

TABLE OF CONTENTS
SECTION 4.19 - SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Page

LIST OF SECTIONS

4.19.1	Introduction	4.19-1
4.19.2	Methodology	4.19-3
4.19.3	Regulatory Setting.....	4.19-4
4.19.4	Existing Conditions.....	4.19-5
4.19.5	Impact Significance Criteria.....	4.19-12
4.19.6	Impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternatives.....	4.19-12
4.19.7	Mitigation Measures.....	4.19-33
4.19.8	Summary of Significance Findings	4.19-35
4.19.9	Significant Unavoidable Impacts	4.19-35

LIST OF TABLES

4.19-1	Impacts to Population, Housing, and Employment Caused by Implementation of the Specific Plan and WRP.....	4.19-2
4.19-2	Population Growth (1990-2005).....	4.19-5
4.19-3	Population Projections for the Santa Clarita Valley	4.19-6
4.19-4	Santa Clarita Valley Racial/Ethnic Mix (1990 to 2005).....	4.19-6
4.19-5	Growth In Housing Units (1990 to 2005).....	4.19-7
4.19-6	Median Housing Prices 2006.....	4.19-8
4.19-7	Average Household Size.....	4.19-9
4.19-8	Employment Growth (1992 to 2005).....	4.19-10
4.19-9	Employment Projections, Santa Clarita Valley (2000 to 2030).....	4.19-11
4.19-10	Alternative 2 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts.....	4.19-16
4.19-11	Alternative 3 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts.....	4.19-19
4.19-12	Alternative 4 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts.....	4.19-23
4.19-13	Alternative 5 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts.....	4.19-26
4.19-14	Alternative 6 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts.....	4.19-30
4.19-15	Alternative 7 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts.....	4.19-33
4.19-16	Summary of Significant Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice Impacts Pre- and Post- Mitigation.....	4.19-35

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the socioeconomic conditions within the Santa Clarita Valley, and evaluates potential impacts to those conditions that could result from implementation of the proposed Project (Alternative 2), a "No Action/No Project" alternative (Alternative 1), and the five "build" alternatives (Alternatives 3-7). This section includes a discussion of whether the proposed Project and alternatives would disproportionately affect low-income or minority populations, or displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

4.19.1.1 Relationship of Proposed Project to Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR

The previously certified Newhall Ranch environmental documentation provides important information related to the RMDP and SCP components of the proposed Project. Implementation of these Project components would require federal and state permitting, consultation, and agreements that are needed to facilitate development of the approved land uses within the Specific Plan site. Further, if approved, the proposed Project would establish comprehensive spineflower preserves within the Specific Plan area, also facilitating development of the approved Specific Plan. Due to this relationship, the Newhall Ranch environmental documentation, findings, and mitigation, as they relate to socioeconomic, housing, and environmental justice characteristics, are summarized below to provide context for the proposed Project.

Section 4.21 of the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR (March 1999) identified and analyzed the existing conditions, potential impacts, and mitigation measures related to population, housing, and employment for the entire Specific Plan area. In addition, Section 5.0 of the Revised Draft EIR (March 1999) identified and analyzed the potential population, housing, and employment impacts and mitigation measures associated with construction and operation of the approved WRP, which would treat the wastewater generated by the Specific Plan. The Newhall Ranch mitigation program was adopted by Los Angeles County in findings and in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and WRP.

The Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR (March 1999) found that the population, housing, and employment in the Santa Clarita Valley has grown since the 1970s, transitioning from a bedroom community with limited retail services and employment to a more self-contained community with a range of housing types and diversity of goods, services, and industries. The increase in housing and employment resulting from the Specific Plan was considered inconsistent with the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan's population and housing projections, but consistent with the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) population, housing, and employment forecasts for the Santa Clarita Valley. By amending the County growth forecast to include the Specific Plan within growth projections, the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR (March 1999) concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would not have a significant impact on either regional or local population, housing, or employment.

Although the impacts to population, housing, and employment were not considered significant, the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR (March 1999) recommended the implementation of Mitigation Measure SP-4.21-1, which called for general and local plan amendments to accommodate the Specific

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Plan.¹ **Table 4.19-1** summarizes the Specific Plan's and the WRP's impacts on population, housing, and employment; the applicable mitigation measures; and the significance findings after the mitigation is implemented.

Table 4.19-1
Impacts to Population, Housing, and Employment
Caused by Implementation of the Specific Plan and WRP

Impact Description	Mitigation Measures	Finding After Mitigation
<p>Specific Plan Impacts to Population, Housing, and Employment - As revised by the Board of Supervisors, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would add up to 20,885 dwelling units (plus as many as 423 second units), 68,524 residents, and 19,323 jobs to the Santa Clarita Valley. The Specific Plan is inconsistent with the 1990 Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan population and housing projections, but is consistent with SCAG's 1994 population, housing, and employment forecasts for the Valley. Since the Specific Plan is consistent with SCAG forecasts, by amending the County growth forecasts to include the Specific Plan within growth projections, the Specific Plan would not have a significant impact on either regional or local population, housing, or employment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation Measure SP-4.21-1 (calling for Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan to be amended by Los Angeles County to accommodate the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan). 	<p>Population and housing: less than significant. Employment: beneficial.</p>
<p>Specific Plan Cumulative Population, Housing, and Employment Impacts - Cumulative population would be consistent with SCAG population projections, but would exceed Los Angeles County projections. Cumulative employment in the Valley would exceed both SCAG and County projections; however, because the Santa Clarita Valley is considered housing rich and job poor, having more employment opportunities than what is projected is considered beneficial.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional mitigation recommended. 	<p>Population and housing: less than significant. Employment: beneficial.</p>
<p>WRP Impacts to Population, Housing, and Employment - Approximately 50 people could be employed at the WRP at any given time during construction. When fully operational, the plant would generate an estimated 18 jobs, which would be a beneficial impact. Because plant employees are expected to reside in the Santa Clarita Valley, it would not have an impact on housing or residential population.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mitigation recommended. 	<p>Population and housing: less than significant. Employment: beneficial.</p>

Source: Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR (March 1999); Newhall Ranch Revised Additional Analysis (May 2003).

¹ References to mitigation measures included in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR is preceded by "SP" in this EIS/EIR to distinguish them from other mitigation measures discussed herein.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.1.2 Relationship of Proposed Project to VCC and Entrada Planning Areas

4.19.1.2.1 VCC Planning Area

The SCP component of the proposed Project, if approved, would facilitate development in the VCC planning area. The VCC is reliant on the SCP and associated take authorizations, and would not be developed without the take authorizations due to grading constraints. The VCC planning area is the remaining developed portion of the VCC commercial/ industrial complex currently under development by the applicant. The VCC was the subject of an EIR certified by Los Angeles County in April 1990 (SCH No. 1987123005). The applicant recently has submitted to Los Angeles County the last tentative parcel map (TPM No. 18108) needed to complete build-out of the remaining undeveloped portion of the VCC planning area. The County will require preparation of an EIR in conjunction with the parcel map and related project approvals; however, the County has not yet issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the EIR or released the EIR. The previously certified VCC EIR (April 1990) did not include an analysis of socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts.

4.19.1.2.2 Entrada Planning Area

The applicant is seeking approval from Los Angeles County for planned residential and nonresidential development within the Entrada planning area. The SCP component of the proposed Project would designate an area within Entrada as a spineflower preserve. If approved, the SCP component would include take authorization of spineflower populations in Entrada that are located outside of the designated spineflower preserve area. Thus, the planned residential and nonresidential development within portions of the Entrada planning area is reliant on the SCP and associated take authorizations, and those portions would not be developed without the take authorizations. The applicant has submitted to Los Angeles County Entrada development applications, which cover the portion of the Entrada planning area facilitated by the SCP component of the proposed Project. However, as of this writing, the County has not yet issued a NOP of an EIR or released an EIR for Entrada. As a result, there is no underlying local environmental documentation for the Entrada planning area at this time.

4.19.2 METHODOLOGY

Existing data sources were reviewed to describe existing conditions in the Project region related to population, race and ethnicity, housing, and employment. Data from the 2000 U.S. Census and other sources were also used to determine if any geographic areas within the Project region meet the definition of a "minority or low-income population."

Development characteristics of the proposed Project and each alternative were evaluated to determine if adverse impacts to the housing supply potentially would occur, or if a Project alternative potentially would result in social or economic impacts to identified minority or low-income populations in the Project region. Potential housing and socioeconomic effects of the Project that were identified were compared to significance criteria to determine if the Project-related impacts would be significant.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.3 REGULATORY SETTING

This subsection describes the regulatory requirements applicable to this analysis and provides a summary of existing socioeconomic data for the Project region.

