations would also stimulate economic growth in the immediate area similar to the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, the long-term effects to population growth would be small relative to the size of the regional economy, and they would not significantly affect population distribution in the local area and region as a whole. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not be associated with substantial population growth.

CEQA Determination

Since Alternative 3 would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 3; therefore, Alternative 3 would not have a significant impact under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Alternative 3 would not induce substantial population growth, directly or indirectly; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under NEPA.

Change in the Local Employment or Labor Force

Under Alternative 3, construction activities would result in approximately 238 direct jobs and 197 secondary jobs (433 total) (Table 7-22). As shown in Table 7-23, during

Alternative 3 operations, 274 net direct net jobs and 473 secondary jobs (747 total) would be added to the regional economy in 2017, and 821 net direct jobs and 1,419 secondary jobs (2,241 total) would be added in 2026. As shown in Table 7-24, total gross jobs are estimated to be 13,993 in 2017 and 19,395 in 2026.

Table 7-22: Alternative 3: Direct and Secondary Construction Employment Over the Two-Year Construction Period

	Employment (Number of Jobs)
Direct	238
Secondary	197
Total	**433**

Note: Numbers do not add up due to rounding.

Table 7-23: Alternative 3: Net Direct and Secondary Operations Employment

	Employment (Number of Jobs)		
	2017	2020	2026
Direct	274	616	821
Secondary	473	1,065	1,419
Total	**747**	**1,681**	**2,241**

Table 7-24: Alternative 3: Gross Direct and Secondary Operations Employment

	Employment (Number of Jobs)		
	2017	2020	2026
Direct	5,128	5,930	7,108
Secondary	8,865	10,252	12,287
Total	**13,993**	**16,182**	**19,395**

Alternative 3 would provide new construction-related job opportunities at reduced levels compared to the proposed Project while providing the same level of new operations-related job opportunities as the proposed Project due to similar levels of terminal operations at build-out. These job opportunities would represent a very small portion (less than 0.1%) of overall regional employment. Given the large labor pool throughout the region, Alternative 3 is not anticipated to result in substantial in-migration or relocation of employees. As with the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force, and impacts would be less than significant.

CEQA Determination

As Alternative 3 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 3; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Alternative 3 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under NEPA.

Property Values

Alternative 3 would not displace any housing, nor would it involve construction of housing, develop a previously undeveloped area, or result in major infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development. Job growth and economic growth occurring under Alternative 3 would be similar to but reduced from that of the proposed Project. As such, Alternative 3 would not change residential property trends in the areas immediately adjacent to the Port, and thus would not adversely affect property values.

Additionally, as discussed for the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would involve improvements to an existing container terminal over one mile from the nearest residential community within a working port environment. Therefore, it is not anticipated that Alternative 3 would change residential property trends in the areas immediately adjacent to the Port, nor would it cause building code violations, dilapidation and deterioration, defective design or physical construction near residential communities, faulty or inadequate utilities, or other similar factors that could lead to a lowering of property values. Therefore, no substantial decrease to property values would occur.

CEQA Determination

As Alternative 3 would not cause substantial change in local property values, no physical changes are anticipated as a result of Alternative 3; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under CEQA.

NEPA Determination

Alternative 3 would not cause substantial decrease in local property values; therefore, the impact would be less than significant under NEPA.

7.3.3 Summary of Impact Determinations

Table 7-25 summarizes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations of the proposed Project and alternatives related to socioeconomics, as described in the detailed discussion above. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the potential impacts of the proposed Project and 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 impact threshold, 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.

Table 7-25: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Socioeconomics Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Proposed Project	The proposed Project would not result in direct or indirect inducement of substantial population growth.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	Mitigation not required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	The proposed Project would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	Mitigation not required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	The proposed Project would not displace any housing and does not propose construction of housing or development of a previously undeveloped area, nor would it result in major infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	Mitigation not required.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 1 would not result in direct or indirect inducement of substantial population growth.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not required Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable
	Alternative 1 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not required Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable
	Alternative 1 would not displace any housing and does not propose construction of housing or development of a previously undeveloped area, nor would it result in major infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not required Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Not applicable
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action	Alternative 2 would not result in direct or indirect inducement of substantial population growth.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
	Alternative 2 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact
	Alternative 2 would not displace any housing and does not propose construction of housing or development of a previously undeveloped area, nor would it result in major infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: No impact

Table 7-25: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Socioeconomics Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impacts after Mitigation
Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Improve Berths 217–220 Only	Alternative 3 would not result in direct or indirect inducement of substantial population growth.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	Alternative 3 would not cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant
	Alternative 3 would not displace any housing and does not propose construction of housing or development of a previously undeveloped area, nor would it result in major infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development.	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant	Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant NEPA: Less than significant