

3.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

3.11.1 Introduction

This EIR section analyzes the potential for adverse environmental impacts on population and housing resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project. This section summarizes the population and housing characteristics of the City and region, based on existing documentation, and analyzes the potential impacts associated with both.

This EIR uses data collected and provided at the city and county level, in an effort to focus the analysis specifically on the Lake Forest area. Data used to prepare this section were taken from a variety of sources including: the United States Bureau of the Census, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG), the City of Lake Forest General Plan 2000–2005 Housing Element (Housing Element), and the most recent data available (2005) from the California Department of Finance (Demographic Research Unit) population estimates.

City-specific information for this section is based primarily on the most recent data available, which is the Department of Finance 2005 data. This data is used for the majority of the analysis in this section as it most accurately reflects the existing conditions within the City. However, since the City bases their parkland dedication ratio upon the most recent official census data (Municipal Code Section 7.38.040), the existing population per household (pph) ratio was obtained from the official 2000 census data. Thus, to ensure consistency with the Recreation section of this EIR, which relies upon pph data, this information was also used in this subsection. Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 3.11.9 (References) of this section.

No comment letters associated with population and housing were received during the NOP comment period.

3.11.2 Environmental Setting

The Project Area and associated overlay parcel are located entirely within the City of Lake Forest limits, which is located within two analysis areas that may be impacted by new housing and population growth. The first is a six-county SCAG region, which includes the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial. The second is the SCAG Orange County subregion, the Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG), which includes thirty-four cities, the County of Orange, and representation from transportation agencies, sanitation and water districts, as well as the local air district.

The recent population, household, and employment (employment generated from businesses located within Lake Forest) forecasts provided in Table 3.11-1 for the City of Lake Forest, the OCCOG Subregion, and SCAG region were prepared by SCAG in 2004.

Table 3.11-1 SCAG Population, Housing, and Employment Forecast						
	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
City of Lake Forest						
Population	79,077	80,604	81,401	82,044	82,645	82,943
Households	26,271	26,538	26,623	26,743	26,860	26,895
Employment	40,237	58,654	61,023	63,108	64,847	67,490
OCCOG Region						
Population	3,103,377	3,291,628	3,369,745	3,433,609	3,494,394	3,552,742
Households	978,423	1,034,027	1,046,473	1,063,976	1,081,421	1,098,474
Employment	1,580,855	1,749,985	1,801,602	1,848,135	1,887,542	1,921,806
SCAG Region						
Population	18,117,604	19,208,661	20,191,117	21,137,519	22,035,416	22,890,797
Households	5,673,585	6,072,578	6,463,402	6,865,355	7,263,519	7,660,107
Employment	7,764,997	8,729,192	9,198,618	9,659,847	10,100,776	10,527,202
SOURCE: SCAG, 2004 Population, Household, and Employment forecasts						

■ Regional Characteristics

According to SCAG’s 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Growth Forecast Report, Orange County is the second largest county in terms of population in the region. However, Orange County is expected to have the slowest annual growth rate through 2030 when compared to Riverside, Imperial, San Bernardino, Ventura, and Los Angeles counties. The County had 2.9 million people and 0.9 million households according to the 2000 Census. As shown above in Table 3.11-1, the County’s population is projected to increase to nearly 3.6 million in 2030. In addition, total households in Orange County are projected to reach 1.1 million in 2030. Housing prices in Orange County have been rising very rapidly and are projected to continue to rise because the demand for housing exceeds the supply. According to the RTP, the high cost of Orange County housing is likely to prevent or delay the formation of new households. Total employment in Orange County is projected to increase from 1.5 million jobs in 2005 to nearly 2.0 million jobs in the year 2030. This represents an average annual increase of approximately 13,600 jobs or 0.9 percent annual growth rate during the forecast period. This contrasts to an annual increase rate of 6.7 percent during 1972-2000 (SCAG RTP 2004).