4.19.3.1 Federal

National Environmental Quality Act of 1969. NEPA and associated CEQ guidelines require that federal agencies consider the effects of their regulations, policies, and programs on the environment; and avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental impacts to the extent practicable. (42 U.S.C. § 4321; 40 C.F.R. § 1500.2.) This includes the need to review social and economic impacts. (40 C.F.R. §§1508.8 and 1508.14.) For the proposed Project, the Corps is responsible for administering this requirement.

Executive Order 12898. On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. The Order focuses federal attention on the relationship between the environment and human health conditions of minority communities and calls on agencies to make achieving environmental justice part of their mission. The Order requires the USEPA and all federal and state agencies receiving federal funds to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. It also requires the agencies to develop strategies to address this problem.

4.19.3.2 State

The State CEQA Guidelines section 15131 states that economic and social effects of a project are not significant environmental effects; however, they may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by a project. Further explained, a project may result in a physical environmental change, but the economic or social effects of the project on the community may be used to determine whether the physical changes would be significant. For this Project, CDFG is responsible for administering this requirement.

4.19.3.3 Local

The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan provides the regulatory framework for the development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area. With the adoption of Los Angeles County General Plan Amendment No. 94-087-(5) by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on May 27, 2003, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan and Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.4 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The proposed Project is within the Santa Clarita Valley,² which is comprised of the city of Santa Clarita and unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County. The city of Santa Clarita is located in the central portion of the Santa Clarita Valley and is mostly developed. The County's unincorporated area surrounds the city and includes a number of small communities and rural areas.

As discussed above, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area previously was evaluated with respect to population, housing, and employment in the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR (March 1999). The socioeconomic information provided in that EIR has been updated using existing information sources and is presented below. The most recent U.S. Census data (2000) has been updated with other information sources. Additional information also has been added, including an analysis of the potential impact of the construction workforce on population and housing in the Project vicinity, and environmental justice issues.

4.19.4.1 Population

The Santa Clarita Valley has experienced a significant population influx over the past several decades. This population growth has been attributed to factors such as the expansion of the regional freeway system, which has provided greater access to Los Angeles metropolitan employment centers, and new development opportunities for relatively affordable housing and industrial land. As shown in **Table 4.19-2**, from 1990 to 2005, the population in the Santa Clarita Valley increased by 55.7 percent, while population throughout the entire County increased by 16.6 percent. These growth rates equate to an average annual growth rate of 3.4 percent in the Santa Clarita Valley and 0.7 percent countywide, demonstrating that average annual population growth in the Santa Clarita Valley has been approximately five times greater than countywide growth.

Table 4.19-2
Population Growth (1990-2005)

Location	1990	2005	Fifteen Year Growth Rate	Annual Growth Rate
Santa Clarita Valley	152,798	237,844	55.7%	3.7%
Los Angeles County	8,863,164	10,331,939	16.6%	1.1%

Source: EIP Associates (2004) and California Department of Finance (2007).

The population of the Santa Clarita Valley is concentrated in the center of the Valley, specifically within the boundaries of the city of Santa Clarita. Based on 2000 U.S. Census data, 151,088, or 71 percent of Santa Clarita Valley residents, live within the boundaries of the city of Santa Clarita. However, since the

² The Santa Clarita Valley has been defined as the ten following U.S. Postal Service zip codes: 93510, 91351, 91387, 91384, 91321, 91350, 91390, 91381, 91354, and 91355, as of July 2007. The Santa Clarita Valley consists of approximately 400,000 acres of north Los Angeles County, including the following jurisdictions and communities: City of Santa Clarita, Acton, Canyon Country, Castaic, Newhall, Stevenson Ranch, and Valencia.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

latter part of the 1980s, the unincorporated areas, such as the North River area of Valencia and Castaic, located to the north of the Project area, have experienced greater growth and development. Urban expansion also occurred west of I-5 in the Stevenson Ranch community and in the VCC planning area.

By the year 2030, the population of the Santa Clarita Valley is projected to increase to nearly one-half million, with an increase of 229,093 individuals from 2000 to 2030. (EIP Associates, 2004.) As depicted in **Table 4.19-3**, projections suggest that the population in the Santa Clarita Valley will grow at an average annual rate of about 2.5 percent over 30 years.

**Table 4.19-3
Population Projections for the Santa Clarita Valley**

	2000	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	Average Annual Growth
Population	212,611	273,092	313,577	363,220	403,103	441,704	2.5%

Source: EIP Associates (2004).

4.19.4.2 Race and Ethnicity

The Santa Clarita Valley has become home to an increasingly ethnically diverse community. All racial/ethnic categories, except Whites (non-Hispanic) and Other Races, increased their representation of the total population from 1990 to 2005. The Hispanic population comprised about 13.8 percent of the population in 1990, and increased to about 17.3 percent of the population in 2005. In contrast, the White (non-Hispanic) population decreased from 72.8 percent of the population in 1990, to 65.4 percent of the population in 2005. The Black population increased 221.0 percent from 1990 to 2005, but comprised only a small percentage of the total population, 2.7 percent, in 2005. In 2000, the U.S. Census also added a new racial/ethnic category: Two or More Races, which accounted for about 3.9 percent of the Santa Clarita Valley's residents. This new category makes it difficult to directly compare 2000 U.S. Census data by race to earlier censuses (see **Table 4.19-4**).

**Table 4.19-4
Santa Clarita Valley Racial/Ethnic Mix (1990 to 2005)**

Racial/Ethnic Mix	1990	% 1990	2000	% 2000	2005	% 2005
White (non-Hispanic)	111,243	72.80%	130,686	61.50%	155,543	65.40%
Hispanic	21,125	13.80%	40,159	18.90%	41,150	17.30%
Black	2,923	1.90%	6,914	3.30%	6,470	2.72%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6,712	4.40%	12,108	5.70%	10,921	4.59%
Other ¹	10,795	7.10%	14,552	6.80%	16,090	6.76%
Two or more races ²	N/A	N/A	8,192	3.90%	7,670	3.22%
Total	152,798	100%	212,611	100%	237,844	100%

Notes:

¹ "Other" includes Native American and Alaska Native, and some other races as classified by the U.S. Census Bureau.

² Two or More Races is a new classification utilized in the 2000 U.S. Census.

Source: EIP Associates, 2004; American Community Survey, 2005.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.4.3 Housing

There are no occupied residences located on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Similarly, there are no occupied residences located on the portions of the VCC or Entrada planning areas that are included in the proposed Project.

Housing stock in the Santa Clarita Valley increased substantially between 1990 and 2005. As shown in **Table 4.19-5**, the Valley experienced an approximate 26.8 percent increase in new housing units from 1990 to 2005. In comparison, the County increased its housing units by only 5.3 percent. The strong demand for housing also was reflected in the number of vacant units, resulting in a decrease in estimated vacancy rates in both the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County. The vacancy rate in the Santa Clarita Valley decreased from 7.5 percent to 4.17 percent from 1990 to 2005, while it decreased from 5.5 percent to 4.4 percent in Los Angeles County. (US Census, American Community Survey 2005.)

Table 4.19-5
Growth In Housing Units (1990 to 2005)

Location	1990	2000	2005	New Units	Fifteen Year Change
Santa Clarita Valley	56,310	71,836	76,972	20,662	26.8%
Los Angeles County	3,163,343	3,270,909	3,339,763	176,420	5.3%

Source: EIP Associates 2004; US Census American Community Survey, 2005.

Housing Stock Characteristics. Originally developed as a residential suburb of the Los Angeles and San Fernando Valley employment centers, the Santa Clarita Valley experienced substantial residential growth beginning in the late 1950s and continuing into the current century. The Valley remained primarily a residential community until the beginning of the 1980s, when increased industrial development demand was experienced. The increase in the number and diversity of jobs in the Santa Clarita Valley, especially in Valencia, has resulted in a broad range of housing types and prices that are affordable to a wide range of people. Data on current residential market conditions indicates that the single-family median home price in the Santa Clarita Valley was approximately \$705,000 in February 2006 (Data Quick News Real Estate News and Data, 2007), which is 23.3 percent higher than the single-family median price in Los Angeles County (\$541,000) and 10.5 percent higher than Ventura County (\$638,000), for the same period. In contrast, the average sale price of a single family home in the city of Santa Clarita was \$628,000, approximately 10.9 percent lower the Santa Clarita Valley median. For condominiums, that pattern was reversed with the median condominium price in Los Angeles County being about 5.1 percent higher than in the city of Santa Clarita. (Southland Regional Association of Realtors and Dataquick, 2007; see **Table 4.19-6**.)

