This section describes potential project-related impacts to population, housing and employment associated with the Canoga Transportation Corridor Project. Potential environmental justice effects are also addressed in this section to evaluate whether implementation of the proposed project could result in adverse human health or environmental effects that would disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations.

### 4.3.1 EXISTING SETTING

#### Population

Los Angeles County covers approximately 4,000 square miles of land that includes more than 2,600 square miles of unincorporated areas and 88 incorporated cities. Los Angeles County is the most populous county in California and in the United States. In the year 2000, Los Angeles County’s population was approximately 9.5 million persons (Table 4.3-1). By the year 2030, Los Angeles County’s population is anticipated to increase by approximately 27.6 percent (12.2 million persons). The City of Los Angeles is the largest city within Los Angeles County. The City of Los Angeles had a population of approximately 3.7 million persons in the year 2000. The population is anticipated to increase by 16.1 percent (4.3 million persons) by the year 2030. The Canoga Transportation Corridor is located in the western portion of the San Fernando Valley. The San Fernando Valley, which includes many communities of the City of Los Angeles, as well as the incorporated cities of San Fernando, Burbank, Glendale, Hidden Hills, and Calabasas and some unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles, had a population of approximately 1.4 million in the year 2001. The population of the San Fernando Valley is anticipated to increase by 14 percent to approximately 1.6 million persons in the year 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3-1: Population and Housing Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of Los Angeles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Los Angeles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canoga Transportation Corridor /a, b/</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/a/ Data derived from 2000 U.S. Census Tract Block Groups within a one-half mile of the proposed stations.

/b/ Growth projections based upon 30-year Population and Housing growth within the Canoga Park-Winnetka and Chatsworth-Porter Ranch Communities.

**SOURCE:** SCAG, 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Growth Projections; TAHA, 2007

The Corridor is approximately six miles long and spans the City of Los Angeles communities of Chatsworth-Porter Ranch, Canoga Park, West Hills, Winnetka, and Woodland Hills. In the year
2000, the Corridor had a population of approximately 83,070 persons. The population in the Corridor is anticipated to increase by 16.7 percent (96,943 persons) by the year 2030. The proposed project does not include any housing units that would increase the population of the Corridor, and the Canoga Transportation Corridor has been designated as part of the 2% Opportunity Area in the SCAG Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy (see Section 4.1 for a discussion of this plan).

**Housing**

The County of Los Angeles' housing stock is a mixture of single-family, multi-family and mobile housing units. Slightly over half of the housing stock in the County is single-family units. In 2000, there were approximately 3.1 million housing units in the County (Table 4.3-1). The number of housing units in Los Angeles County is anticipated to increase by 31.3 percent (to 4.1 million housing units) by 2030.

The composition of the City of Los Angeles' housing stock is slightly different from that of Los Angeles County. The City of Los Angeles' housing stock is composed of approximately 40 percent single-family housing units and approximately 60 percent multi-family housing units. In the year 2000, the City of Los Angeles had approximately 1.3 million housing units (Table 4.3-1). The number of housing units is expected to increase by approximately 28.3 percent (to 1.6 million housing units) by the year 2030.

Housing stock within the Corridor is predominantly composed of single-family housing units. In the year 2000, there were approximately 29,618 housing units in the Corridor (Table 4.3-1). The number of housing units in the Corridor is anticipated to increase by 26.3 percent (to 37,048 housing units) by the year 2030. The proposed project does not include any housing units, and as discussed in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition, Displacement and Relocation, no housing units would be displaced by the proposed project. Section 4.1 Land Use and Planning further addresses residential land uses within the Corridor.

**Employment**

In 2001, there were 573,002 jobs within the San Fernando Valley. By 2030, the number of jobs within the San Fernando Valley is expected to increase to 723,501, a 26-percent increase. For the study area, which generally extends from Ventura Boulevard on the south to the SR-118 Freeway on the north, and from Winnetka Avenue on the east to Topanga Canyon on the west, employment is predicted to increase by 24 percent from 140,533 in 2000 to 174,533 by 2030.

Major employment centers within the Corridor include the Warner Center and Chatsworth Industrial Center. The Kaiser Foundation Hospital, a large medical center located in Woodland Hills adjacent to De Soto Avenue and Burbank Boulevard, also represents a concentration of employment. The highest employment densities are in the Warner Center area through to Ventura Boulevard and the mid-section of Chatsworth between Nordhoff and Lassen Streets. In addition, a narrow band of employment surrounds Canoga Avenue through Canoga Park.

