C. POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section examines the effects of the Proposed Project related to population, housing, and employment. The Setting discussion describes existing regional and Citywide population, housing, and employment-related conditions and trends. The Impacts analysis describes anticipated changes to the population, employment, and housing characteristics of the Development Plan Area and greater San Francisco region. This analysis evaluates the potential for the Proposed Project to induce substantial unplanned population growth and to displace existing housing or residents for both project-level and cumulative population and housing as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project. Construction of the Proposed Project would be phased over an approximately 15- to 20-year period, with the completion of development expected to occur by 2030. Therefore, the time frame used in this analysis is the 20-year period from 2010 to 2030.


SETTING

REGIONAL AND CITYWIDE POPULATION AND HOUSING TRENDS

Population

In 2000, the population of the City and County of San Francisco was recorded by the U.S. Census as 776,733, ranking San Francisco as the second most populous city, behind San Jose, in the nine-county Bay Area, and the fourth most populous county, behind Santa Clara, Alameda, and Contra Costa.2 San Francisco is the most urbanized county, with the highest population and residential densities of the nine Bay Area counties. At that time, San Francisco comprised approximately 11.4 percent of the Bay Area’s total population (6,783,760 persons).3

As shown in Table IV.C.1, the population of the Bay Area grew by approximately 4.6 percent (a total population of 7,096,100 persons), an increase of approximately 312,340 persons, over the

1 ABAG is the regional agency responsible for preparing forecasts of population, housing, and job growth in the nine Bay Area counties and their cities. Though ABAG’s 2009 edition (Projections 2009) of its biennial forecast of population, housing, jobs, and income for the nine-county San Francisco Bay region is available, this EIR analysis uses ABAG’s 2007 edition (Projections 2007).


five-year period between 2000 and 2005.\textsuperscript{4} Between 2000 and 2005, the regional population of the Bay Area grew by about 1 percent per year, and it is expected to grow at about this same rate through 2030. During that same period of 2000-2005, the population of San Francisco grew by approximately 2.4 percent (a total population of 795,800 persons) an increase of approximately 19,070 people.

### Table IV.C.1: San Francisco and Bay Area Population Growth Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>776,733</td>
<td>795,800</td>
<td>+2.4 %</td>
<td>808,700</td>
<td>+1.6 %</td>
<td>922,600</td>
<td>+14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>6,783,762</td>
<td>7,096,100</td>
<td>+4.6 %</td>
<td>7,412,500</td>
<td>+4.5 %</td>
<td>8,712,800</td>
<td>+17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census 2000 Data; ABAG, Projections 2007

By 2010, the population of the Bay Area is expected to grow by approximately 4.5 percent (a total population of 7,412,500 persons), an increase of about 316,400 persons between 2005 and 2010. During that same 2005–2010 period, the population of San Francisco is expected to grow by approximately 1.6 percent (total population of 808,700 persons), an increase of about 12,900 persons. For the 20-year period between 2010 and 2030, around the time period of the Proposed Project’s buildout, ABAG projects an overall Bay Area population growth increase of 17.5 percent (a total population of 8,712,800 persons), an increase of approximately 1,300,300 persons. Over 70 percent of that growth would be accommodated in Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara Counties. ABAG projects that the population of San Francisco will increase by about 14.1 percent (approximately 113,900 additional people) during that same time period, for a projected total population of 922,600. In 2030, the population of San Francisco is expected to be approximately 10.6 percent of the Bay Area’s total population.

As shown in Table IV.C.1, San Francisco’s total population has grown at a slightly slower rate than the region as a whole since 2000, a trend that is expected to continue through 2030. This slower rate of population growth in the City is due, in part, to housing prices in San Francisco, increased housing opportunities in the Sacramento and Central Valley areas, and a cyclical decline in the City’s role as a regional employment center.

### Housing

The U.S. Census 2000 data show that the average household size for the San Francisco Bay Area is 2.69 persons per unit.\textsuperscript{5} ABAG Projections 2007 reports that the average household size for the nine-county Bay Area continued to be 2.69 persons per unit in 2005, and it is expected to remain