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

**Table 4.19-6
Median Housing Prices 2006**

Location	Single-Family Home Median Price	Condominium Median Price
City of Santa Clarita	\$ 628,000	\$ 391,000
Santa Clarita Valley	\$ 705,000	\$ 454,000
Los Angeles County	\$ 541,000	\$ 412,000
Ventura County	\$ 638,000	\$ 432,000

Source: Southland Regional Association of Realtors and Dataquick Real Estate News, 2007.

As of 2002, there were a total of 17,846 apartment units in the Santa Clarita Valley. A survey of rental rates in August 2002 indicates that the average rent in the Valley was approximately \$1,227, with rents ranging from \$835 to \$1,693 per month. (EIP Associates, 2004.)

There has been a significant change in the character of development in the Santa Clarita Valley over the past two to three decades. Development in the Valley was once characterized as a collection of small rural communities interspersed with small farms. In the 1950s, Newhall Land began development of Valencia as a master planned community. The Valley entered a maturation phase in the late 1980s and 1990s with development and planning for both commercial and employment centers. The Valley's emergence as an employment center, and the increasing costs of housing in the San Fernando Valley and other areas closer to downtown Los Angeles, created a demand for housing in the Santa Clarita Valley. As a result, thousands of townhomes and apartments were constructed in the 1980s and 1990s. In 1980, there were 26,423 housing units in the Santa Clarita Valley, according to the U.S. Census. By 1990, that number rose to approximately 53,000 units, representing a doubling of housing units between 1980 and 1990. (City of Santa Clarita, 2004.)

According to the Housing Element for the Los Angeles County General Plan, between 1990 and 2000, the number of available housing units increased by 108,859 units countywide, representing a 3.4 percent increase. In the same time period, the number of households (occupied housing units) also increased by 3.4 percent, while population increased at a more rapid rate of 12 percent. These trends indicate formation of larger-sized households, due perhaps to the constraint in the number of available affordable housing units. (County of Los Angeles, 2001.) Between 2000 and 2005, Los Angeles County housing stock has slowed to a growth rate of 2.1 percent, for a total of 68,854 new units. (Data Quick News Real Estate News and Data, 2007.)

As of January 1, 2000, 55 percent of all housing units in Los Angeles County were single-family homes. Nearly half (43 percent) of the housing stock was composed of multi-family units and the remaining two percent of the housing stock was composed of mobile homes. Since 1990, nearly 70 percent of residential building permits issued have been for single-family housing units. Only about 15 percent of the units approved by the County have been for apartment buildings with five or more units, which are usually more affordable for low- to moderate-income households. (County of Los Angeles, 2001.)

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The overall condition of the housing stock in the Santa Clarita Valley is very good. The majority of units in the Santa Clarita Valley are less than 45-years old. Statistics from the 1990 U.S. Census identified three areas, two in Newhall and one in Val Verde, where substandard housing units are concentrated. According to the city of Santa Clarita (2004), the most common reasons for declaring a property substandard are overgrown weeds, trash in the yards, and abandoned vehicles. Subsequent windshield surveys completed in April 2000 confirmed that the substandard units in the Valley were concentrated in these areas and in two other locations in the Canyon Country area, near South Whites Canyon and Sierra Estates. (City of Santa Clarita, 2004.)

Household Size. The number of households in the Santa Clarita Valley increased rapidly (26.8 percent) from 1990 to 2005. This is approximately five times the growth rate experienced in Los Angeles County (5.3 percent). Households in the Santa Clarita Valley grew at an average annual rate of 1.8 percent, compared to 3.7 percent annual growth for population, resulting in increasing average household sizes. As of 2005, the average household size in both the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County was 3.09, versus a California state average of 2.92 (see **Table 4.19-7**).

Location	1990	2000	2005
Val Verde	3.65	3.31	NA
Santa Clarita Valley	2.93	3.09	3.09
Los Angeles County	2.96	3.04	3.09
California	2.87	2.87	2.92

Source: EIP Associates, 2004; U.S. Census 1990, 2000; American Community Survey 2005.

The community of Val Verde is located adjacent to the northern Project boundary in Chiquito Canyon. The 2000 U.S. Census recognizes the community of Val Verde as a Census Designated Place, which is a statistical entity defined for each decennial census and comprises a densely-settled concentration of population that is not within an incorporated place, but is identified locally by a name. The U.S. Census indicates that the population in Val Verde was 1,689 in 1990, and declined to 1,472 in the year 2000. In both 1990 and 2000, Whites (non-Hispanic) were the predominant race, but accounted for 51.5 and 56 percent of the population accordingly. The average household size in Val Verde was 3.65 in 1990, and has since decreased to 3.31 in 2000. In respect to both race and household characteristics, the community of Val Verde is similar to the population of the Santa Clarita Valley. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the racial composition of the Val Verde Census Designated Place is 56 percent White (non-Hispanic), 4.3 percent African American, 0.7 percent Native American, 1.6 percent Asian, 0.20 percent Pacific Islander, 33.2 percent from Other Races, and 4.0 percent from Two or More Races.

4.19.4.4 Employment

The Santa Clarita Valley has experienced significant employment growth in recent years, which is expected to continue as both residential and business development continues to increase. The availability

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

of large amounts of land combined with the proximity to employment centers and economic cycles are major factors affecting the pace and nature of economic growth. Employment opportunities are diverse and include professional, wholesale/retail trade, services, construction, and mining.

The California Employment Development Department has provided baseline employment data, for the years 1992 to 2000, for zip codes within the Santa Clarita Valley. These figures were adjusted to correspond to SCAG employment estimates from 2000. Between 1992 and 2005, a net total of 32,959 new jobs were added to the Santa Clarita Valley. This represents a growth rate of 55.1 percent between 1992 and 2005, and an average annual growth rate of 4.28 percent. While jobs increased dramatically in the Santa Clarita Valley as a result of substantial new development, job growth in the County as a whole only increased by 11.2 percent over the same time period. In fact, job growth in the Santa Clarita Valley accounted for 3.9 percent of the total net job growth in Los Angeles County, while its residents comprised only 2.3 percent of the Los Angeles County population base. **Table 4.19-8** illustrates this employment growth. (EIP Associates, 2004.)

**Table 4.19-8
Employment Growth (1992 to 2005)**

Location	Jobs 1992	Jobs 2000	Jobs 2005	Percent Increase	Average Annual Rate
Santa Clarita Valley (CEDD)	40,491	60,511	73,450	21.38%	4.28%
Los Angeles County	4,131,484	4,480,801	4,983,367	11.22%	2.24%
% Santa Clarita Valley of Los Angeles County	0.98%	1.35%	1.47%	N/A	N/A

Note:

Self-employment has been factored into the total employment estimated by California Employment Development Department for the city of Santa Clarita and Los Angeles County. Based on factors provided by SCAG, employment shown is higher than that estimated by California Employment Development Department.

Source: EIP Associates (February 2004, US Census American Community Survey 2005.)

The major employment center in the Santa Clarita Valley is within the city of Santa Clarita. There are an estimated 59,640 employees that work in the city of Santa Clarita, which represents nearly 81.1 percent of the total employment in the Santa Clarita Valley.

The remaining employment, in the unincorporated areas of the Santa Clarita Valley, consists of 13,900 jobs. The majority of these jobs are located in the area west of I-5, which includes the Stevenson Ranch area, VCC, and the Six Flags Magic Mountain Amusement Park; as well as industrial employment and 1,300 federal employment positions at the U.S. Post Office Distribution Center. The Castaic Lake area is another small employment hub, with several motels, service stations, and truck stops/restaurants that cater to the trucking industry and traveler activities.

Although the Santa Clarita Valley had a significantly higher job growth rate than Los Angeles County, the average pay per worker in the Santa Clarita Valley was approximately 74 percent of the Los Angeles County average. The average salary per worker in the Santa Clarita Valley decreased slightly in constant

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

2000 dollars, from \$29,697 in 1992, to \$29,201 in 2000. The average salary per worker in Los Angeles County increased in constant 2000 dollars only slightly, from \$39,023 in 1992, to \$39,671 in 2000. (EIP Associates, 2004.)