---


As discussed in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition, Displacement and Relocation, there are a number of commercial and industrial businesses with lease agreements to expand their sites for parking, storage, and/or building improvements into the Metro Right-of-Way (ROW) that would be terminated as part of the project. In addition, acquisition of a few properties occupied by commercial and/or industrial businesses outside the Metro ROW may also be required. Although Metro may provide relocation assistance and compensation per the California Relocation Act to those who are displaced or whose property is acquired, it is assumed that commercial and industrial jobs would be displaced by the project. Additionally, the qualification for the relocation assistance and compensation is dependent on the specific lease agreement. Based on the size of the developed lease area and SCAG employment data for the project area, it is estimated that the leased area could account for approximately 143 jobs. Similarly, the properties to be acquired are estimated to contribute up to approximately 91 jobs.  

Environmental Justice

As defined by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), environmental justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including a racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or policies. Meaningful involvement means that: (1) potentially affected community residents have an appropriate opportunity to participate in decisions about a proposed activity that will affect their environment and/or health, (2) the public’s contribution can influence the regulatory agency’s decision, (3) the concerns of all participants will be considered in the decision making process, and (4) the decision makers shall seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected.

Public Participation and Alternative Screening

To ensure opportunities for public participation during the project development process, Metro held two public project scoping meetings, after sending 44,400 notices. The first was held on July 26, 2007 at the Chatsworth High School and the second on July 30, 2007 at the New Academy Canoga Park Elementary School in Canoga Park. A total of 168 people attended the two meetings to provide comments on the alignment alternatives for the proposed project.

Following the public project scoping meetings, an Alternative Screening Report was prepared to evaluate the alternative alignments for the northern extension of the existing Metro Orange Line (MOL). Based on community input, as well as qualitative and quantitative evaluations, the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative and the Canoga Busway Alternative were chosen to be further evaluated in this Draft EIR in addition to the No Project Alternative and Transportation System Management Alternative (TSM).

Environmental justice concerns would be the same under each of the alternatives since the alternatives are located adjacent to one another and would affect the same local population. The Corridor’s demographic data, which were derived from the 2000 U.S. Census, are presented in Table 4.3-2. As shown, the Corridor’s population is predominantly Hispanic and White, approximately 80.1 percent of the Corridor’s entire population. In 2000, approximately 16.3 percent of the

---

3Employment estimates are based on the SCAG Employment Density Study (2001).
Corridor’s population was below the poverty threshold. The poverty thresholds in 2000 are as follows:

- One person household: $8,794
- Two person household: $11,239
- Three person household: $13,738
- Four person household: $17,603
- Five person household: $20,819
- Six person household: $23,528
- Seven person household: $26,754
- Eight person household: $29,701
- Nine person or more household: $35,060

The demographic data were derived from the census tract block groups within one-half mile of the five proposed stations (Figure 4.3-1).

4.3.2 Regulatory Framework

Following the lead of the environmental justice movement at the federal level, a series of laws beginning in 1999 have been enacted in California to implement environmental justice. Environmental justice in California means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has been designated the “coordinating agency in state government for environmental justice programs.” As part of its new environmental justice coordinator role, OPR must now incorporate environmental justice considerations into local government planning decisions.

Recognizing the federal government’s lead in the area of environmental justice, the California laws require OPR to coordinate with federal agencies regarding environmental justice. At the federal level, an “Executive Order on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” was issued on February 4, 1994. This order is designed to focus federal attention on environmental and human health conditions in minority communities and low-income communities and states that “each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.” This Order is intended to guard against discrimination in Federal Programs substantially affecting human health and the environment and to provide for access to information and public participation relating to such matters.

