

1
2

Chapter 8

Socioeconomics

3 Chapter Summary

4 This chapter characterizes the existing socioeconomic setting of the Proposed Project area and vicinity, as
5 well as the factors contributing to positive or adverse conditions affecting that setting. The potential
6 socioeconomic outcomes are evaluated in terms of the effects of the Proposed Project and each of the
7 alternatives on employment, population, and housing characteristics directly and indirectly related to
8 construction and operation.

9 Chapter 8, Socioeconomics, provides the following:

- 10 • Population and employment conditions at the regional and county levels;
- 11 • A brief account of the Port of Los Angeles' economic programs and initiatives;
- 12 • A discussion on the methodology used to determine socioeconomic effects associated with the
13 Proposed Project and alternatives; and
- 14 • An evaluation of the socioeconomic effects associated with the Proposed Project and alternatives.

15 Key Points of Chapter 8

16 The Proposed Project would involve the construction and operation of a facility at Berths 192-194 to
17 produce a low-carbon construction binder from raw materials and the hauling of the product by customer
18 trucks to cement facilities throughout the region. In addition, the Proposed Project and alternatives will
19 include the rehabilitation of the wharf at Berth 191 to receive oceangoing bulk-type vessels delivering one
20 of the raw materials (see Section 2.5 for a complete description of the Proposed Project).

21 Based on a study prepared for Ecocem on the economic impact of the Proposed Project (Beacon
22 Economics 2023), short-term (i.e., construction) jobs would employ up to 735 workers during a period of
23 18 months. Long-term (i.e., operational) employment associated with the Proposed Project would total
24 approximately 242 jobs, including those directly related to operating the facility (approximately 26 on-site
25 employees) and associated jobs such as trucking and stevedoring. Construction and operation would
26 support approximately 450 secondary jobs (i.e., off-site jobs created by the purchases of goods and
27 services associated with the Proposed Project's direct jobs) throughout the Southern California region
28 comprising Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties.

29 While the economic impacts of the Proposed Project would be beneficial, the increase in jobs and,
30 housing attributable to the Proposed Project would be small compared to current and projected future
31 employment in the larger economic region. Similarly, because the number of jobs involved would be
32 small relative to regional employment, the effect of the Proposed Project on housing supply and values
33 would likewise be insubstantial.

8.1 Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is primarily concerned with the disclosure and mitigation of significant physical environmental effects related to construction and operation of a proposed project. However, LAHD is committed to disclosing the greater impacts operating a project may have on the community, including effects related to socioeconomics. Consequently, an impact discussion on socioeconomics is provided below. The initial step in estimating the socioeconomic effects associated with implementation of a project is to characterize aspects of the construction and operational phases of that project.

The primary catalyst for changes to socioeconomic resources is a change in economic activity (that is, industry output [i.e., the value of goods and services], employment, and income). Changes in employment in an area have the potential to affect population and housing.

8.2 Socioeconomics

Socioeconomics encompasses a number of areas, including population, employment, income, and housing. The environmental setting includes existing or baseline conditions as of 2021 (see Section 8.3.2) and describes attributes of the socioeconomic environment in the region of California most closely affected by the Port of Los Angeles (Port). 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.

8.2.1 Population

According to the Census Bureau (AFF 2023a, b), between the years 2000 and 2020, the number of residents in the five-county region increased by about 3,245,739, or an average annual rate of 1 percent (Table 8-1). The most rapid rate of change and the largest numeric increase took place in Riverside County (2.8 percent annual average and just under 1,000,000 people) and Los Angeles County had the third-largest numeric increase but the smallest annual percentage increase. The population of the City of Los Angeles increased over the same time at about the same pace as Los Angeles County.

Population projections prepared by the California Department of Finance (DOF 2021) forecast an increase in population in the five-county region of approximately 833,000 residents by 2060. The highest growth rates are projected for Riverside and San Bernardino counties. Conversely, the population of Los Angeles County is projected to decrease by nearly 500,000 residents.