Table 4.19-9 presents employment projections, through 2030, for the Santa Clarita Valley. The projections for the City of Santa Clarita are based on SCAG 2002 projections, which are still in the review process with local jurisdictions. Projections for the unincorporated area of the Santa Clarita Valley are provided by Los Angeles County. (EIP Associates, 2004.)

	2000	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	Numerical Change	Average Annual Growth
Employment	60,511	76,345	85,990	95,473	105,536	114,312	53,800	2.1%

Source: EIP Associates (2004)

Unemployment and median family income data was not readily available for the Santa Clarita Valley. However, since approximately 71 percent of Santa Clarita Valley's residents reside within the city of Santa Clarita, unemployment and median family income data from the city of Santa Clarita will be utilized as a representative sample. The city of Santa Clarita has experienced low unemployment rates in recent years. The city of Santa Clarita's estimated unemployment rate of 2.7 percent, in May 2007, is below that of the Los Angeles County rate of 4.4 percent. Additionally, the city of Santa Clarita's unemployment rate of 2.7 percent is substantially lower than the rates of several nearby jurisdictions, including the cities of Lancaster (6.4 percent), Palmdale (5.6 percent), Simi Valley (3.5 percent), and Thousand Oaks (3.3 percent); and the counties of Los Angeles (4.4 percent) and Ventura (4.3 percent). (California Employment Development Department, 2007.)

Based upon U.S. Census data, the 2000 median household income in the city of Santa Clarita, Val Verde, and Los Angeles County was \$66,717, \$53,843, and \$42,189, respectively. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services provides annual poverty guidelines. For 2000, the Department of Health and Human Services defined the poverty threshold for a family unit of four as an annual income of \$17,050 or less. Per U.S. Census data, in 2000, the percentages of families living in poverty within the city of Santa Clarita, Val Verde, and Los Angeles County, were 4.7 percent (1,782 families), 3.6 percent (13 families), and 14.4 percent (311,226 families), respectively. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005 American Community Survey.) Therefore, the vast majority of households residing within the city of Santa Clarita, Val Verde, and Los Angeles County are living above the poverty line. Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, there are no minority or low-income populations, which are defined as 50 percent or more minority or low-income residents, located in the Project region.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.5 IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

NEPA requires analysis of social and economic impacts (*i.e.*, socioeconomic impacts). (40 C.F.R. § 1508.8(b); and 40 C.F.R. § 1508.14.) Since there are no standard significance criteria for socioeconomic impacts under NEPA, such criteria must be developed based on the circumstances of a proposed project. The Presidential Memorandum accompanying Executive Order 12898 directs federal agencies to include measures to mitigate disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects of proposed federal actions on minority and low-income populations. Federal agencies also are required to give affected communities opportunities to provide input into the environmental review process, including identification of mitigation measures.

The State CEQA Guidelines section 15131 indicates that CEQA does not require socioeconomic analysis except in cases when a project induces economic or social changes that result in physical changes to the environment (*e.g.*, urban blight). In addition, Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines provides criteria related to potential population and housing impacts.

For the purposes of this EIS/EIR, the proposed Project and alternatives would result in significant socioeconomic/environmental justice impacts if they would:

1. Result in disproportionate, adverse environmental effects on a minority or low-income population;
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

4.19.6 IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

4.19.6.1 Impacts of Alternative 1 (No Action/No Project)

Under Alternative 1, no action would be taken and the proposed Project would not be developed. Therefore, under this alternative, there would be no construction of bridges, bank stabilization, grade control structures, detention basins, storm drains, the outfall for the WRP, utility crossings, haul routes, or maintenance activities. Consequently, Alternative 1 would result in the continuation of existing conditions on the Project site, and would not result in any direct socioeconomic, housing, or environmental justice impacts.

Alternative 1 would result in the continuation of existing environmental conditions on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and would preclude the development of an approved, large-scale housing, commercial, and mixed-use planned community. This alternative would not result in significant adverse indirect housing, socioeconomic, or environmental justice impacts based on the requirements of Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3; however, the beneficial effects of providing the additional housing and employment opportunities associated with the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would not occur. As a result, the growing demand for housing in the Santa Clarita Valley would not be addressed, employment opportunities would

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

not be provided, and less potential for increased property and sales tax revenue would result. In addition, adoption of this alternative likely would necessitate residential development on other sites in the region to accommodate the housing demand that would not be met on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site.

Under Alternative 1, the SCP would not be adopted and development within the VCC planning area or on portions of the Entrada planning area would not be facilitated. This alternative would not result in significant adverse indirect housing, socioeconomic, or environmental justice impacts based on the requirements of Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3. However, beneficial effects of providing previously planned and approved housing, employment opportunities, and property and sales tax revenue would not occur. In addition, adoption of this alternative likely would necessitate residential and commercial development on other sites in the region to accommodate the development demand that would not be met by the VCC and Entrada planning areas.

Based on the requirements of Significance Criteria 1, 2, and 3, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse secondary housing, socioeconomic, or environmental justice impacts in areas located beyond the Project boundaries. However, this alternative would have the potential to result in increased development in other locations in the Project region.

4.19.6.2 Impacts of Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

4.19.6.2.1 Direct Impacts

RMDP Direct Impacts. There are no existing residences located on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Implementation of the RMDP and the installation of proposed infrastructure improvements would not result in the removal of any housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, the RMDP would not result in significant direct housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations (defined as 50 percent or more minority or low-income residents). Therefore, implementation of the RMDP and the construction of proposed infrastructure improvements would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

SCP Direct Impacts. The proposed SCP is a conservation program, and would not result in the development of any urban land uses or result in the removal of any existing housing. Therefore, the proposed spineflower preserves would not result in direct housing impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3. Creation of the spineflower preserves would reduce incrementally future property tax earnings and development in the areas designated as preserves. This incremental reduction in the tax revenue and potential development area would not result in significant impacts related to housing, social, or economic conditions under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

4.19.6.2.2 Indirect Impacts

RMDP Indirect Impacts. Implementation of the proposed RMDP indirectly would facilitate development of housing, commercial, and support uses on the Specific Plan site. As revised by the Board of Supervisors, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would result in the development of 20,885 residential

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

units (plus a maximum of 423 second units), and 5,550,000 square feet of nonresidential uses. Build-out of the previously approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would not result in the displacement of any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based upon data extrapolations from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, the implementation of the Specific Plan would create approximately 18,795 new jobs and would provide housing for approximately 57,903 residents. The construction of these residential units would contribute to the housing stock in the rapidly growing Santa Clarita Valley and would contribute increased property and sales tax revenues to Los Angeles County. In addition, the increase in employment opportunities in the Santa Clarita Valley potentially could enable existing and future residents to live and work in the Santa Clarita Valley, and potentially increase expenditures in the area.

The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan also includes an affordable housing program that would provide very low-, low-, and moderate-income affordable housing opportunities in several housing categories, including for sale and rental units. A total of 2,200 affordable housing units are proposed, of which 440 units would be very low-income affordable housing units; 330 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 65 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; 220 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 80 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; and 1,210 would be moderate-income affordable units. The construction of these units would contribute to the affordable housing stock in Los Angeles County.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations (as defined). By providing affordable housing and fostering economic development in a rural portion of the Santa Clarita Valley, development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would beneficially affect the socioeconomics of the Santa Clarita Valley. Therefore, the RMDP would not result in significant indirect socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts under Significance Criteria 1.

SCP Indirect Impacts. Implementation of the proposed SCP would facilitate Specific Plan build-out. Development on the Specific Plan site would be the same as described above for direct impacts of the SCP.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would facilitate the completion of the VCC, resulting in the development of an additional 3,500,000 square feet of nonresidential uses. Implementation of Alternative 2 also would facilitate development of a portion of the Entrada planning area, consisting of approximately 1,725 residential units and 450,000 square feet of nonresidential uses.

Build-out of the previously approved VCC and new development on portions of the Entrada planning area would not result in the displacement of any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3. Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations (as defined). Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts under Significance Criteria 1.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Facilitating development within the Specific Plan site, and the VCC and Entrada planning areas would create additional housing and employment opportunities. This construction would contribute to the housing stock in the rapidly growing Santa Clarita Valley and would contribute increased property and sales tax revenues to Los Angeles County. The increase in employment opportunities within the Santa Clarita Valley could enable existing and future residents to live and work in the Santa Clarita Valley, and increase expenditures in the area.