---

1 The listed thresholds are the weighted average thresholds (U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division). The poverty threshold is updated each year by the U.S. Census Bureau.
2 Census tract block group are a cluster of census blocks having the same first digit of their four-digit identifying numbers within a census tract. For example, block group 3 within a census tract includes all blocks numbered from 3000 to 3999.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3-2: Canoga Transportation Corridor Demographic Data (2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Persons in Corridor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households in Corridor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minority Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Household Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $10,000 and $14,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $15,000 and $19,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $20,000 and $24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $25,000 and $29,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $30,000 and $39,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $40,000 and $59,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $60,000 and $99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Levels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income in 1999 below poverty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income in 1999 at or above poverty level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Population, Housing & Environmental Justice
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Figure 4.3-1
In response to the Executive Order, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) issued an Order to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. This order, issued in April 1995, sets guidelines to ensure that all federally funded transportation-related programs, policies, or activities having the potential to adversely affect human health or the environment involve a planning and programming process that explicitly considers the effects on minority populations and low-income populations.

The proposed project is not being undertaken by a federal agency or using federal funds and, therefore, is not subject to the USDOT Order to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. However, California Government Code Section 11135 expressly prohibits disparate impact discrimination and provides a private right of action to enforce any state anti-discrimination regulation created under Section 11135. Thus, private parties in California can rely on the judicial system to address environmental justice concerns. Government Code Section 11135 is not an express environmental justice statute but rather a general prohibition on discrimination in government programs and benefits. In addition, CEQA requires a finding as to whether or not specific social considerations, among others, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives to the project identified in the environmental review process. Therefore, agencies should evaluate whether measures or alternative projects that minimize significant environmental effects on low-income and minority communities truly are infeasible.

4.3.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Significance Criteria

Population and Housing

According to CEQA, a significant impact to population and housing may occur when:

- The proposed project causes the redistribution of the population, or an influx or loss of population (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- Creates inconsistencies with the growth management polices mentioned in the various applicable plans that govern the project area; or
- Displaces substantial numbers of existing housing and/or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Employment

According to CEQA, a significant impact to employment may occur when:

- Employment opportunities are displaced.

Environmental Justice

The State of California defines environmental justice as the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. CEQA does not have thresholds of significance for issues related to environmental justice. Therefore, environmental justice issues associated with the proposed project were evaluated in accordance with Federal Actions to Address Environmental
Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations (Environmental Justice), Executive Order 12898. Accordingly, a significant impact associated with environmental justice would occur when:

- The proposed project disproportionately affects minority and/or low-income populations.

**Methodology**

**Population, Housing and Employment**

2000 U.S. Census data were used to describe the existing population, housing and employment characteristics of the study area, and SCAG population projections were used to describe expected growth in the area. A qualitative discussion was provided to examine the potential impacts of the proposed project on these population, housing and employment patterns.

**Environmental Justice**

The methodology in this section incorporates the socioeconomic and environmental justice analysis guidelines set by the USDOT and the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Final Guidance For Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA’s NEPA Compliance Analyses. Data used in this section were gathered from the 2000 U.S. Census. For this analysis, all census tract block groups within a half-mile of the Corridor were analyzed for race and income composition. A “high concentration” of minority or low-income residents was defined as an area that contains a higher percentage of minority or low-income populations than that found in the City of Los Angeles. The USDOT uses the following definition given in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act to define “minority”:

- **Black**
  a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa

- **Hispanic**
  a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race

- **Asian**
  a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent

- **American Indian**
  a person having origins in any of the original people of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition

- **Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander**
  a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam Samoa, or other Pacific Islands

The USDOT uses the following definition given in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act to define “low-income”:

- **Low-income**
  a person whose household income (or in the case of a community or group, whose median household income) is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines.
The 2007 HHS poverty guidelines are shown in Table 4.3-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Family Unit</th>
<th>Poverty Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$17,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$17,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$24,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$27,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$31,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$34,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each additional person $3,480


Impact 4.3.1. The proposed project would not have the potential to cause the redistribution of population, or an influx or loss of population. The proposed project would not have any significant impact to population and housing without mitigation.

Section 4.1 Land Use and Development indicates that there are adopted policies that would support increased intensification of land uses in the Corridor, especially in the vicinity of transit stations. The probability of this intensification at transit stations, however, is not directly reflected in local land use controls, such as zoning and the applicable community plan. Intensification of land uses would have to undergo additional environmental review and a public decision/approval process through the City of Los Angeles. The guidelines to CEQA expressly prohibit the inclusion of speculative information. Thus, without the appropriate land use zoning allowing intensification of areas adjacent to Metro station areas, any further discussion of the effects is entirely speculative and is beyond the scope of this Draft EIR. For further information, see the discussion in Section 5.1 Growth Inducing Impacts. As none of the project alternatives would displace housing or include a housing component, none of the alternatives under consideration would have an affect on housing or population, and no significant impacts are anticipated.