Table 8-1: Population by Region, County, and City of Los Angeles (2000–2020)

	2000 (Census)	2010 (Census)	2020 (Census Estimate)	Change between years 2000–2020		
				Numeric	Annual Average Increase	Total
Southern California (Five-County Region)	16,373,645	17,877,006	19,619,384	3,245,739	1.0%	19.8%
Counties						
Los Angeles County	9,519,338	9,818,605	9,992,236	472,898	0.2%	4.9%
Orange County	2,846,289	3,010,232	3,185,516	339,227	0.5%	11.9%
Riverside County	1,545,387	2,189,641	2,422,847	877,460	2.8%	56.8%
San Bernardino County	1,709,434	2,035,210	2,183,239	473,805	1.4%	27.7%
Ventura County	753,197	823,318	843,310	90,113	0.6%	12.0%
Local Jurisdictions						
City of Los Angeles	3,694,820	3,792,621	3,895,836	201,016	0.2%	5.4%

1 Source: AFF 2023a, b

2 **8.2.2 Employment**

3 According to the Southern California Association of Governments, employment in the
 4 five-county region in 2020 totaled approximately 8.6 million jobs (SCAG 2020). The
 5 largest employment sectors are retail trade, manufacturing, health care and social
 6 services, administrative support and waste services, and accommodation and food
 7 services, which combined account for approximately 60% of employment in the region.
 8 Between 2000 and 2016, employment increased by approximately 13%, an annualized
 9 rate of 0.8%. That low rate of increase is attributable to job losses during the 2008-2009
 10 recession. Employment in the five-county region is forecasted to expand over the next
 11 decades, increasing by approximately 14% by 2045. Growth is forecasted to be
 12 particularly strong in San Bernardino and Riverside counties, where employment is
 13 expected to increase by around 30% by 2045 in the transportation and warehousing
 14 industry sector (SCAG 2020). Unemployment rates in the region have fluctuated
 15 substantially between 2000 and 2021, from 5-6% in the early 2000s to over 10% in 2010,
 16 down to 4-5% in 2016-2017, back up to nearly 20% in early 2020 (BLS 2023) as a
 17 consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, and down to approximately 6% in late 2021
 18 (CA EDD 2023a) as the economy began to recover from the pandemic.

19 The employment generated by cargo activity at the Port’s marine terminals falls largely
 20 into SCAG’s transportation and warehousing category. A study commissioned by the
 21 Port in 2007 found that approximately 43,000 jobs were directly generated by Port
 22 activity (Martin and Associates 2007); the 2021 figure is likely somewhat higher, given
 23 the growth in cargo volumes since 2007. The study found that approximately 40% of
 24 those employees resided near the Port (i.e., Wilmington, San Pedro, and Long Beach) and
 25 another 50% elsewhere in Los Angeles County.

Table 8-2: Employment by County (2021)

County	Labor Force	Employed	Unemployed	Rate
Los Angeles	4,993,500	4,547,600	445,900	8.9%
Orange	1,560,700	1,467,300	93,400	6.0%
Riverside	1,133,000	1,050,000	83,000	7.3%
San Bernardino	992,200	918,600	73,600	7.4%
Ventura	407,500	382,200	25,200	6.2%
Southern California (Five-County Region)	9,086,900	8,365,700	721,100	7.9%

Source: CA EDD 2023b

1
2

Table 8-3: Total Employment Projection by County (2030–2045)

	2030	2045
Southern California (Five-County Region)	9,201,000	9,919,000
County		
Los Angeles County	5,060,000	5,382,000
Orange County	1,886,000	1,980,000
Riverside County	961,000	1,243,000
San Bernardino County	926,000	1,064,000
Ventura County	369,000	389,000

Source: SCAG 2020

3 **8.2.3 Income**

4 The 2017-2021 average of median household income (income received by all members of
5 a household, 16 years old and over) reported by the U.S. Census Bureau (2023) for Los
6 Angeles County was \$76,367. Riverside and San Bernardino counties had similar values,
7 while the value for Orange County was \$100,485 and the value for Ventura County was
8 \$94,150.

9 **8.2.4 Housing**

10 Residential housing construction in California varies considerably over time in response
11 to local, regional, and national economic conditions and trends. For example, in
12 California as a whole, permits for new private housing have ranged from over 20,000 per
13 month in 1988-1989 to approximately 2,700 per month in mid-2009 (associated with the
14 recession of 2008-2009), and in 2021 averaged approximately 10,000 permits per month
15 (Federal Reserve St. Louis 2023). This long-term, state-wide temporal pattern is
16 generally true for the five-county region, as well (Federal Reserve St. Louis 2023).

1 The share of new housing in the five-county region accounted for by each county has also
2 varied over time as population growth and economic factors have driven new settlement.
3 In 2021, however, Los Angeles County accounted for approximately half of the new
4 housing units authorized in the five-county region (US Census Bureau 2022).