4.19.6.2.3 Secondary Impacts

RMDP Secondary Impacts. The RMDP component of the Project that would be implemented under Alternative 2 would result in the construction of various infrastructure improvements on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site, which would facilitate Specific Plan build-out. Implementation of the proposed RMDP and the associated build-out of the Specific Plan would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project region or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. Accordingly, the Project would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations exist in the vicinity of the Project area. Therefore, implementation of the RMDP and the construction of proposed infrastructure improvements would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

Development of the infrastructure facilities proposed by the RMDP, and the resulting development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not substantially affect the available supply of rental housing units in nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, the RMDP would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

SCP Secondary Impacts. The SCP component of the proposed Project would facilitate future development on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site, and the VCC and Entrada planning areas. Development of those sites would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project vicinity or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, the Project would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. Thus, the Project would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations exist in the vicinity of the Project areas. Therefore, implementation of the SCP and the facilitated development that may occur on the Specific Plan site, and VCC and Entrada planning areas would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The development of new structures on the Specific Plan site, and the VCC and Entrada planning areas, would be conducted by a construction labor force that predominately is located in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in the nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, the SCP would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

Table 4.19-10 summarizes the potential for significant socioeconomic and environmental justice impacts to occur as a result of the direct, indirect, and secondary impacts of Alternative 2.

Type of Impact	Potential for Significant Socioeconomic or Environmental Justice Impacts
Direct	None
Indirect	None
Secondary	None

4.19.6.3 Impacts of Alternative 3 (Elimination of Planned Potrero Bridge and Additional Spineflower Preserves)

Alternative 3 would eliminate some of the proposed RMDP infrastructure improvements proposed for the Specific Plan area when compared to the proposed Project, and would increase the size of proposed spineflower preserves from 167 to 221 acres. Subsequent development on the Specific Plan site and Entrada planning area would also be reduced, as Alternative 3 would facilitate the development of 21,558 residential dwelling units and approximately 9,400,000 square feet of nonresidential uses.

4.19.6.3.1 Direct Impacts

RMDP Direct Impacts. There are no existing residences located on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Implementation of the RMDP and the installation of infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 3 would not result in the removal of any housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not result in significant direct housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income population areas (as defined). Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, the construction of infrastructure improvements provided by Alternative 3 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

SCP Direct Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 3 would not result in the development of any urban land uses, or result in the removal of any existing housing. Therefore, the

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

preserves that would be established under Alternative 3 would not result in direct housing impacts under Significance Criteria 2 and 3. The preserves that would be created under Alternative 3 would be 54 acres larger than the preserves provided by the proposed Project, which would result in a reduction of the future property taxes and development area when compared to the proposed Project. This incremental reduction would not, however, result in significant effects to housing, social, or economic conditions under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

4.19.6.3.2 Indirect Impacts

RMDP Indirect Impacts. Development of the RMDP infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 3 would facilitate the development of 20,433 residential units and 5,480,000 square feet of nonresidential uses on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Alternative 3 would provide 452 fewer residential units and 70,000 fewer square feet of nonresidential uses when compared to the previously approved Specific Plan. However, the residential units and nonresidential uses that would be provided would not remove any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based upon data extrapolations from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, Alternative 3 would create approximately 16,228 new jobs and would provide housing for approximately 57,838 residents. Alternative 3 would result in approximately 2,567 fewer job opportunities than the approved Specific Plan. The construction of the residential units and commercial uses provided by Alternative 3 would contribute to the housing stock in the rapidly growing Santa Clarita Valley and would contribute additional property and sales tax revenues to Los Angeles County, although at a reduced scale when compared to the approved Specific Plan.

Alternative 3 would include an affordable housing program that would provide very low-, low-, and moderate-income affordable housing opportunities in several housing categories, including for sale and rental units. Based upon extrapolations from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, a total of 1,855 affordable housing units would be created, of which 371 units would be very low-income affordable housing units; 278 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 65 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; 186 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 80 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; and 1,180 would be moderate-income affordable units. Alternative 3 would provide approximately 345 fewer affordable residential units than the Specific Plan; however, the construction of affordable units under this alternative would still contribute to the affordable housing stock in the County.

SCP Indirect Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 3 would facilitate Specific Plan build-out. Development on the Specific Plan site would be the same as described above for direct impacts of the SCP.

Implementation of Alternative 3 would facilitate the completion of the VCC, resulting in the development of an additional 3,500,000 square feet of nonresidential uses. Implementation of Alternative 3 also would facilitate development of a portion of the Entrada planning area, consisting of approximately 1,125 residential units and 450,000 square feet of nonresidential uses.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Build-out of the Specific Plan site, VCC planning area, and portions of the Entrada planning area would not result in the removal of any existing housing or the displacement of any people. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3. Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project vicinity does not contain any minority or low-income populations (as defined). Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

Facilitating development within the Specific Plan site, and the VCC and Entrada planning areas, would create additional housing and employment opportunities. This construction would contribute to the existing housing stock and would contribute increased property and sales tax revenues to Los Angeles County. In addition, the increase in employment opportunities within the Santa Clarita Valley potentially could enable existing and future residents to live and work in the Santa Clarita Valley, and potentially increase expenditures in the area.

The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 3 would increase the size of the spineflower preserve area by 54 acres when compared to the SCP that would be implemented under the proposed Project. The increased preserve area would result in a reduction in future property taxes and development when compared to the proposed Project.

4.19.6.3.3 Secondary Impacts

RMDP Secondary Impacts. The RMDP component of the Project that would be implemented under Alternative 3 would result in the construction of various infrastructure improvements on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site, which would facilitate partial build-out of the approved Specific Plan. Implementation of the RMDP under Alternative 3 would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project region or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. The implementation of Alternative 3 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations (as defined), as no such populations exist in the Project area. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 3 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

Development of the infrastructure facilities included in Alternative 3 and the resulting partial development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

SCP Secondary Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 3 would facilitate future development on the Specific Plan site, and the VCC and Entrada planning areas. Development of those sites would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project vicinity or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. Alternative 3 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations (as defined) exist in the vicinity of the Project area. Therefore, implementation of the SCP and the facilitated development that may occur on the Specific Plan site and the VCC and Entrada planning areas would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

The development of new structures on the Specific Plan site and the VCC and Entrada planning areas would be conducted by a construction labor force that is predominately located in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units that are available in the nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, the SCP would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

Table 4.19-11 summarizes the potential for significant socioeconomic and environmental justice impacts to occur as a result of the direct, indirect, and secondary impacts of Alternative 3.

Type of Impact	Potential for Significant Socioeconomic or Environmental Justice Impacts
Direct	None
Indirect	None
Secondary	None

4.19.6.4 Impacts of Alternative 4 (Elimination of Planned Potrero Bridge and Addition of VCC Spineflower Preserve)

Alternative 4 would eliminate additional infrastructure improvements included in the proposed RMDP, and would increase the size of proposed spineflower preserves from 167 to 259 acres. Under this alternative, no additional development would be facilitated on the VCC planning area, and subsequent development on the Specific Plan site would be reduced. In total, Alternative 4 would facilitate the development of 21,846 residential dwelling units and approximately 5,930,000 square feet of nonresidential uses on the Specific Plan site and on a portion of the Entrada planning area.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.6.4.1 Direct Impacts

RMDP Direct Impacts. There are no existing residences located on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Implementation of the RMDP and the installation of infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 4 would not result in the removal of any housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed RMDP, Alternative 4 would not result in significant direct housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income population areas (as defined). Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, the construction of infrastructure improvements provided by Alternative 4 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

SCP Direct Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 4 would not result in the development of any urban land uses, or result in the removal of any existing housing. Therefore, the preserves that would be established under Alternative 4 would not result in direct housing impacts under Significance Criteria 2 and 3. The preserves that would be created under Alternative 4 would be 92 acres larger than the preserves provided by the proposed Project, which would result in an additional reduction in future property taxes and the development area when compared to the proposed Project. This incremental reduction would not, however, result in significant effects to housing, social, or economic conditions under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

4.19.6.4.2 Indirect Impacts

RMDP Indirect Impacts. Development of the RMDP infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 4 would facilitate the development of 20,721 residential units and 5,500,000 square feet of nonresidential uses on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Alternative 4 would provide 164 fewer residential units and 50,000 fewer square feet of nonresidential uses when compared to the Specific Plan. However, the residential units and nonresidential uses that would be provided would not remove any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based upon data extrapolations from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, Alternative 4 would create approximately 16,533 new jobs and would provide housing for approximately 58,925 residents. Alternative 4 would result in approximately 2,262 fewer job opportunities than the approved Specific Plan. The construction of the residential units and commercial uses provided by Alternative 4 would contribute to the housing stock in the rapidly growing Santa Clarita Valley and would contribute additional property and sales tax revenues to Los Angeles County, although at a reduced scale when compared to the approved Specific Plan.