**Alternative 1. No Project**

The No Project Alternative would not include any physical changes, and the Metro ROW would not be used for a transit project. This alternative would not cause the redistribution of the population, or an influx or loss of population. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not result in any impacts to population and housing.

**Alternative 2. TSM**

The TSM Alternative would include improvements to the transportation system within existing street ROWs. The local bus stops that would be constructed for this alternative would not cause the
redistribution of the population, or an influx or loss of population. No significant impacts to population and housing are anticipated.

**Alternative 3. Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes**

The Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative requires widening Canoga Avenue into the Metro ROW on the east side of Canoga Avenue. This alternative would also require acquisition of private property outside of and adjacent to the Metro ROW and the termination and reconfiguration of lease agreements between commercial and industrial businesses operating within the Metro ROW. No housing units would be displaced or introduced as part of the proposed project. Therefore, no redistribution, or influx or loss of the population is anticipated as a result of this alternative. The Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would not result in any significant impact to population and housing.

**Alternative 4. Canoga Busway**

The Canoga Busway Alternative would require acquisition of private property outside of and adjacent to the Metro ROW and the termination and reconfiguration of lease agreements between commercial and industrial businesses operating within the Metro ROW. Similar to the other alternatives, no housing units would be displaced or introduced as part of the proposed project. Therefore, no redistribution, or influx or loss of the population is anticipated as a result of this alternative. The Canoga Busway Alternative would not result in any significant impact to population and housing.

**Mitigation Measures:**

The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to population and housing for each alternative, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Level of Impact After Mitigation:** No impact.

---

Impact 4.3.2. The proposed project could have the potential to create inconsistencies with the growth management polices mentioned in the various applicable plans that govern the project area. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on population and housing without mitigation.

Relevant growth management policies applicable to the proposed project are discussed in Section 4.1 Land Use and Development, and growth-inducing impacts are discussed in Subsection 5.1 Growth-Inducing Impacts.

**Alternative 1. No Project**

The No Project Alternative would not include any physical changes, and the Metro ROW would not be used for a transit project. This alternative would not create inconsistencies with the growth management polices in the plans that govern the project area. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not have any impacts on population and housing.
Alternative 2. TSM

The TSM Alternative would include improvements to the transportation system within existing street ROWs. As discussed in response to Impact 4.3.1, it would be speculative to attempt to predict the additional intensification of land use or changes of land use from community plans that may be made in the future along this Corridor. No housing units are proposed as part of the project, and this alternative is not anticipated to stimulate development to a level inconsistent with applicable planned local land use designations. Therefore, the TSM Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on population and housing.

Alternative 3. Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes

The Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would improve the mobility and accessibility for people in the area by widening Canoga Avenue into the Metro ROW. As discussed in response to Impact 4.3.1, it would be speculative to attempt to predict the additional intensification of land use or changes of land use from community plans that may be made in the future along this Corridor. No housing units are proposed as part of the project, and this alternative would not create inconsistencies with the growth management polices applicable to the project, including the SCAG Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy (see Section 4.1 Land Use and Planning). On the contrary, the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would be consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy to build on the success of existing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lines and to connect major activity centers. Therefore, the Canoga On-street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on population and housing.

Alternative 4. Canoga Busway

The Canoga Busway Alternative would improve the mobility and accessibility for people in the area. As discussed in response to Impact 4.3.1, it would be speculative to attempt to predict the additional intensification of land use or changes of land use from community plans that may be made in the future along this Corridor. No housing units are proposed as part of the project, and this alternative would not create inconsistencies with the growth management polices applicable to the project, including the SCAG Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy (see Section 4.1 Land Use and Planning). On the contrary, the Canoga Busway Alternative would be consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan policy to build on the success of existing BRT lines and to connect major activity centers. Therefore, the Canoga Busway Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on population and housing.

Mitigation Measures: The proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to population and housing for each alternative, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: Less than significant.
Impact 4.3.3. The proposed project would not have the potential to displace substantial numbers of existing housing and/or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on population and housing without mitigation.

**Alternative 1. No Project**

The No Project Alternative would not include any physical changes, and the Metro ROW would not be used for a transit project. This alternative would not displace existing housing and/or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not result in any impacts to population and housing.