5 Residential property values in the five-county region have generally risen over time since
6 2010, following the 2008-2009 recession (LAEDC 2015). In 2021, the median listing
7 price for homes for sale in Los Angeles County was \$718,521 (LAEDC 2021).

8 **8.3 Effects Related to Socioeconomics**

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

12 Under CEQA, social and economic effects are not treated as significant effects on the
13 environment; however, where a physical change is caused by economic or social effects
14 of the Proposed Project, the physical change may be regarded as a significant impact.
15 Evidence of economic and social impacts that do not contribute to or are not caused by
16 physical changes in the environment is not substantial evidence that the project may have
17 a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines sections 15064(e) and (f) (6)
18 and section 15131). Therefore, the potential for physical changes as a result of
19 socioeconomic changes are considered. This may include the need for new construction,
20 infrastructure, and transportation facilities to accommodate an influx of new population
21 and/or businesses, or physical blight related to falling property values and movement of
22 people out of an area.

23 **8.3.1 Methodology**

24 The initial step in estimating socioeconomic impacts associated with implementation of
25 the Proposed Project is to link construction and operational activities to measurable
26 socioeconomic indicators such as jobs. Economic impact modeling techniques (described
27 below) can then be used to assess the economic impacts that implementation of the
28 Proposed Project could have on the regional and local economy within the five-county
29 Southern California region.

30 **8.3.1.1 CEQA Baseline**

31 The CEQA baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time. The CEQA baseline
32 differs from the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) in that the No Project Alternative
33 (Alternative 1) addresses what is likely to happen at the Project site over time, starting
34 from the existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) allows
35 for growth at the Project site that could be expected to occur without additional
36 approvals, whereas the CEQA baseline does not. For this analysis, the No Project
37 Alternative (Alternative 1) and the CEQA baseline are functionally identical because the
38 No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) does not envision any growth or other activity at
39 the site.

40 As described in Section 2.6, calendar year 2021 is the baseline used in this Draft EIR. In
41 2021, activity within the boundaries of the Project site (i.e. Berth 191 and the backlands
42 at Berths 192-194; see Figure 2-2) was negligible as the site is largely vacant and there
43 were no vessel calls at Berth 191. Activity on the waterfront of Berths 192-194

1 (immediately outside the Project site) consisted of a small boat restoration operation and
2 equipment storage uses. However, for purposes of defining the CEQA Baseline, activities
3 at the Project site during 2021 were assumed to be negligible, resulting in a baseline of
4 zero activity.

5 **8.3.1.2 Proposed Direct, Indirect, and Induced Jobs**

6 The new jobs associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Project are
7 categorized in terms of *direct jobs*, *indirect jobs*, and *induced jobs*. Together, the indirect
8 and induced jobs are referred to as *secondary jobs*. In terms of construction, direct jobs
9 are those jobs created by construction activities. Indirect construction jobs are related to
10 purchases from materials supply firms and their suppliers, and induced jobs are related to
11 household expenditures by workers. For operations, direct jobs are those jobs created by
12 operational activities that would not exist if the Proposed Project did not occur, indirect
13 jobs are created throughout the region as the result of purchases of goods and services by
14 the firms directly impacted by the Proposed Project, and induced jobs are jobs created in
15 the region by the purchases of goods and services by those individuals directly employed
16 by the Proposed Project.

17 The employment effects of the Proposed Project relative to construction are presented in
18 terms of direct and secondary (indirect and induced) jobs, and total jobs (direct and
19 secondary combined) over the 18-month construction period.

20 The employment effects of the Proposed Project and alternatives relative to operations
21 are presented in terms of direct and secondary jobs, and total jobs (direct and secondary
22 combined) for 2024 (maximum construction employment) and 2027 (full operation;
23 effects beyond 2027 would be similar because the facility is assumed to be at full
24 operation throughout its life. Note that in this case, gross jobs (the combined total of net
25 jobs and jobs associated with existing operations) are the same as net jobs because there
26 is no existing employment at the Project site.

27 **8.3.1.3 Economic Modeling**

28 The economic impact analysis of the Proposed Project was assessed using the IMPLAN
29 (Impact analysis for PLANning) model to evaluate potential changes in regional
30 economic activity (Beacon 2023). Originally developed by the U.S. Department of
31 Agriculture, the IMPLAN model is a widely used model employed to assess the regional
32 economic impacts of private and public projects. IMPLAN is an input-output model in
33 which the total industry purchases of commodities, services, employment compensation,
34 value added, and imports are equal to the value of the commodities produced. Purchases
35 for final use (final demand) drive the model. Industries produce goods and services for
36 final demand and purchase goods and services from other producers. These other
37 producers, in turn, purchase goods and services (indirect purchases).