Alternative 4 includes an affordable housing program that would provide for the direct inclusion of very low-, low-, and moderate-income affordable housing opportunities in several housing categories; including for sale and rental units. Based upon extrapolations from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, a total of 1,889 affordable housing units are proposed, of which 378 units would be very low-income affordable housing units; 283 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 65

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

percent of the Los Angeles County median income; 189 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 80 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; and 1,039 would be moderate-income affordable units. Alternative 4 would provide approximately 311 fewer affordable residential units than the Specific Plan; however, the construction of affordable units under this alternative would still contribute to the affordable housing stock in the County.

SCP Indirect Impacts. Implementation of the SCP under Alternative 4 would facilitate the development of the previously approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Development on the Specific Plan site would be the same as described above for direct impacts of the SCP.

Alternative 4 would result in the establishment of a spineflower preserve in the VCC planning area, which would preclude build-out of the VCC project. Build-out of the VCC would not occur because grading would not be allowed in the spineflower preserve area. Due to existing topographic conditions of the VCC planning area, it would not be feasible to implement a site development grading plan that does not include grading of the preserve area. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in the loss of 3,500,000 square feet of commercial space and associated jobs within the VCC planning area when compared to the proposed Project. Alternative 4 would not adversely affect existing or previously approved housing supplies because no housing was planned for the VCC planning area.

Implementation of Alternative 4 would facilitate development of a portion of the Entrada planning area, consisting of approximately 1,125 residential units and 450,000 square feet of nonresidential uses. Development on portions of the Entrada planning area facilitated by the SCP would not result in the removal of any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. The construction of proposed residential units would contribute to the existing Los Angeles County housing stock and also would contribute additional property tax revenues. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, there are no minority or low-income populations (as defined) in the Project vicinity. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1. However, the loss of planned employment opportunities provided by the future development of up to 3,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial land uses in a portion of the VCC planning area would adversely affect the planned jobs/housing balance of the Project region.

The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 4 would increase the size of the spineflower preserve area by 92 acres when compared to the proposed SCP. The increased preserve area would result in a reduction of future property taxes and development when compared to the proposed Project.

4.19.6.4.3 Secondary Impacts

RMDP Secondary Impacts. The RMDP component of the Project that would be implemented under Alternative 4 would facilitate partial build-out of the approved Specific Plan. Implementation of the RMDP under Alternative 4 would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project region or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. The implementation of Alternative 4 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations (as defined) exist in the Project vicinity. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 4 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

Development of the infrastructure facilities included in Alternative 4, and the resulting partial development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

SCP Secondary Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 4 would facilitate future development on the Specific Plan site and the Entrada planning area, but would preclude build-out of the previously approved VCC planning area. Development of the Entrada planning area would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project vicinity or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. Alternative 4 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations exist in the vicinity of the Project area. Therefore, implementation of the SCP and the facilitated development that may occur on the Entrada planning area would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1. However, the loss of planned employment opportunities provided by the future development of up to 3,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial land uses in a portion of the VCC planning area would adversely affect the planned jobs/housing balance of the Project region.

The development of new structures on the Entrada planning area would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units that are available in the nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, the SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 4 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

Table 4.19-12 summarizes the potential for significant socioeconomic and environmental justice impacts to occur as a result of the direct, indirect, and secondary impacts of Alternative 4.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Table 4.19-12
Alternative 4 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts

Type of Impact	Potential for Significant Socioeconomic or Environmental Justice Impacts
Direct	None
Indirect	None
Secondary	None

4.19.6.5 Impacts of Alternative 5 (Widen Tributary Drainages and Addition of VCC Spineflower Preserve)

Alternative 5 would eliminate additional infrastructure improvements included in the proposed RMDP, and would increase the size of proposed spineflower preserves from 167 to 338 acres. Under this alternative, no additional development would be facilitated on the VCC planning area, and subsequent development on the Specific Plan site would be reduced. In total, Alternative 5 would facilitate the development of 21,155 residential dwelling units and approximately 5,860,000 square feet of nonresidential uses on the Specific Plan site and on a portion of the Entrada planning area.

4.19.6.5.1 Direct Impacts

RMDP Direct Impacts. There are no existing residences located on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Implementation of the RMDP and the installation of infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 5 would not result in the removal of any housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed RMDP, Alternative 5 would not result in significant direct housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income population areas (as defined). Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, the construction of infrastructure improvements provided by Alternative 5 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

SCP Direct Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 5 would not result in the development of any urban land uses, or result in the removal of any existing housing. Therefore, the preserves that would be established under Alternative 5 would not result in direct housing impacts under Significance Criteria 2 and 3. The preserves that would be created under Alternative 5 would be 171 acres larger than the preserves provided by the proposed Project, which would result in an additional reduction in future property taxes and development area when compared to the proposed Project. This incremental reduction would not, however, result in significant effects to housing, social, or economic conditions under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

4.19.6.5.2 Indirect Impacts

RMDP Indirect Impacts. Development of RMDP infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 5 would result in the development of 20,196 residential units and 5,410,000 square feet on nonresidential

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

uses on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Alternative 5 would provide 689 fewer residential units and 140,000 fewer square feet of nonresidential uses when compared to the Specific Plan. However, the residential units and nonresidential uses that would be provided would not remove any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based upon data extrapolations from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, the RMDP component of Alternative 5 would create approximately 15,943 new jobs and would provide housing for approximately 56,823 residents. Alternative 5 would result in approximately 2,852 fewer job opportunities than the approved Specific Plan. The construction of the residential units and commercial uses provided by Alternative 5 would contribute to the housing stock in the rapidly growing Santa Clarita Valley and would contribute additional property and sales tax revenues to Los Angeles County, although at a reduced scale when compared to the approved Specific Plan.

Alternative 5 would include an affordable housing program that would provide for the direct inclusion of very low-, low-, and moderate-income affordable housing opportunities in several housing categories, including for sale and rental units. A total of 1,822 affordable housing units would be provided, of which 365 units would be very low-income affordable housing units; 273 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 65 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; 182 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 80 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; and 1,002 would be moderate-income affordable units. Alternative 5 would provide approximately 378 fewer affordable residential units than the Specific Plan; however, the construction of affordable units under this alternative would still contribute to the affordable housing stock in the County.

SCP Indirect Impacts. Implementation of the SCP under Alternative 5 would facilitate Specific Plan build-out. Development on the Specific Plan site would be the same as described above for direct impacts of the SCP.

Alternative 5 also would result in the establishment of a spineflower preserve in the VCC planning area, which would preclude build-out of the VCC project. Build-out of the VCC would not occur because grading would not be allowed in the spineflower preserve area. Due to existing topographic conditions of the VCC planning area, it would not be feasible to implement a site development grading plan that does not include grading of the preserve area. Therefore, Alternative 5 would result in the loss of 3,500,000 square feet of commercial space and associated jobs within the VCC planning area when compared to the proposed Project. Alternative 5 would not adversely affect existing or previously approved housing supplies because no housing was planned for the VCC planning area.

Implementation of Alternative 5 would facilitate development of a portion of the Entrada planning area, consisting of approximately 959 residential units and 450,000 square feet of nonresidential uses. Development on portions of the Entrada planning area facilitated by the SCP would not result in the removal of any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. The construction of proposed residential units would contribute to the existing Los Angeles County housing stock and also would contribute additional property tax revenues. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, there are no minority or low-income populations (as defined) in the Project vicinity. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1. However, the loss of planned employment opportunities provided by the future development of up to 3,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial land uses in a portion of the VCC planning area would adversely affect the planned jobs/housing balance of the Project region.

The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 5 would increase the size of the spineflower preserve area by 171 acres when compared to the proposed SCP. The increased preserve area would result in a reduction in future property taxes and development when compared to the proposed Project.