■ Project Area Characteristics

Population

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the City of Lake Forest had a population of 58,707. As the City was incorporated in 1991, the earliest population estimate is from 1992, which was approximately 56,600. Compared to the population of 56,600 in 1992, this represents an increase of approximately 3.7 percent, with an annual growth rate of approximately 0.5 percent. This is considerably smaller than the average population trend of 14.5 percent with a growth rate of 1.8 percent that occurred in Orange County

during this time.¹¹ Table 3.11-2 shows the population growth in the City since its incorporation. The City’s Census population of 58,707 in 2000 represented approximately two percent of Orange County’s total population (2,846,289).

As of January 2005, the City’s population was approximately 78,020 persons, which represents 2.6 percent of Orange County’s total population (3,056,865) in 2005 (DOF 2005). From 2000 to 2005, the City’s population increased by approximately 19,313 persons. This tremendous growth can be primarily explained by the major annexation of all of Foothill Ranch and Portola Hills in 2000, which alone accounted for an increase in population of approximately 15,768 persons (81.6 percent of the growth). Factoring out the population growth from the annexation in 2000, which skews the calculation, yields a more meaningful annual average growth of approximately 318 persons per year between 1992 and 2005, averaging an annual growth rate of approximately 1.48 percent. During this same time, Orange County’s growth rate was approximately 1.47. Therefore, the increase in population in the City of Lake Forest from 2000 to the present is substantially the same as the overall population growth that is occurring in Orange County.

Table 3.11-2 Population Growth: City of Lake Forest (1992–2005)

Year	Population	Percent Increase (Decrease)	Average Annual Growth (persons/year)
1992	56,600	—	—
1993	57,100	0.88	500
1994	57,100	0	0
1995	56,700	(0.70)	-400
1996	56,800	0.17	100
1997	57,100	0.53	300
1998	57,600	0.88	500
1999	58,100	0.87	500
2000	58,707	1.04	607
2001	76,089	29.6	17,382 ¹
2002	76,703	0.81	614
2003	77,442	.96	739
2004	77,740	0.38	298
2005	78,020	0.36	280

SOURCES: California Department of Finance. *Revised Historical City, County and State Population Estimates, 1991-2000, with 1990 and 2000 Census Counts*. March 2002; California Department of Finance. *E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2005, with 2000 DRU Benchmark*. May 2005; CA Department of Finance 2005c

¹ 81.6 percent of population growth in 2000 was a result of the annexation of the Foothill Ranch and Portola Hills communities.

¹¹ According to the DOF records, Orange County’s population in 1992 was approximately 2,485,200 persons and approximately 2,846,289 persons in 2000.

Households

A household is defined by the U.S. Census as a group of people who occupy a housing unit. A household differs from a dwelling unit because the number of dwelling units includes both occupied and vacant dwelling units. It is important to note that not all of the population lives in households. A portion lives in group quarters, such as board and care facilities; others are homeless.

Household Size

Small households (1 to 2 pph) traditionally reside in units with 0 to 2 bedrooms; family households (3 to 4 pph) normally reside in units with 3 to 4 bedrooms. Large households (5 or more pph) reside in units with 4 or more bedrooms. However, the number of units in relation to the household size may also reflect preference and economics: many small households obtain larger units, and some large families live in small units for economic reasons.

Table 3.11-3 compares the number of households in the City of Lake Forest and Orange County in 2000. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the average household size was 2.91 pph, which is similar to the rest of Orange County, where the average household size was 2.9 pph.

Table 3.11-3 Households in Lake Forest and Orange County		
Area	2000^a	2005^b
Occupied Housing Units		
City of Lake Forest	20,124	25,712 ¹
Orange County	935,287	976,540
Average Household Size (persons per household)*		
City of Lake Forest	2.91	N/A
Orange County	2.9	N/A
<small>SOURCES: ^a U.S. Census Bureau American Fact Finder, City of Lake Forest and Orange County. <i>Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000.</i> ^b California Department of Finance, <i>E-5 City / County Population and Housing Estimates, 2005, Revised 2001-2004, with 2000 DRU Benchmark.</i> May 2005.</small>		
<small>¹ This number includes the 5,975 homes that were annexed to the City from the Portola Hills and Foothill Ranch Communities. Subtracting the annexation households, Lake Forest would have actually experienced a net decrease of households between 2000 and 2005.</small>		
<small>Household figures represent occupied house units.</small>		
<small>* To ensure consistency with the Recreation section of this EIR, which relies upon 2000 census data for pph information, the 2005 information was not provided here.</small>		