**Alternative 2. TSM**

The TSM Alternative would include improvements to the transportation system within existing street ROWs. The local bus stops that would be constructed for this alternative would not displace existing housing and/or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the TSM Alternative would not result in any impacts to population and housing.

**Alternative 3. Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes**

Implementation of the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative may require the acquisition of a couple commercial and/or industrial properties outside the Metro ROW and the termination and reconfiguration of lease agreements between commercial and industrial businesses operating within the Metro ROW. Compliance with State relocation assistance policies would assist displaced business owners and compensate property owners. However, qualifications are dependent on the specific lease agreement. It is assumed that a number of jobs would be displaced, as certain businesses would likely relocate out of the area and other business would choose to close. Specifically, it is estimated that implementation of the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would result in the loss of approximately 234 jobs (143 due to the termination of leases in the area and 91 due to land acquisitions). However, because of the overall local and regional employment growth anticipated in the area, the loss of jobs resulting from the implementation of the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative is not anticipated to displace a substantial number of people. Furthermore, no housing units would be displaced under this alternative. Therefore, the construction of replacement housing would not be necessary. The Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on population and housing.

**Alternative 4. Canoga Busway**

Implementation of the Canoga Busway Alternative may require the acquisition of commercial and/or industrial properties outside the Metro ROW and the termination and reconfiguration of lease agreements between commercial and industrial businesses operating within the Metro ROW. Compliance with State relocation assistance policies would assist displaced business owners and compensate property owners. However, qualifications are dependent on the specific lease agreement. It is assumed that some jobs and employment opportunities would be displaced, as certain businesses would likely relocate out of the area and other business would choose to close. Specifically, it is estimated that implementation of the Canoga Busway Alternative would result in the loss of approximately 219 jobs (143 due to the termination of leases in the area and 76 due to land acquisitions).

---

7Employment estimates are based on the SCAG Employment Density Study (2001).
acquisitions). However, because of the overall local and regional employment growth anticipated in the area, the loss of jobs as a result of the Canoga Busway Alternative is not anticipated to displace substantial numbers of people. Furthermore, no housing units would be displaced under this alternative. Therefore, the construction of replacement housing would not be necessary. The Canoga Busway Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on population and housing.

**Mitigation Measures:**

The proposed project would result in no impact or a less-than-significant impact to population and housing for each alternative, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Level of Impact After Mitigation:** Less than significant.

Impact 4.3.4. The proposed project could have the potential to displace employment opportunities. The proposed project would have a significant impact on employment without mitigation.

**Alternative 1. No Project**

The No Project Alternative would not include any physical changes, and the Metro ROW would not be used for a transit project. This alternative would not displace any jobs or employment opportunities. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not result in any employment impacts.

**Alternative 2. TSM**

The TSM Alternative would include improvements to the transportation system within existing street ROWs. This alternative would not displace any jobs or employment opportunities. Therefore, the TSM Alternative would not result in any employment impacts.

**Alternative 3. Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes**

The Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative requires widening Canoga Avenue into the Metro ROW. This alternative would require acquisition of private property outside the Metro ROW (see Section 4.2 Land Acquisition, Displacement and Relocation for a list of private properties that may be acquired outside of the Metro ROW) and the termination and reconfiguration of lease agreements between commercial and industrial businesses operating within the Metro ROW. Compliance with State relocation assistance policies would assist displaced business owners and compensate property owners. The relocation assistance is dependent on the specific lease agreement. However, it is assumed that a number of jobs and employment opportunities would be displaced, as certain businesses would likely relocate out of the area and other business would choose to close. Specifically, implementation of the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative may require the acquisition of six properties (See Table 4.2-3 in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition and Displacement), the termination of 56 leases and the possible reconfiguration of the leases. It is estimated that implementation of Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would result in the loss of approximately 234 jobs (143 due to the termination of leases in the area and 91 due to land acquisitions). However, because of the overall local and regional employment growth anticipated in

---

*Employment estimates are based on the SCAG Employment Density Study (2001).*
the area, the number of jobs displaced would be relatively small in comparison to the total jobs in the region. Nonetheless, the Canoga On-street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would result in a significant impact on employment without mitigation.