4.19.6.5.3 Secondary Impacts

RMDP Secondary Impacts. The RMDP component of the Project that would be implemented under Alternative 5 would result in the construction of various infrastructure improvements on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site, which would facilitate partial build-out of the approved Specific Plan. Implementation of the RMDP under Alternative 5 would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project region or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. The implementation of Alternative 5 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations (as defined) exist in the vicinity of the proposed Project area. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 5 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

Development of the infrastructure facilities included in Alternative 5, and the resulting partial development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

SCP Secondary Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 5 would facilitate future development on the Specific Plan site and the Entrada planning area, and would preclude build-out of the VCC planning area. Development of the Entrada planning area would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project vicinity or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, Alternative 5 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. Alternative 5 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations exist in the vicinity of the Project area. Therefore, implementation of the SCP and the facilitated development that may occur on the Entrada planning area would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1. However, the loss of planned employment opportunities provided by the future development of up to 3,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial land uses in a portion of the VCC planning area would adversely affect the planned jobs/housing balance of the Project region.

The development of new structures on the Specific Plan site and the Entrada planning area would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in the nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, the SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 5 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

Table 4.19-13 summarizes the potential for significant socioeconomic and environmental justice impacts to occur as a result of the direct, indirect, and secondary impacts of Alternative 5.

Table 4.19-13	
Alternative 5 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts	
Type of Impact	Potential for Significant Socioeconomic or Environmental Justice Impacts
Direct	None
Indirect	None
Secondary	None

4.19.6.6 Impacts of Alternative 6 (Elimination of Planned Commerce Center Drive Bridge and Maximum Spineflower Expansion/Connectivity)

Alternative 6 would result in additional reductions in the infrastructure improvements included in the proposed RMDP, and would increase the size of proposed spineflower preserves from 167 to 892 acres. Under this alternative, no additional development would be facilitated on the VCC planning area, and subsequent development on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site would be reduced. In total, Alternative 6 would facilitate the development of 20,212 residential dwelling units and approximately 5,780,000 square feet of nonresidential uses on the Specific Plan site and on a portion of the Entrada planning area.

4.19.6.6.1 Direct Impacts

RMDP Direct Impacts. There are no existing residences located on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Implementation of the RMDP and the installation of infrastructure improvements included in

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Alternative 6 would not result in the removal of any housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed RMDP, Alternative 6 would not result in significant direct housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income population areas (as defined). Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, the construction of infrastructure improvements provided by Alternative 6 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

SCP Direct Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 6 would not result in the development of any urban land uses, or result in the removal of any existing housing. Therefore, the preserves that would be established under Alternative 6 would not result in direct housing impacts under Significance Criteria 2 and 3. The preserves that would be created under Alternative 6 would be 725 acres larger than the preserves provided by the proposed Project, which would result in an additional reduction in future property taxes and development area when compared to the proposed Project. This incremental reduction would not, however, result in significant effects to housing, social, or economic conditions under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

4.19.6.6.2 Indirect Impacts

RMDP Indirect Impacts. Development of the RMDP infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 6 would facilitate the construction of 19,787 residential units and 5,330,000 square feet of nonresidential uses on the Specific Plan site. Alternative 6 would provide 1,098 fewer residential units and 220,000 fewer square feet of nonresidential uses when compared to the Specific Plan. However, the residential units and nonresidential uses that would be provided would not remove any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 6 would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based upon data extrapolations from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, Alternative 6 would create approximately 13,847 new jobs and would provide housing for approximately 49,351 residents. Alternative 6 would result in approximately 4,948 fewer job opportunities than the approved Specific Plan. The construction of the residential units and commercial uses provided by Alternative 6 would contribute to the housing stock in the rapidly growing Santa Clarita Valley and would contribute additional property and sales tax revenues to Los Angeles County, although at a reduced scale when compared to the Specific Plan.

Alternative 6 includes an affordable housing program that would provide for the inclusion of very low-, low-, and moderate-income affordable housing opportunities in several housing categories, including for sale and rental units. A total of 1,582 affordable housing units would be provided, of which 317 units would be very low-income affordable housing units; 237 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 65 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; 158 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 80 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; and 870 would be moderate-income affordable units. Alternative 6 would provide approximately 618 fewer affordable residential units than the Specific Plan; however, the construction of affordable units under this alternative would still contribute to the affordable housing stock in the County.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

SCP Indirect Impacts. Implementation of the SCP under Alternative 6 would facilitate Specific Plan build-out. Development on the Specific Plan site would be the same as described above for the direct impacts of the SCP.

Alternative 6 also would result in the establishment of a spineflower preserve in the VCC planning area, which would preclude build-out of the VCC planning area. Build-out of the VCC would not occur because grading would not be allowed in the spineflower preserve area. Due to existing topographic conditions of the VCC planning area, it would not be feasible to implement a site development grading plan that does not include grading of the preserve area. Therefore, Alternative 6 would result in the loss of 3,500,000 square feet of commercial space and associated jobs within the VCC planning area when compared to the proposed Project. Alternative 6 would not adversely affect existing or previously approved housing supplies because no housing was planned for the VCC planning area.

Implementation of Alternative 6 would facilitate development of a portion of the Entrada planning area, consisting of approximately 425 residential units and 450,000 square feet of nonresidential uses. Development on portions of the Entrada planning area facilitated by the SCP would not result in the removal of any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. The construction of proposed residential units would contribute to the existing Los Angeles County housing stock and also would contribute additional property tax revenues. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, there are no minority or low-income populations (as defined) in the Project vicinity. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1. However, the loss of planned employment opportunities provided by the future development of up to 3,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial land uses in a portion of the VCC planning area would adversely affect the planned jobs/housing balance of the Project region.

The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 6 would increase the size of the spineflower preserve area by 725 acres when compared to the proposed SCP. The increased preserve area would result in a reduction in future property taxes and development when compared to the proposed Project.

4.19.6.6.3 Secondary Impacts

RMDP Secondary Impacts. The RMDP component of the Project that would be implemented under Alternative 6 would result in the construction of various infrastructure improvements on the Specific Plan site, which would facilitate partial build-out of the approved Specific Plan. Implementation of the RMDP under Alternative 6 would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project region or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 6 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. The implementation of Alternative 6 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations (as defined) exist in the vicinity of the

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Project area. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 6 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

Development of the infrastructure facilities included in Alternative 6, and the resulting partial development of the Specific Plan site, would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 6 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

SCP Secondary Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 6 would facilitate future development on the Specific Plan site and the Entrada planning area, and would preclude build-out of the VCC planning area. Development of the Specific Plan site and Entrada planning area would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project vicinity or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, Alternative 6 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. Alternative 6 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations (as defined) exist in the vicinity of the Project area. Therefore, implementation of the SCP and the facilitated development that may occur on the Entrada planning area would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1. However, the loss of planned employment opportunities provided by the future development of up to 3,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial land uses in a portion of the VCC planning area would adversely affect the planned jobs/housing balance of the Project region.

The development of new structures on the Entrada planning area would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in the nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, the SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 6 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

Table 4.19-14 summarizes the potential for significant socioeconomic and environmental justice impacts to occur as a result of the direct, indirect, and secondary impacts of Alternative 6.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Table 4.19-14
Alternative 6 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts

Type of Impact	Potential for Significant Socioeconomic or Environmental Justice Impacts
Direct	None
Indirect	None
Secondary	None

4.19.6.7 Impacts of Alternative 7 (Avoidance of 100-Year Floodplain, Elimination of Two Planned Bridges, and Avoidance of Spineflower)

Alternative 7 would substantially reduce the infrastructure improvements provided by the RMDP when compared to the proposed Project, and would increase the size of proposed spineflower preserves from 167 to 659 acres. Under this alternative, no additional development would be facilitated on the VCC planning area, and subsequent development on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site would be reduced. In total, Alternative 7 would facilitate the development of 17,323 residential dwelling units and approximately 3,815,000 square feet of nonresidential uses on the Specific Plan site and on a portion of the Entrada planning area.

4.19.6.7.1 Direct Impacts

RMDP Direct Impacts. There are no existing residences located on the Specific Plan site. Implementation of the RMDP and the installation of infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 7 would not result in the removal of any housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed RMDP, Alternative 7 would not result in significant direct housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income population areas (as defined). Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, the construction of infrastructure improvements provided by Alternative 7 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

SCP Direct Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 7 would not result in the development of any urban land uses, or result in the removal of any existing housing. Therefore, the preserves that would be established under Alternative 7 would not result in direct housing impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3. The preserves that would be created under Alternative 7 would be 492 acres larger than the preserves provided by the proposed Project, which would result in an additional reduction in future property taxes and development area when compared to the proposed Project. This reduction would not, however, result in significant effects to housing, social, or economic conditions under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.6.7.2 Indirect Impacts

RMDP Indirect Impacts. Development of the RMDP infrastructure improvements included in Alternative 7 would facilitate the construction of 16,471 residential units and 3,890,000 square feet of nonresidential uses on the Specific Plan site. This would be 4,414 fewer residential units and 1,660,000 fewer square feet of nonresidential uses when compared to the Specific Plan. However, the residential units and nonresidential uses that would be provided would not remove any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, Alternative 7 would not result in significant indirect housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3. Alternative 7 would, however, result in a substantial reduction in the number of residential units that could be provided on the Specific Plan site.