As shown above in Table 3.11-3, as of January 2005, an estimated total of 25,712 households were located in the City. Thus, from 2000 to 2005, an increase of 5,588 households within the City had occurred. This increase is, as noted above, accounted for by the annexation of the Foothill Ranch and Portola Hills Communities (which totaled 5,975 housing units), without which the number of households in the City would have actually decreased to 19,737. The number of new homes actually built in the City since incorporation in 1991 has been negligible: 42 single-family homes were built in approximately 1991 and 131 townhomes were constructed in 2002/03. According to SCAG projections, the number of households in the City is expected to increase to 26,860 by 2025, and 26,895 by 2030. As such, from 2005 to 2030, the City is projected to experience an approximate 4.6 percent increase in households, or an annual growth rate in households of approximately 0.18 percent.

Housing

Only two new residential projects have been built since the City's incorporation in 1991 - 42 single-family homes in 1991 and 131 multi-family units in 2002/03. Rather than an annual increase in units, the annexation represented a large one time increase.

Growth Trends

A city's housing market is driven by supply and demand and can be influenced by population growth, income, housing cost, and housing locations. However, age distribution is a key market characteristic because housing demand within the market is influenced by the housing preference of certain age groups: due to limited income, the majority of the young adult population (20 to 34 years old) tends to occupy apartments, low- to moderate-cost condominiums, and smaller single-family units. The 35- to 65-year-old group provides the market for moderate- to high-cost apartments and condominiums, as well as larger single-family units because, on average, people of this age group have higher incomes and larger household sizes. Housing demand for the elderly population (65 years of age and up) is similar to young adults, but can also include group quarters as housing options. Table 3.11-4 provides age distribution in the City of Lake Forest in 2000.¹²

<i>Age Group/Year</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>% of Total</i>
Preschool (0 to 4)	4,143	7.1
School (5 to 19)	13,200	22.5
Young Adults (20 to 24)	3,159	5.4
Prime Working (25 to 54)	28,398	48.4
Retirement (55 to 64)	4,756	8.0
Seniors (65+)	5,051	8.6
Total	58,707	100.0%

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau American Fact Finder, City of Lake Forest. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000

Types of Housing Stock

As noted above, 42 single-family homes were built in 1991, and 131 multi-family apartment units were constructed in 2002/03. Annexation in 2000 added an additional 5,975 dwelling units consisting primarily of single-family homes, but with some condominiums and apartments to the existing housing stock in the City. The number of housing units in 2000 and 2005, as defined by units per structure in the City, is shown in Table 3.11-5.

¹² This table does not include data on the annexed communities of Foothill Ranch and Portola Hills.

Table 3.11-5 Total Housing Units: City of Lake Forest (2000 & 2005) Defined by Units per Structure

Year	Housing Type			Mobile Homes/Other	Total Number of Units	Occupied Units
	Single-Family	Multifamily				
		2 to 4 units	5+ units			
2000 ^a	13,753	1,257	4,286	1,292	20,588	20,124
2005 ^a	18,089	1,276	5,734	1,286	26,385 ¹	25,712

SOURCES: a US Census Bureau American Fact Finder, City of Lake Forest. Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000
 b California Department of Finance, E-5 City / County Population and Housing Estimates, 2005, Revised 2001-2004, with 2000 DRU Benchmark, May 2005.

¹ Again, this includes the 5,975 housing units annexed in 2000.

The percentage breakdown for the total housing units by type is shown in Table 3.11-6.