**Alternative 4. Canoga Busway**

Implementation of the Canoga Busway Alternative would require acquisition of private property outside of the Metro ROW and result in the termination and reconfiguration of lease agreements between commercial and industrial businesses operating within the Metro ROW. Compliance with State relocation assistance policies would assist displaced business owners and compensate property owners. The relocation assistance is dependent on the specific lease agreement. However, it is assumed that some jobs and employment opportunities would be displaced, as certain businesses would likely relocate out of the area and other business would chose to close. Specifically, implementation of the Canoga Busway Alternative may require the acquisition of no more than five properties (see Table 4.2-4 in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition and Displacement), the termination of 56 leases and the possible reconfiguration of the leases. It is estimated that the implementation of the Canoga Busway would result in the loss of approximately 219 jobs (143 due to the termination of leases in the area and 76 due to land acquisitions). However, because of the overall local and regional employment growth anticipated in the area, the number of jobs displaced would be relatively small in comparison to the total jobs in the region. Nonetheless, the Canoga Busway Alternative would result in a significant impact on employment without mitigation.

**Mitigation Measures:**

Mitigation Measure MM 4.2-1 and MM 4.2-2 included in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition, Relocation and Displacement would also be applicable to the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes and the Canoga Busway Alternatives.

**Level of Impact After Mitigation:** Less-than-significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.2-1 and MM 4.2-2 included in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition, Relocation and Displacement would result in employment impacts to be deemed less-than-significant after mitigation.

Impact 4.3.5. The proposed project would disproportionately affect minority and/or low-income populations through the displacement of employment. The proposed project would have a significant impact on minority and/or low-income population without mitigation.

Table 4.3-4 indicates that the Corridor has higher concentrations of minorities and low-income populations than the San Fernando Valley as a whole or compared to the City of Los Angeles. The Canoga Corridor is one of five corridors considered in the San Fernando Valley for further study and transit improvements.

Through the project alternative analysis and screening process, four basic alternatives are addressed in this EIR, (e.g., No Project Alternative, the TSM Alternative, the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative, and the Canoga Busway Alternative). The No Project and TSM Alternatives would not have physical impacts to adjacent land uses, particularly housing and community facilities, or environmental justice implications. The Canoga On-Street and Canoga Busway alternatives would entail a substantial increase in transit service to the Corridor, and both options would include physical changes to Canoga Avenue and to the adjacent Metro ROW. As discussed in the Project
Description, stations have been located to provide convenient access for the adjacent community. Failure to provide service to transit dependent, low income, or minority populations would have environmental justice implications. As shown in Table 4.3-4, the proposed stations would provide adequate transit service to environmental justice sensitive communities surrounding the station areas. As such, there would be no adverse environmental justice implications of the proposed service or station locations.

The bulk of this EIR addresses potential adverse impacts on other topic areas. As discussed, there are no housing and associated housing displacements associated with the project alternatives. Thus, there would be no disproportionate impact on affordable housing or the general housing stock in adjacent communities, and there would be no adverse environmental justice implications.

The only area where the proposed project alternatives may have an adverse effect related to environmental justice is the displacement of employment, resulting from either the termination of leases in the Metro ROW or from the acquisition of commercial and industrial properties to create connections to the Chatsworth Metrolink Station. The environmental justice considerations in this case stem from the fact that most of the land uses displaced are industrial or warehouse in nature where the proportion of minorities is typically high. In addition, it is assumed that the affected jobs in the Corridor are reflective of the labor pool socioeconomic distribution of the adjacent community, which has a minority population proportion higher than the San Fernando Valley, the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles as a whole. Thus, as discussed below, of the 234 jobs displaced by the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative and the 219 jobs displaced by the Canoga Busway Alternative, a disproportionate number of minority workers could be affected. Without specific mitigation to address the needs of displaced workers (which can only be addressed on a business-by-business basis), this displacement may have significant adverse environmental justice implications.

**Alternative 1. No Project**

The No Project Alternative would not include any physical changes, and the Metro ROW would not be used for a transit project. This alternative would not result in any impacts on minority or low-income populations. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not disproportionately affect minority and/or low-income populations, and no impacts would occur.

**Alternative 2. TSM**

The TSM Alternative would include improvements to the transportation system within existing street ROWs. This alternative would not result in any impacts to minority and/or low-income populations. Therefore, the TSM Alternative would not disproportionately affect minority and/or low-income populations, and no impacts would occur.