38 Creating input-output models requires a tremendous amount of data, and the costs of
39 deriving that data directly are prohibitive. IMPLAN was developed as a cost-effective
40 means to develop regional input-output models. The IMPLAN accounts closely follow
41 the accounting conventions used in the “Input-Output Study of the U.S. Economy” by the
42 Bureau of Economic Analysis (MIG 2011) and the rectangular format recommended by
43 the United Nations.

44

8.3.1.4 Thresholds of Significance

CEQA Guidelines Section 15131 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.

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, because no people or housing would be displaced as a result of the Proposed Project or alternatives, this issue is not discussed further, and the following criteria are evaluated here:

1. *Direct or Indirect Inducement of Substantial Population Growth:* 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. *Changes to the Local Employment or Labor Force:* The Proposed Project/alternative would have a socioeconomic effect if it would cause substantial change in the local employment or labor force.
3. *Property Values:* The Proposed Project/alternative would have a socioeconomic effect if it would cause a substantial decrease in property values.

8.4 Socioeconomic Effects of the Proposed Project and Alternatives

8.4.1 Proposed Project

The analysis of potential effects of the Proposed Project includes the construction phase (2024-2025) and the operational phase (2025-2054). The Proposed Project (see Section 2.5 for more detail) would construct and operate a facility at Berths 192-194 to produce a low-carbon construction binder from raw materials and transport the product to cement facilities throughout the region and would rehabilitate the wharf at Berth 191 to receive oceangoing vessels delivering one of the raw materials. Orcem estimates that construction would cost approximately \$132 million, \$80 million of it in wages, and would generate \$7.5 million in state and local taxes. At full operation, beginning in 2027, the facility would expend approximately \$113 million annually, approximately \$68 million of that amount in Los Angeles County (purchases of raw materials and shipping services would involve expenditures outside the county), and generate approximately \$4 million annually in state and local taxes.

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 evaluated.

1 Construction of the Proposed Project is assumed to commence in 2024 and last
2 approximately 18 months, during which time labor would be employed and purchases of
3 materials, supplies, services, and equipment would occur. The first year of Proposed
4 Project operation would be 2025, and full capacity would be reached in 2027.

5 **Effects on Employment**

6 Construction of the Proposed Project would involve up to 75 construction workers on-site
7 at any one time. The IMPLAN model (Beacon 2023) estimates that construction would
8 generate an estimated 497 direct and another 238 indirect and induced (i.e., secondary)
9 jobs during the construction period. Those jobs would represent much less than 0.01
10 percent of the approximately 9 million jobs in the five-county region in 2021 (Table 8.3-
11 2). The construction workforce would likely be composed entirely of people already
12 living in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, given the large existing construction industry
13 workforce, the highly integrated nature of the Southern California economy, and the
14 prevalence of cross-county and inter-community commuting by workers between their
15 places of work and residence. Most of the indirect workforce would likely come from
16 within the five-county region. The Proposed Project, therefore, is not anticipated to result
17 in either in-migration or relocation of construction employees to satisfy the need for
18 increased temporary, construction-related employment.

19 The Proposed Project is estimated to support a total of 242 direct jobs at full operation,
20 26 of them on-site operating the facility and the remainder in related activities such as
21 trucking. Linkages among economic sectors would result in the creation of 208 additional
22 secondary (indirect and induced) jobs in related sectors. Accordingly, at full operation the
23 Proposed Project's increased employment would represent much less than 0.01% of the
24 projected regional employment of nearly 10 million in 2045 (Table 8-3). As with the
25 construction workforce, the operational workforce would likely come largely from Los
26 Angeles County, and no substantial influx of employees into the local communities is
27 anticipated.

28 While the Proposed Project would provide new job opportunities, the added jobs would
29 represent an insignificant proportion of future jobs in the five-county region. Given the
30 large labor pool found throughout the region, the Proposed Project would not result in
31 substantial in-migration or relocation of employees. Therefore, the Proposed Project
32 would not cause substantial changes in local employment or the labor force.