Table 3.11-6 Percentage Comparison of Housing Units

Type of Housing	2000	2005
Single-Family	66.8	68.6
Multifamily (2 to 4 units)	6.1	4.8
Multifamily (5+ units)	20.8	21.7
Mobile Homes/Other	6.3	4.9

SOURCE: EIP Associates 2004 (derived from data contained within Table 3.11-5)

Although the City added 6,106 housing units between 2000 and 2005 (5,975 of which were annexed from Foothill Ranch and Portola Hills in 2000), the percentage breakdowns for housing type in the City have remained relatively similar during this time period. From 2000 to 2005, the City has experienced a slight increase in single-family and multifamily (5+) dwelling units, while the percentage of multifamily (2 to 4 units) and dwelling units under the category of “mobile homes/other” has slightly decreased.

Vacancy Rates

The vacancy rates and affordability of the housing stock are also key elements in the balance between supply and demand in the City’s housing market. High vacancy rates usually indicate low demand and/or high prices in the housing market or significant mismatches between the desired and available types of housing. Conversely, low vacancy rates usually indicate high demand and/or low prices in the housing market. However, vacancy rates are not the sole indicator of market conditions. They must be viewed in the context of all the characteristics of the local and regional market and economy. Vacancy rates, which indicate a “market balance” (i.e., a reasonable level of vacancy to avoid local housing shortages, and appropriate price competition and consumer choice), generally range from 1 percent to 3 percent for single-family units, and from 3 to 5 percent for multifamily units. Of the 20,588 housing units in Lake Forest in 2000, 464 units (2.25 percent) were vacant (American Fact Finder 2000). As of January 2005, an estimated total of 26,385 housing units are located in the City, with a vacancy rate of 2.5 percent (DOF E-5 City / County Population and Housing Estimates 2005).

It should be noted that the total vacancy rates include vacant units that are not available for rent or sale. This includes units that are for rent for occasional, seasonal, or recreational purposes; units that have been rented or sold but have not yet been occupied as of the date of the census; and units being held for repairs/modernization or for personal reasons of the owner (i.e., probate). Ultimately, these units should not be included in the vacancy rate because they are not on the market, and are not available for rental or purchase. In 2000, however, there were only 27 vacant units in this category. In addition, the vacant rental units should include both assisted and unassisted living units, as well as units available only to senior citizens.

As shown by the most recent statistics available for detailed vacancy rates, the 2000 Census data shows that approximately 56 percent of the total occupied housing units in Lake Forest were specified owner-occupied, while 28 percent was specified renter-occupied (American Fact Finder, 2000). The remaining 16 percent of occupied units were unspecified within the Census data set. The homeowner vacancy rate in the City in 2000 was 0.8 percent; the rental vacancy rate, 4.1 percent. The homeowner vacancy rate is lower than the statewide average, which is 1.4 percent (5.8 percent overall), while the rental vacancy rate is higher than the statewide average of 3.7 percent. The City's rates reflect the high demand for owner-occupied units and high prices for rental units.

Housing Needs Assessment

California's Housing Element Law requires that each city and county, when preparing its state-mandated Housing Element of a General Plan, must develop local housing programs designed to meet its share of existing and future housing needs for all income groups, as determined by the jurisdiction's Council of Governments.

In the six-county southern California region, the agency responsible for assigning portions of regional housing needs to each jurisdiction is the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). As part of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), the SCAG determines the five-year housing growth needs by income category for municipalities within its jurisdiction, which includes the City of Lake Forest. As discussed previously, in Orange County, the Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG) was delegated responsibility for developing the RHNA in coordination with the cities and county. Future housing needs reflect the number of new units needed in a jurisdiction based on households, which are expected to reside within the jurisdiction (future demand), plus an adequate supply of vacant housing to assure mobility and new units to replace losses.

