

5.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The majority of the project area is contained within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of Moreno Valley. The remainder of the project area, the City's sphere of influence, is primarily undeveloped and contains only a few residential units and no major employment generating uses. Estimates of population and housing stock vary somewhat depending on the method of calculation used and the assumed number of persons per dwelling unit. According to the Department of Finance, the City had an estimated population of 165,328 and 46,944 housing units as of January of 2005. Approximately 5.3 percent of the housing units were vacant. The average household size was 3.703 persons.

According to the 2000 Census, the median age in Moreno Valley was 27.1, which is lower than the County median age of 33.1. This difference is attributable to the large number of family aged persons (children under 18 and parents between the ages of 25 and 44) in Moreno Valley. As shown in **Table 5.12-1**, 76.8 percent of the City's population was below 45 years old in 2000, compared to the County where 70 percent of the population less than 45 years old. Based on the 2000 Census, the population of Moreno Valley continues to have a younger population since 37 percent of its population is younger than 18 years or old, compared to the County, where 30 percent of its population is younger than 18 years or old.

TABLE 5.12-1
2000 AGE DISTRIBUTION

Age Group	Moreno Valley	County of Riverside
Under 24 Years	47.3%	39.5%
25 to 44 Years	29.5%	28.9%
45 Years or Older	23.2%	31.6%

Source: 2000 Census

The Census 2000 estimated that 41,431 housing units were in Moreno Valley. The California Department of Finance estimated that 42,045 housing units were in the City as of January 1, 2002 and 46,944 as of January 1, 2005. This represents an increase of 4,899 units since the 2000 Census. Of the City's housing stock in 2005, 86.6 percent were single-family residences, 11.2 percent were multi-family residences, and 2.2 percent were mobile homes.

THRESHOLD FOR DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this EIR, a significant impact would occur if implementation of General Plan Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 would:

- *Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly;*
- *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or,*
- *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

General Plan Land Use Alternatives 1, 2, and 3

Implementation of General Plan Land Use Alternative 1, 2, or 3 would allow an increase of dwelling units and population within the project area. The following summarizes the expected population and dwelling units for the buildout of General Plan Land Use Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, as well as the resulting increase from existing conditions (see Table 3-1 in the Project Description):

- **Alternative 1** – 279,697 persons or 76,420 households (82% increase)
- **Alternative 2** – 304,966 persons or 83,324 households (98% increase)
- **Alternative-3** – 302,785 persons or 82,728 households (97% increase)

New residents will locate to the project area. The actual rate of development that may occur pursuant to the proposed General Plan Land Use Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 will depend on market conditions and other factors, such as availability of infrastructure or environmental constraints. The rate of population and housing growth resulting from the implementation of General Plan Land Use Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 would not differ substantially from each other or from recently experienced growth rates. Amendment of the General Plan could accommodate population growth, but would not induce growth. No significant impact is anticipated.

Implementation of General Plan Land Use Alternative 1, 2 or 3 would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing units or persons since the majority of the areas designated for future development consist of vacant land. Some residential units may be removed in conjunction with the redevelopment of land. Alternative 1 could indirectly result in the displacement of more existing housing than

Alternative 2 or 3. Alternative 1 designates a large part of the existing residential neighborhood of Edgemont in southwest Moreno Valley as Office and Commercial, which might encourage nonresidential development. Alternatives 2 and 3 designate most of that area as Residential/Office, which allows for residential development. This impact would not be large, however, as removal of a large number of units is not likely. As a result, no significant impact will result from the displacement of a large number of persons or housing units.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measure is proposed.

IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

Not significant

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit. E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2003, Revised 2002 and Revised 2001, with 2000 DRU Benchmark.
2. California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit. E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1/1/2005.

This page intentionally left blank.