Based upon data extrapolations from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, Alternative 7 would create approximately 11,508 new jobs, which would be 7,287 fewer job opportunities than the approved Specific Plan. Implementation of Alternative 7 would contribute to the housing stock in the rapidly growing Santa Clarita Valley and would contribute increased property and sales tax revenue to Los Angeles County, but at a substantially reduced scale when compared to the approved Specific Plan.

Alternative 7 would include an affordable housing program that would provide for the development of very low-, low-, and moderate-income affordable housing opportunities in several housing categories, including for sale and rental units. A total of 1,315 affordable housing units would be provided, of which 263 units would be very low-income affordable housing units; 197 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 65 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; 132 units would be low-income affordable housing units at 80 percent of the Los Angeles County median income; and 723 would be moderate-income affordable units. Alternative 7 would provide approximately 885 fewer affordable residential units than the proposed Project; however, the construction of these 1,315 units would contribute to the affordable housing stock in the County.

SCP Indirect Impacts. Implementation of the Alternative 7 SCP would facilitate the development of the previously approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Development on the Specific Plan site would be the same as described above for direct impacts of the SCP.

Alternative 7 also would result in the establishment of a spineflower preserve in the VCC planning area, which would preclude build-out of the VCC planning area. Build-out of the VCC would not occur because grading would not be allowed in the spineflower preserve area. Due to existing topographic conditions of the VCC planning area, it would not be feasible to implement a site development grading plan that does not include grading of the preserve area. Therefore, Alternative 7 would result in the loss of 3,500,000 square feet of commercial space and associated jobs within the VCC planning area compared to the proposed Project. Alternative 7 would not adversely affect existing or previously approved housing supplies because no housing was planned for the VCC planning area.

Implementation of Alternative 7 would facilitate development of a portion of the Entrada planning area, consisting of approximately 852 residential units and 50,000 square feet of nonresidential uses. Development on portions of the Entrada planning area facilitated by the SCP would not result in the removal of any existing housing or result in the displacement of any people. The construction of proposed residential units would contribute to the existing Los Angeles County housing stock and also

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

would also contribute to additional property tax revenues. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, there are no minority or low-income populations (as defined) in the Project vicinity. Therefore, the indirect impacts of the SCP would not result in significant socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1. However, the loss of planned employment opportunities provided by the future development of up to 3,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial land uses in a portion of the VCC planning area would adversely affect the planned jobs/housing balance of the Project region.

The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 7 would increase the size of the spineflower preserve area by 492 acres when compared to the proposed SCP. The increased preserve area would result in a reduction in future property taxes and development when compared to the proposed Project.

4.19.6.7.3 Secondary Impacts

RMDP Secondary Impacts. The RMDP component of the Project that would be implemented under Alternative 7 would result in the construction of various infrastructure improvements on the Specific Plan site, which would facilitate partial build-out of the approved Specific Plan. Implementation of the RMDP under Alternative 7 would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project region or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 7 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. The implementation of Alternative 7 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations (as defined) exist in the vicinity of the Project area. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 7 would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1.

Development of the infrastructure facilities included in Alternative 7, and the resulting partial development of the Specific Plan, would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 7 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

SCP Secondary Impacts. The SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 7 would facilitate future development on the Specific Plan site and the Entrada planning area, and would preclude build-out of the VCC planning area. Development of the Specific Plan site and the Entrada planning area would not result in the removal of any existing housing in the Project vicinity or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, Alternative 7 would not result in significant secondary housing supply impacts under Significance Criterion 2 or 3.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Based on data provided by the 2000 U.S. Census, the Project area does not contain any minority or low-income populations. Alternative 7 would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations, as no such populations (as defined) exist in the vicinity of the Project area. Therefore, implementation of the SCP and the facilitated development that may occur on the Entrada planning area would not result in significant environmental justice impacts under Significance Criterion 1. However, the loss of planned employment opportunities provided by the future development of up to 3,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial land uses in a portion of the VCC planning area would adversely affect the planned jobs/housing balance of the Project region.

The development of new structures on the Entrada planning area would be conducted by a construction labor force that is located predominately in the Project region. It is not anticipated that a substantial in-migration to the Project area would occur for construction employment opportunities that may become available as a result of future development projects. Any in-migration of workers that may occur would not affect substantially the long-term social, ethnic, or economic composition of the Santa Clarita Valley, and would not affect substantially the available supply of rental housing units in the nearby urbanized areas. Therefore, the SCP that would be implemented under Alternative 7 would not result in significant secondary impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice under Significance Criterion 1, 2, or 3.

Table 4.19-15 summarizes the potential for significant socioeconomic and environmental justice impacts to occur as a result of the direct, indirect, and secondary impacts of Alternative 7.

Table 4.19-15	
Alternative 7 Direct/Indirect/Secondary Significant Impacts	
Type of Impact	Potential for Significant Socioeconomic or Environmental Justice Impacts
Direct	None
Indirect	None
Secondary	None

4.19.7 MITIGATION MEASURES

4.19.7.1 Mitigation Measures Already Required by the Adopted Newhall Ranch Specific Plan EIR

The County of Los Angeles County previously adopted mitigation to minimize impacts to population, housing, and employment within the Specific Plan area as part of its adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP. The measure is found in the previously certified Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR and the adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and WRP (May 2003) and is summarized above in **Table 4.19-1**. In addition, the mitigation measure is set forth in full below, and preceded by "SP," which stands for Specific Plan.

SP-4.21-1 The Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan shall be amended by Los Angeles County to accommodate the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.7.2 Mitigation Measures Already Required by the Adopted VCC EIR

The previously certified VCC EIR (April 1990) did not address impacts related to socioeconomic and environmental justice because there was no substantial evidence that these resources would be impacted due to implementation of the VCC project. Therefore, no such mitigation measures were adopted in conjunction with the VCC project. As noted in **Subsection 4.19.1.2.1**, additional environmental review will be conducted by Los Angeles County with respect to the VCC planning area, because the applicant recently submitted the last tentative parcel map for the build-out of the VCC planning area. However, based on the above analysis, no mitigation is required because there are no significant socioeconomic or environmental justice effects associated with build-out of the VCC project.

4.19.7.3 Mitigation Measures Relating to the Entrada Planning Area

The County has not yet prepared or released an EIR for the proposed development within the portion of the Entrada planning area that would be facilitated by approval of the SCP component of the proposed Project. As a result, there are no previously adopted mitigation measures for the Entrada planning area.; however, no such measures are anticipated to be needed based on the above analysis.

4.19.7.4 Additional Mitigation Measures Proposed by this EIS/EIR

The proposed Project and alternatives would not result in significant socioeconomic, housing, or environmental justice impacts. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are recommended or required.

4.19 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.19.8 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE FINDINGS

Table 4.19-16 presents a summary of the significance criteria relating to each of the Project alternatives, and the reduced level of impact that would be achieved for each alternative by applying the above mitigation measures.

Table 4.19-16									
Summary of Significant Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice Impacts									
Pre- and Post- Mitigation									
Significance Criteria	Applicable Mitigation Measures	Planning Area	Impact of Alternatives - Pre/Post-Mitigation						
			Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6	Alt 7
Project would result in disproportionate, adverse environmental effects on a minority or low-income population.	None Required	NRSP	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
		VCC	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
		Entrada	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Project would displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	None Required	NRSP	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
		VCC	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
		Entrada	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Project would displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	None Required	NRSP	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
		VCC	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
		Entrada	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Note:									
NI = No impact, and no mitigation required									

In summary, neither the proposed Project nor any of the alternatives would result in disproportionate, adverse environmental effects on a minority or low-income population, and would not result in significant socioeconomic justice impacts. Neither the proposed Project nor any of the Project alternatives would result in the removal of any housing or the displacement of any people, and would not result in significant housing-related impacts. The provision of proposed housing and employment opportunities would have beneficial housing and socioeconomic impacts.

4.19.9 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The proposed Project and alternatives would not result in any significant, unavoidable socioeconomic or environmental justice-related impacts.