**Alternative 3. Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes**

The Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would be an improvement to the existing public transportation system serving the area. The extension of MOL to this area would result in beneficial impacts to the local population that is comprised primarily of a minority and low-income demographic. Although the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would result in the loss of 234 jobs (143 due to the termination of leases in the area and 91 due to land acquisitions) that may affect minority and low-income residents, these residents would benefit from increased access to employment opportunities and regional centers. Therefore, the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes
Alternative would result in a beneficial overall effect to transportation for the communities affected. Nonetheless, as a disproportionate number of minority workers could be affected by the displacement of jobs as certain businesses would likely relocate out of the area and other business would choose to close, mitigation measures are included to reduce impacts to minority and/or low-income populations to less than significant.

**Alternative 4. Canoga Busway**

Similar to the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative, the Canoga Busway Alternative would be an improvement to the existing public transportation system serving the area and would result in beneficial impacts to the local population that is comprised primarily of a minority and low-income demographic. Although the Canoga Busway Alternative would result in the loss of 219 jobs (143 due to the termination of leases in the area and 76 due to land acquisitions) that may affect minority and low-income residents, these residents would benefit from increased access to mass transit and, subsequently, increased access to employment opportunities and regional centers. Therefore, the Canoga Busway Alternative would result in a beneficial overall effect to transportation for the communities affected. Nonetheless, as a disproportionate number of minority workers could be affected by the displacement of jobs as certain businesses would likely relocate out of the area and other business would choose to close, mitigation measures are included to reduce impacts to minority and/or low-income populations to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

Mitigation Measure MM 4.2-1 and MM 4.2-2 included in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition, Relocation and Displacement would also be applicable to the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes and the Canoga Busway Alternatives.

**Level of Impact After Mitigation:** Less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.2-1 and MM 4.2-2 included in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition, Relocation and Displacement would result in employment impacts to be deemed less-than-significant after mitigation.

Impact 4.3.6. The proposed project has the potential to have significant construction impacts without mitigation.

**Alternative 1. No Project**

The No Project Alternative would not include any construction activity. Therefore, the local population would not be affected, and no construction impacts would occur.

**Alternative 2. TSM**

The TSM Alternative would not require any construction activity. Therefore, the local population would not be affected, and no construction impacts would occur.
## Table 4.3-4: Station Area Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Medium Income</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Group</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>% Other</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>$42,189</td>
<td>9,519,338</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>25,609</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>265,861 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>$36,687</td>
<td>3,694,820</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8,879</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100,826 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley</td>
<td>$47,791</td>
<td>651,944</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16,280 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Valley</td>
<td>$44,579</td>
<td>703,014</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>26,313 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Stations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoga MOL Station/a/</td>
<td>$35,783</td>
<td>18,233</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>561 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Way/b/</td>
<td>$40,256</td>
<td>18,762</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>347 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscoe Boulevard/c/</td>
<td>$45,256</td>
<td>21,965</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>676 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordhoff Street/d/</td>
<td>$43,759</td>
<td>22,393</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>847 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatsworth Metrolink Station/e/</td>
<td>$62,263</td>
<td>18,259</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>633 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Station at Parthenia Street/f/</td>
<td>$42,068</td>
<td>21,508</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>855 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/a/ Data gathered from Census Tract Block Groups: 1351.12.3, 1349.02.3, 1349.02.2, 1340.00.3, 1345.20.2 and 1345.20.1
/b/ Data gathered from Census Tract Block Groups: 1340.00.4, 1340.00.3, 1345.20.2, 1345.10.1, 1345.10.1, 1340.00.2 and 1340.00.1
/c/ Data gathered from Census Tract Block Groups: 1342.01.1, 1342.01.2, 1342.01.3, 1343.06.1, 1343.05.1, 1132.33.2 and 1132.34.1
/d/ Data gathered from Census Tract Block Groups: 1134.21.1, 1132.33.2, 1132.32.2, 1132.34.1, 1132.02.3, 1132.02.1, 1133.03.2 and 1134.21.2
/e/ Data gathered from Census Tract Block Groups: 1133.03.2, 1132.02.1, 1132.13.2, 1132.12.1, 1132.12.2, 1131.00.3 and 1133.21.3
/f/ Data gathered from Census Tract Block Groups: 1132.32.2, 1132.33.2, 1132.34.1, 1134.21.1, 1134.21.2 and 1134.22.5