\textsuperscript{4} ABAG, Projections 2007, December 2006, pp. 35-36.
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at that level through 2030.6 The U.S. Census for 2000 reported an average household size in the City and County of San Francisco of 2.3 persons per unit.7 San Francisco has a comparatively small number of family households in comparison to the Bay Area as a whole, and this proportion is continuing to shrink. ABAG Projections 2007 estimated a slight dip in the number of persons per household in 2005 (2.29 persons per household), and estimated further decreases in the estimated number of persons per household in the City by 2010 (2.26 persons per household). By 2030, however, the household size is anticipated to slightly increase to 2.33 persons per household.8 ABAG projected that the total number of households in San Francisco (which roughly equates to the number of housing units) would be 338,920 in 2005, and it projects 348,330 total households for 2010.9 Household growth, an approximation of the demand for housing, is expected to grow approximately 11 percent, from 348,330 in 2010 to 386,680 by 2030. This would be an increase of 38,350 households.10

Residential densities within San Francisco vary by neighborhood, from an average of 25 dwelling units per acre in the Richmond and Sunset districts to 40 dwelling units per acre in the Mission district, and 86 dwelling units per acre in the Chinatown and North Beach districts. Existing residential density within the Development Plan Area currently averages about 13.5 dwelling units per acre.11

Employment

According to Projections 2007, the total number of jobs anticipated in the City in 2005 was 553,090 and is estimated to reach approximately 593,370 in 2010. By 2030, the City is projected to have a total of approximately 782,560 jobs, an increase of 189,190 jobs.12 In 2005, ABAG estimated 3,449,460 total jobs in the Bay Area, and estimates a 7.1 percent increase in the number of jobs by 2010 (3,693,920). From 2010 through 2030, the total number of jobs in the nine-county Bay Area is expected to increase by almost 1,227,760 jobs. In this context, the City’s share of regional employment is expected to remain about the same, with a slight decline from

---

6 ABAG, Projections 2007, p. 35.  
8 ABAG, Projections 2007, p. 139.  
9 Households are based on the number of units divided by the number of persons per household. This total does not account for units that are vacant and, therefore, may slightly overstate the total number of households.  
10 ABAG, Projections 2007, p. 139.  
11 Existing residential density is based on 908 total dwelling units (du), including occupiable and non-occupiable units, in the existing residential area on Treasure Island (67.5 acres divided by 908 units on Treasure Island = 13.5 du/acre rounded). Due to the steep topography, and configuration of Yerba Buena Island, estimates of residential land area on Yerba Buena Island are not available.  
12 ABAG, Projections 2007, p. 139.
16 to 15.9 percent.\textsuperscript{13} Maintaining this job share ensures San Francisco’s continuing role as an employment hub, making full use of existing transportation and urban services infrastructure.

ABAG projected the City to have about 388,100 employed residents in 2005, and estimates roughly a 1.9 percent increase in the number of employed residents by 2010 (395,500). In 2010, about 76 percent (300,580) of these employed residents are anticipated to be employed in the City itself, while about 24 percent (94,920) of the employed residents would commute to jobs outside of the City.\textsuperscript{14} The total number of the City’s employed residents is projected to increase to approximately 481,800 by 2030. Assuming the same percentage (24 percent) of the City’s employed residents would continue to commute to jobs elsewhere (or 115,630), about 76 percent (or 366,170) of these employed residents would live and work in the City in 2030.

Jobs and Housing Balance in San Francisco

The \textit{San Francisco General Plan} Housing Element summarizes population, housing, and employment challenges facing the City in the future. Notable jobs-housing challenges include a lag in the number of new housing units compared to population and employment growth during the past ten years; the mismatch between income from available jobs and the cost of housing in the City, resulting in a large number of commuters, increased commute time, and adverse effects on traffic and air quality; and a lag in the construction of affordable housing compared to demand.

2010 Estimated Jobs-to-Household Ratio

According to ABAG \textit{Projections 2007} there were an estimated total of 553,090 jobs and 338,920 households in the City in 2005. By 2010 these totals are anticipated to increase to about 593,370 total jobs and 348,330 total households or occupied housing units. Based on these numbers, the City is expected to have 1.7 jobs-to-household in 2010. There are expected to be approximately 395,500 employed residents in the City in 2010, averaging about 1.14 wage-earners per household.