33 **Effects on Local Businesses, Income, and Tax Revenues**

34 Existing businesses in the vicinity of the of the project site include Vopak to the west, the
35 University of Southern California (USC) Boathouse and Fire Station 49 to the east, and
36 the WWL automobile terminal to the north. None of these businesses would be adversely
37 affected by construction of the Proposed Project, which would occur entirely at Berth
38 191, which is inactive, and within the Orcem leasehold. Construction would not cause
39 any loss of revenues or increased costs to those entities. Similarly, operation of the
40 Proposed Project would not adversely affect the operations of nearby businesses because
41 the only off-site activity would be truck traffic on established roads.

42 The Proposed Project is estimated to generate nearly \$4 million per year in direct and
43 indirect local and state tax revenues, as well as additional tax revenues to the federal
44 government. The Proposed Project would also generate revenue to the Port of Los
45 Angeles via lease payments.

1 **Effects on Population**

2 The Proposed Project does not include the construction of new housing or infrastructure
3 that would directly induce population growth. Therefore, no shifts in residential
4 population would be expected as a result of the Proposed Project. Because construction
5 workers tend to commute to job sites they are unlikely to relocate as a result of the
6 Proposed Project. Similarly, operation of the Proposed Project would employ a small
7 workforce (26 workers) that would come largely or entirely from the existing regional
8 workforce. Any relocations would involve too few workers to have a perceptible effect
9 on population in the region.

10 **Effects on Housing and Property Values**

11 The Proposed Project would not displace any housing and does not propose construction
12 of housing or development of a previously undeveloped area, nor would it result in major
13 infrastructure improvements that could provide for future housing development. As
14 discussed above, the direct and secondary jobs during the construction period and the
15 long-term increases in direct and secondary employment from operation of the Proposed
16 Project would not change existing population in-migration and relocation patterns
17 because of the large existing labor pool in the region.

18 The Proposed Project would stimulate a certain amount of economic growth in the
19 immediate area. However, as discussed above, the effects of this economic growth would
20 not substantially affect employment levels or population distribution in the local area and
21 region. Given the large size of the existing workforce in the area, it is anticipated that the
22 most, if not all, workers would already be living in the area, meaning that there would be
23 no substantial relocation of workers and families and that no measurable change in
24 population distribution is likely to occur as a result of the Proposed Project. Accordingly,
25 the Proposed Project would result in negligible changes in demand for additional
26 housing, and it is unlikely that the Proposed Project would exert upward pressure on
27 property values in the local communities. Should some relocation of new employees
28 occur within the local communities or the region as a whole, existing housing stock
29 would be available. Any workers that did relocate as a result of new jobs generated by the
30 Proposed Project could be readily accommodated by existing housing stock without
31 affecting the demand for housing or property values.

32 Because of the small number of additional jobs relative to regional employment, the
33 Proposed Project would not change residential property trends in the areas immediately
34 adjacent to the Port or in the region. Further, the Proposed Project would not cause
35 building code violations, dilapidation and deterioration, defective design or physical
36 construction adjacent to residential communities, faulty or inadequate utilities, or other
37 similar factors that could lead to a lowering of property values.

38 Since implementation of the Proposed Project would not induce substantial population
39 growth directly or indirectly, substantially change local employment, or cause a
40 substantial change in local property values, no physical changes to adjacent communities
41 are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Project. The overall economic effects of the
42 Proposed Project locally and on the Southern California region would be insubstantial.

8.4.2 Analysis of Alternatives

Under the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), no construction or operations would occur; the Berths 192-194 site would continue to be largely or entirely vacant and unused and there would be no construction or operational jobs. Accordingly, there would be no changes in local or regional population, employment, or housing. Because there would be no changes in socioeconomic conditions, the No Project Alternative would have no adverse socioeconomic effects on population growth, jobs, or housing in the region.

Under the Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2) (see Section 2.7.1.3) the Orcem facility would operate at a lower throughput than the Proposed Project. Construction employment and spending would remain the same as for the Proposed Project because the same facility would be built, but the facility would be operated by 18 employees rather than the 26 under the Proposed Project. Accordingly, as with the Proposed Project, the Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2) would not induce substantial direct or indirect population growth. The added jobs would represent an insignificant proportion of future jobs in the five-county region. Given the large existing labor pool throughout the region, this alternative would not result in substantial in-migration or relocation of employees. Because of the small number of additional jobs relative to regional employment, the Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2) would not change residential property trends in the region.