According to the City's 2000–2005 Housing Element, the RHNA adopted by OCCOG and SCAG identified a 1998-2005 future housing need for Lake Forest of 183 housing units, with 80 lower-income units, as shown in Table 3.11-7. Housing units developed as of January 1998 can be credited towards the City's future RHNA for the 1998-2005 period, which includes 42 new single-family homes (upper income units) constructed in the City in 1991, and the 131 apartments that were constructed in 2002/2003, six of which were for low to moderate-income housing. These can be subtracted from the City's identified need

Table 3.11-7 Lake Forest Regional Housing Needs by Income Group (1998-2005)

<i>Income Category</i>	<i>Housing Units</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Units Since 1/98</i>	<i>Remaining Housing Needed</i>
Very Low (0-50% County median income)	73	40%	0	73
Low (50-80% County median income)	7	4%	2	5
Moderate (80-120% County median income)	27	15%	4	23
Upper (over 120% County median income)	76	41%	167	0
<i>Total Housing Units</i>	<i>183</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>173</i>	<i>107</i>

SOURCES: SCAG 1999; City of Lake Forest 2000, Table H-4

Given the construction that has already occurred, in order to meet the RHNA for this time period (1998-2005), the City is required to have land appropriately designated to allow for the construction of an additional 107 low- to moderate-income housing units out of the original projected 183 units.

3.11.3 Planning and Regulatory Framework

■ Regional

Southern California Association of Governments

SCAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) and RHNA are tools for coordinating regional planning and housing development strategies in southern California. State Housing Law mandates that local governments, through Councils of Governments, identify existing and future housing needs in a RHNA. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment provides recommendations and guidelines to identify housing needs within cities. It does not impose requirements as to housing development in cities.

■ Local

General Plan

The City of Lake Forest General Plan contains goals, policies, and plans that are intended to guide land use and development decisions. The General Plan consists of a Land Use Policy Map and the following six elements, or chapters, which together fulfill the state requirements for a General Plan:

- Land Use Element
- Housing Element
- Circulation Element
- Recreation and Resources Element
- Safety and Noise Element
- Public Facilities/Growth Management Element

Policies that relate to Population and Housing are listed below.

Housing Element

- Goal 1.0** Adequate housing to meet the existing and future needs of Lake Forest residents.
- Policy 1.1** Ensure the provision of a variety of housing opportunities (ownership and rental) in Lake Forest including low-density single-family homes, moderate density townhomes, higher density apartments and condominiums and mobile homes to fulfill regional housing needs.
 - Policy 1.2** Facilitate the development of affordable housing by offering development incentives.
 - Policy 1.3** Encourage development of City’s remaining Medium-Density housing sites with multi-family housing.
 - Policy 1.4** Ensure that the design of new residential development is compatible with that of existing residences.
 - Policy 1.5** Encourage the development of residential units whose design and market intent is to meet the needs of special groups, such as the elderly, the physically challenged and the homeless.
 - Policy 1.6** Encourage the development of new housing units in close proximity to public transportation and community services.
 - Policy 1.7** Evaluate sites within the El Toro Road Specific Plan/Redevelopment Area for potential mixed use development.
 - Policy 1.8** Remove or reduce governmental constraints on affordable housing development, while maintaining compatibility with surrounding development.
 - Policy 1.9** Support the provision of housing services in meeting the housing needs of Lake Forest residents.
 - Policy 1.10** Encourage residential developments to incorporate a minimum of 15 percent affordable units.
 - Policy 1.11** Identify potential sites in the City to expand housing opportunities through public/private partnerships.
- Goal 3.0** Increased opportunities for home ownership.
- Policy 3.1** Encourage the development of affordable home ownership housing for first-time homebuyers.
 - Policy 3.2** Pursue state and federal funding sources to provide favorable home purchase options to low and moderate-income households.

3.11.4 Methodology

The analysis of population, employment, and housing impacts compares existing levels with projected levels and determines whether the growth is within local and/or regional forecasts. In addition to the previous projections, the analysis determines whether the anticipated growth under the Proposed Project would be considered substantial, given the existing and planned infrastructure improvements that could serve population growth.