2010–2030 Estimated Jobs-to-Household Ratio

As noted previously, between 2010 and 2030, the City’s population is projected to grow from 808,700 to about 922,600 persons, and the City’s households are projected to grow from 348,330

\textsuperscript{13} ABAG, \textit{Projections 2007}, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{14} According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s \textit{American Community Survey 2006-2008}, about 75.8 percent of the City’s employed residents work in the City itself. 
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ADPTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=05000US06075&-qr_name=ACS_2008_3YR_G00_DP3YR3&-context=adp&-ds_name=&-tree_id=3308&-_lang=en&-redoLog=false&-format=, accessed April 6, 2010. A copy of the \textit{ACS 2006-2008} tables is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.
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To about 386,680. During this same time period, the number of jobs in the City is projected to increase from 593,370 to about 782,560. As a result, the jobs-to-household ratio in the City is projected to be 2.02 by 2030, an increase from the 2010 jobs-to-household ratio of 1.7. Because the City is projected to experience a 31.9 percent increase in jobs and only a 14.1 percent increase in population, the City’s jobs-to-household ratio is projected to become less balanced over the long term. However, a higher number of wage earners per household is anticipated in the City by 2030, with 481,800 employed residents, representing about 1.24 wage earners per household, which is higher than the 1.14 wage earners per household anticipated for 2010.

2010–2030 Estimated Jobs-to-Employed-Persons Ratio

To account for retired persons and other residents who are not employed, another useful relationship to consider is the ratio of jobs to the total number of employed persons. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, out of a total Citywide population of approximately 776,730, about 437,530 persons were employed either in the City or elsewhere, with the remainder unemployed or out of the labor force entirely. In 2000, the jobs (642,500) to employed residents (437,530) ratio was 1.47. In 2010, the ratio of jobs (593,370) to employed residents (395,500) is anticipated to be 1.5. And by 2030, the ratio of jobs (782,560) to employed residents (481,800) is expected to be about 1.62. Thus, the number of jobs provided in the City is projected to continue to outpace the number of employed City residents over the next 20 years.

Housing Needs

In order to respond to statewide population and household growth, and to ensure the availability of decent affordable housing for all income groups, in 1981 the state enacted Government Code Section 65584, which requires each Council of Governments ("COG") to periodically distribute state-identified housing needs to all jurisdictions within its region. ABAG serves as the COG for the Bay Area. Government Code Section 65584 requires that a city’s share of regional housing needs include housing needs of persons at all income levels. The different income levels to be studied within the parameters of state-mandated local Housing Elements, which must be prepared by every city and county in California, are “Very Low Income,” “Low Income,” “Moderate Income,” and “Above Moderate Income.” Based on a Federal Housing and Urban Development formula, San Francisco’s Area Median Income in 2008 was estimated to be approximately $75,450 for a two-person household and approximately $84,850 for a three-person household. Table IV.C.2, presents the City’s distribution of income levels based on this formula.

---

15 ABAG, Projections 2007, p. 139.
Table IV.C.2: Income Distribution of San Francisco Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage of SF Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>≤ 50% of AMIb</td>
<td>$22,650 – $42,450</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>50% – 80% of AMI</td>
<td>$37,750 – $67,900</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>80% – 120% of AMI</td>
<td>$60,350 – $84,850</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above moderate</td>
<td>&gt;120% of AMI</td>
<td>&gt;$90,550</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a “AMI” – Area Median Income equals approximately $75,450 for two-person and $84,850 for three-person households.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, San Francisco Planning Department, and Turnstone Consulting

The ABAG Policy Board established housing needs for all jurisdictions within its boundaries for the 2007-2014 planning period by using a “fair share” approach, based on household and job growth of the region as well as regional income level percentages. Each jurisdiction is required by State law to incorporate its housing need numbers into an updated version of its general plan housing element. According to ABAG’s *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan 2007–2014*, the Bay Area’s overall housing need would be for a total of about 214,500 new residential dwelling units,16 of which San Francisco’s share is a total of 31,193, or an average yearly need of 4,456 units. In terms of affordability, the distribution of those housing units is as follows:17

- Very Low Income (≤50% of median income) 6,589 units
- Low Income (50–80% of median income) 5,535 units
- Moderate Income (80–120% of median income) 6,754 units
- Above Moderate Income (>120% of median income) 12,315 units

**Total Housing Need for San Francisco (2007–2014) 31,193 units**

From 1989 to 1998, 10,696 net new housing units18 were added Citywide, ranging from a low of about 288 units (1993) to a high of about 2,345 units (1989). The Citywide annual average during that period was about 1,069 net new units. From 1999 to 2008, 20,851 net new housing units were added Citywide, ranging from a low of about 1,619 units (2001) to a high of about 3,019 units (2008). The Citywide annual average during that period was about 2,085 net new units, slightly less than a doubling in production over the previous ten-year period.19 At the end of the second quarter of 2009 (June 30, 2009) approximately 2,850 building permits had been

17 Ibid.
18 Net new units are equal to new units constructed minus units demolished plus units gained or (lost) from alterations.
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approved, issued, or reinstated.\textsuperscript{20} In order to meet current regional housing need projections, the City would need to increase its share of housing unit production to an average 4,456 units per year. Thus, the City is currently not on track to meet its share of the regional housing needs allocation forecasted for the 2007-2014 planning period.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA

Population

In 2000, there were approximately 1,450 residents within the Development Plan Area.\textsuperscript{21} Based on ABAG’s 2010 projection of 2.26 persons per household, the current population on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island is estimated to be about 1,820 persons (805 occupiable units multiplied by 2.26).