**SOURCE:** TAHA 2007 and 2000 U.S. Census
Alternative 3. Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes

Land acquisition and the termination and reconfiguration of Metro leases associated with the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative would occur prior to construction. A limited number of temporary construction easements within Canoga Avenue would most likely be required for construction staging, including equipment and materials storage, construction offices, employee parking, and other related construction uses. Implementation of mitigation measures included in Section 4.7 Traffic, Circulation and Parking would reduce temporary traffic construction impacts on the local population to a less-than-significant level. In addition, Section 4.8 Air Quality and Section 4.9 Noise and Vibration also include mitigation measures to reduce temporary, periodic noise, vibration, and air quality construction impacts that may affect the local population. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce construction impacts on the local population to a less-than-significant level for land use and development. Significant localized air quality and noise construction impacts are anticipated.

Alternative 4. Canoga Busway Lanes

Land acquisition and the termination and reconfiguration of Metro leases associated with the Canoga Busway Alternative would occur prior to construction. A limited number of temporary construction easements within Canoga Avenue would most likely be required for construction staging, including equipment and materials storage, construction offices, employee parking, and other related construction uses. Implementation of mitigation measures included in Section 4.7 Traffic, Circulation and Parking would reduce temporary traffic construction impacts on the local population to a less-than-significant level. In addition, Section 4.8 Air Quality and Section 4.9 Noise and Vibration also include mitigation measures to reduce temporary, periodic noise, vibration, and air quality construction impacts that may affect the local population. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce construction impacts on the local population to a less-than-significant level for land use and development. Significant localized air quality and noise construction impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measures MM 4.7-15 through MM 4.7-27 included in Section 4.7 Traffic, Circulation and Parking, Mitigation Measures MM 4.8-1 through MM 4.8-11 in Section 4.8 Air Quality, and Mitigation Measures MM 4.9-1 through MM 4.9-7 in Section 4.9 Noise and Vibration would be applicable to the Canoga On-Street Dedicated Lanes Alternative and the Canoga Busway Alternative.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: Significant unavoidable impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.7-15 through MM 4.7-27 in Section 4.7 Traffic, Circulation and Parking, MM 4.8-1 through MM 4.8-11 in Section 4.8 Air Quality, and MM 4.9-1 through MM 4.9-7 included in Section 4.9 Noise and Vibration would reduce construction impacts to the local population. However, construction impacts are anticipated to be significant and unavoidable for localized air quality and noise.
Impact 4.3.7. The proposed project would not result in a potentially significant cumulatively considerable impact to population, housing employment or environmental justice without mitigation.

SCAG anticipates that urbanization in the region will increase substantially by 2030. Regional transportation improvements identified within the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), including the proposed project, are anticipated to result in cumulative effects by facilitating population growth in certain areas of the region that are currently vacant lands. The proposed project would not contribute to this cumulative effect due to the fact that the resulting project would occur in an already urbanized area. However, the Canoga Corridor is designated as a growth area in the SCAG Compass Plan (see Subsection 4.1 Land Use & Development) because of the proposed Metro Orange Line extension. Thus, it is anticipated that the project could result in densification of the project area. However, in order to do this, the City may have to change existing zoning designations to encourage increased density around transit stations.

SCAG also states that projects within the RTP would require the acquisition of rights-of-way that would displace a substantial number of existing homes and businesses. As detailed in Section 4.2 Land Acquisition and Displacement, the proposed project would contribute to a cumulative displacement effect, although all acquisitions would be mitigated through applicable relocation assistance programs. The project is not anticipated to result in any disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income businesses and would not cause any environmental justice impacts; therefore, it would not contribute to cumulative environmental justice impacts.

Projects included in the RTP are intended to increase the overall accessibility and mobility of persons within the SCAG region. These improvements could result in an increase in population to the area, making the area more desirable. However, this increase would be expected to be within the growth projected by SCAG in association with the RTP. No cumulative population growth would be expected beyond that projected by SCAG as a result of RTP projects including the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures:

The proposed project would not result in a potentially significant cumulatively considerable impact to population, housing employment or environmental justice, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: Less than significant.