3.11.5 Thresholds of Significance

As the City's 2001 CEQA Significance Thresholds do not cover population and housing issues, the following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the 2005 CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts related to population and housing if they would:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

3.11.6 Impacts

CEQA requires that the Proposed Project's potential environmental impacts be compared to on-the-ground conditions in the Project Area at the time the Notice of Preparation is issued or at the time the analysis of such impacts is commenced. Such on-the-ground conditions are considered, and often referred to as, the environmental or CEQA "baseline." Thus, the following section analyzes the Proposed Project's potential environmental impacts on baseline conditions. However, it should be noted that the land under consideration for the Proposed Project, while currently undeveloped, would not necessarily remain undeveloped. Most sites within the Project Area are subject to existing development agreements or entitlements and, in the absence of the Proposed Project, would in the future likely be developed with approximately 9.8 million square feet of industrial and commercial space under the existing General Plan. Given this, the analysis of alternatives to the Proposed Project in Chapter 4 of this EIR, under the "No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development" alternative, analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with buildout of the existing General Plan. That analysis includes a comparison of the impacts of buildout of the existing General Plan with the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project.

Impact 3.11-1 Development under the Proposed Project would induce substantial population growth.

Significance Level: Significant and unavoidable

The Proposed Project would include a GPA and Zone Change of 838 acres. Under the Proposed Project, population in the City would increase due to the potential new residential developments in the

Project Area. An additional mix of commercial retail uses associated with the Proposed Project could also lead to increased employment/daytime population.

Up to 5,415 additional residential units could potentially be built on Sites 1 through 6. No residential units would be permitted on Site 7, as this site would only contain the three public facilities on 45 acres and the remainder of the 121-acre site would continue with existing nursery operations. With an average City household size of 2.91 pph, this would result in a population increase of 15,758 persons. Compared with the City's existing 2005 population of 78,020, the addition of 15,758 persons would represent an approximate 20 percent increase in population over existing conditions, which is considered to be substantial.

Aside from the additional residential developments, the Proposed Project would also allow for new commercial, retail, and office uses that can result in direct growth in the City's population because future employees associated with these uses may choose to relocate to the City with their families. Since various factors can come into play in influencing personal housing location decisions (i.e., income levels and housing cost and availability), estimating the number of future employees that would relocate to the City from implementation of the Proposed Project would be speculative. For the purpose of analysis and to provide a conservative estimate, it is assumed that approximately 25 percent of these employees would choose to relocate to the City. Thus, using the employment generation factor of 1 person per 500 square feet (sf) (Stan Hoffman & Associates 2003),¹³ the net increase of 648,720 sf of commercial, retail, and office uses in the Project Area is estimated to generate a total of 1,297 new employees, out of which 324 could choose to relocate to the City. This in turn would create a demand for 324 housing units. Based on the ratio of 2.91 persons per household, the new employment-generating commercial uses in the Project Area have the potential to result in a population increase of 943 persons in the City. However, it is anticipated that most, if not all, of the new employment would be accommodated by the housing component of the project, and would, therefore, not result in significant demand for new housing.

As of 2005, total employment in the City stood at 40,237, with total households of 26,271. This yields a jobs/housing ratio of 1.5. The Proposed Project would provide approximately 1,297 new jobs and 5,415 housing units, which would increase total employment in the City to 41,534 and total households to 31,686. The jobs/housing ratio that would result would be 1.3, which represents an improvement of the jobs/housing balance in the City and would be a benefit of the project.

In addition, as a percentage of the housing units to be developed under the Proposed Project would be required to be affordable, pursuant to an Affordable Housing Implementation Plan and through the Development Agreement for each site, the provision of affordable housing within the Project Area resulting from the Proposed Project would facilitate the City's ability to meet the affordability requirement.

As such, maximum buildout of residential and commercial uses under the Proposed Project could result in an increase in the City's population of approximately 16,701 persons (15,758 persons from new residential units and 943 persons potentially relocating to the City). Compared with the City's 2005

¹³ Commercial employment rate estimated at 1/500 sf.

population of 78,020, the addition of 16,701 persons would represent an approximate 21 percent increase in population over existing conditions.