Under the Product Import Terminal (Alternative 3), the Orcem facility would not produce the product on site but instead would import finished product for distribution to the region. A facility similar to the Proposed Project would be built and construction employment at any given time would be similar to that of the Proposed Project. However, there would be fewer operational employees than under the Proposed Project (12 rather than 26). Accordingly, as with the Proposed Project, the Product Import Alternative (Alternative 3) would not induce substantial direct or indirect population growth. The added jobs would represent an insignificant proportion of future jobs in the five-county region. Given the large existing labor pool throughout the region, this alternative would not result in substantial in-migration or relocation of employees. Because of the small number of additional jobs relative to regional employment, the Product Import Alternative (Alternative 3) would not change residential property trends in the region. .

Like the Proposed Project, the Product Import Terminal (Alternative 3) would not induce substantial direct population growth. The added jobs would represent an insignificant proportion of future jobs in the five-county region. Given the large existing labor pool throughout the region, this alternative would not result in substantial in-migration or relocation of employees. Because of the small number of additional jobs relative to regional employment, the Product Import Terminal Alternative (Alternative 3) would not change residential property trends in the region.

8.5 Summary of Evaluation of Socioeconomic Effects

Table 8-4 summarizes the evaluation of the Proposed Project and alternatives related to socioeconomics, as described in the detailed discussion above. All impacts, whether significant or not, are included in this table. Note that CEQA does not require this analysis and it is meant as an informational disclosure of the Proposed Project and alternatives.

Table 8-4: Summary Matrix of Potential Socioeconomics Effects Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Socioeconomic Effects	Evaluation
Proposed Project	The Proposed Project would not result in direct or indirect inducement of substantial population growth, change in the local employment or labor force, or substantial loss of property values	Insubstantial effects
Alternative 1 – No Project	Alternative 1 would not result in direct or indirect inducement of substantial population growth, change in the local employment or labor force, or substantial loss of property values	No effects
Alternative 2 – Reduced Project Alternative	Alternative 2 would not result in direct or indirect inducement of substantial population growth, change in the local employment or labor force, or substantial loss of property values	Insubstantial effects
Alternative 3 – Product Import Terminal	Alternative 3 would not result in direct or indirect inducement of substantial population growth, change in the local employment or labor force, or substantial loss of property values	Insubstantial effects

1

References

AFF (American Fact Finder). 2019. 2014-2018 Median Household Income in the United States by County. <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/interactive/2014-2018-median-household-income-by-county.html>

_____. 2023a. Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Counties: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2022 (CO-EST2022-POP). <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/time-series/demo/popest/2020s-counties-total.html>.

_____. 2023b. Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places in the United States: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2022 (SUB-IP-EST2022-POP).

Beacon Economics, 2023. ORCEM Port of Los Angeles Project: Economic Impact Analysis.

BLS (Bureau of Labor Statistics). 2023. Local Area Unemployment Statistics – Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metropolitan Division. https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LAUDV063108400000006?amp%253bdata_tool=XGtable&output_view=data&include_graphs=true.

CA EDD (California Employment Development Department). 2023a. California Labor Market Top Statistics. Unemployment Rate Graph. <https://labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/Top-Statistics.html#UR>.

_____. 2023b. Report 400 C Monthly Labor Force Data for Counties. Annual Average 2021 – Revised. <https://labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/file/lfhist/21aacou.pdf>.

DOF (California Department of Finance). 2021. Report P-2A: Total Population Projections, 2010-2060. California and Counties, 2019 Baseline. <https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/projections/>.

Federal Reserve St. Louis. 2023. New Private Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits for California. FRED Economic Data. <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/CABPPRIVSA>.

Harbor Community Benefit Foundation. 2022. Accessible at: <http://hcbf.org/about/>.

LAEDC (Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation). 2015. L.A. Stats. June. https://laedc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/2015-LA-Stats_Final.pdf.

_____. 2021. 2021 Economic Forecast: A Tale of Two Recoveries. Executive Summary. LAEDC Institute of Applied Economics. https://laedc.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/LAEDC-2021-Economic-Forecast_Final-1.pdf.

Martin Associates. 2007. The Local and Regional Economic Impacts of the Port of Los Angeles. Prepared for the Port of Los Angeles.

MIG. 2011. Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) Input-Output Model, MIG, Inc., Hudson, Wisconsin, 2011 Regional Data. www.implan.com. Port of Los Angeles. 2015.

SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2020. Demographics and Growth Forecast. Technical Report for the Connect SoCal Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocial_demographics-and-growth-forecast.pdf?1606001579.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2022. New Privately Owned Housing Units Authorized by County: California 2021. Data Visualizations BPS State/County Map. November. <https://www.census.gov/construction/bps/visualizations/statemap/index.html>.