With the City's 2004 population of 78,020, the generation of 16,701 persons from the Proposed Project would result in a total population of 94,721 persons, which would substantially exceed SCAG's population projection of 82,943 persons for the City in 2030. Although the proposed residential development was not previously assumed to occur, future industrial growth in the Project Area was anticipated. As such, it is assumed that although population increases would exceed projections, the City and County's infrastructure could accommodate the future growth.

However, because the residential portion of the Proposed Project would substantially increase population growth within the City (by approximately 20 percent), impacts on population growth would be considered significant according to the CEQA threshold utilized. However, it should be noted that resource sections in this EIR such as Air Quality, Noise, and Traffic analyze the potential impacts directly associated with this substantial increase in population. The mitigation measures provided in each of these sections would help reduce impacts. However, because the population increase from the Proposed Project would substantially exceed SCAG's population projections, as the additional population was not accounted for in the City's General Plan, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 3.11-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people.

Significance Level: No impact

Presently, two single-family dwellings are located on Site 1 (Shea/Baker) and a single, vacant residential dwelling is located on Site 5 (Whisler/Greystone). The remaining Sites (2, 3, 4, and 6) are primarily vacant. In addition, Site 7 is presently used for agricultural activities with a nursery on site, and no residential uses are proposed for this site. Future development under the Proposed Project could displace the existing housing and associated residents on Site 1 (the dwelling unit on Site 5 is not habitable) that could necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The demolition of existing dwelling units would not, by itself, have a significant impact on the physical environment, provided demolition proceeds in accordance with applicable demolition regulations, including those related to control of particulate matter. However, demolition activities could have a significant impact within the meaning of CEQA if they conflict with SCAG's long-range growth forecast for the City, or with adopted City housing policies. The three units that could be demolished under the Proposed Project represent only a fraction (0.01 percent) of the City's current housing stock and would not be considered significant. Therefore, there would be no impact related to the displacement of existing housing or people in the Project Area.

3.11.7 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures that are identified in other resource sections of this EIR are indirectly associated with population growth and would serve to reduce potential impacts. However, there are no mitigation

measures directly associated with population and housing that would reduce the Proposed Project's significant impact associated with substantial population growth to a less-than-significant level.

3.11.8 Summary of Impacts

Table 3.11-8 summarizes the potential long-term adverse impacts of the Proposed Project related to population and housing in the Project Area, and identifies the significance of those impacts after any applicable mitigation measures.

Table 3.11-8 Summary of Impacts		
Impact	Threshold	Significance
3.11-1	Development under the Proposed Project would induce substantial population growth.	Significant and unavoidable
3.11-2	Implementation of the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people.	No impact

3.11.9 References

California Department of Finance. *E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2005, Revised 2001–2004, with 2000 DRU Benchmark*. May 2005.

———. *E-1 City/County Population Estimates, with Annual Percent Change, January 1, 2004 and 2005*. May 2005.

———. *E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2005, with 2000 DRU Benchmark*, May 2005.

———. *Revised Historical City, County and State Population Estimates, 1991-2000, with 1990 and 2000 Census Counts*, March 2002.

Lake Forest, City of. 2000. *General Plan 2000–2005 Housing Element*, December.

Orange County Council of Governments. 2005. Website: <http://www.occities.org/occog>.

San Gabriel, City of. 2003. *Mission District Specific Plan Program EIR*.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 1999. *SCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment*, November.

———. 2001. *Housing in Southern California: A Decade in Review*, January.

———. 2004a. *2004 Regional Transportation Plan/Growth Vision: Socio Economic Forecast Report*. June.

———. 2004b. <http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/downloads/2004GF.xls>

Stan Hoffman & Associates. 2003. *City of San Gabriel Mission District Specific Plan Program EIR*.

United States Census Bureau. Website: <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>.

———. 2000. American FactFinder—2000 Census. Website: <http://factfinder.census.gov>. Accessed July 2005.