Housing

The Project Area includes about 805 occupiable dwelling units. There are about 725 occupiable dwelling units on Treasure Island and about 80 on Yerba Buena Island. This represents roughly 0.23 percent of the total number of households within San Francisco.

Of the 725 dwelling units on Treasure Island, about 250 are operated by the Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative (“TIHDI”), which provides housing for formerly homeless (extremely low income) individuals and families.

Employment

In addition to the 805 occupiable dwelling units within the Development Plan Area, there are also about 100 buildings with existing and former non-residential uses on Treasure Island. These uses include space for retail, office, schools, public services (police and fire), recreational uses (sailing center), and maintenance. Existing uses within the Development Plan Area employ about 320 persons (see Table IV.C.4, p. IV.C.12). Employment associated with the existing Job Corps Campus, and temporary construction employees associated with construction of the east span of the Bay Bridge are not included in the total number of existing employees within the Development Plan Area.

Refer to Section IV.A, Land Use and Land Use Planning, for additional summaries of existing land use conditions within the Project Area.

\textsuperscript{20} San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Pipeline Report 2009 Quarter 2, July 2009, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{21} Based on Census 2000 data for Census Tract 179.02 (the tract in which the Development Plan Area is located).
REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

State

- **Infrastructure Financing District**

Financing for infrastructure is proposed to be obtained by TIDA using an Infrastructure Financing District mechanism. Sections 53395.5 and 53395.14 of the Government Code allow for the establishment of an Infrastructure Financing District (“IFD”) to fund specified public facilities and infrastructure improvements. Within an IFD, State law requires that whenever residential units housing low- or moderate-income persons or families are destroyed or taken out of the low- and moderate-income market as part the activities of an IFD, the district must cause replacement of those units with new or rehabilitated low- and moderate-income units within four years after they are destroyed or removed from the housing market. In addition, within an IFD, 20 percent of the units that are destroyed or removed that are occupied by persons or families above moderate income must be replaced within the four-year time frame. Replacement units may be located anywhere within the district. All of the replacement units must be affordable to low- or moderate-income households.

Community Redevelopment Law

- California Health and Safety Code Section 33334.6 states that the provision of housing is a fundamental purpose of redevelopment. Under the California Redevelopment Law\(^\text{22}\) (“CRL”) Section F, California Health and Safety Code, Section 33680-33692, redevelopment agencies must annually deposit at least 20 percent of the gross tax increment received into a low- and moderate-income housing fund. In addition to the requirement to create funding for affordable housing, the CRL requires a redevelopment agency to produce affordable housing totaling at least 15 percent of all new units within the redevelopment plan project area. Not less than 6 percent of all new units must be affordable to very low-income households, with the remaining 9 percent affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. The housing production requirement must be met every ten years during the life of the redevelopment plan. Redevelopment agencies may meet the housing production obligation by producing units outside the project area on a two-for-one basis. Redevelopment agencies may also meet their housing production requirements by acquiring long-term affordability covenants on existing housing.

\(^{22}\) California Health and Safety Code, Sections 33680-33692.
If the Proposed Project were to include a redevelopment plan, TIDA would serve as the redevelopment agency responsible for implementing any such redevelopment plan. The Project is no longer proposed to include a redevelopment plan under the CRL. For this reason, the requirements of the CRL are not directly applicable to the Proposed Project.

**Regional**

**Bay Area Regional Housing Needs Plan**

The California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") is responsible for determining the overall regional housing need and for initiating the process by which each COG then distributes its share of regional need to all jurisdictions within its region. Government Code Section 65584 requires development of a new Regional Housing Needs Assessment ("RHNA") every five years. In June 2008, ABAG released its *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan*, which identifies the San Francisco Bay Area’s housing needs determination for the 2007–2014 planning period.

**Local**

**San Francisco Housing Element**

The 2004 *Housing Element* update was adopted by the San Francisco Planning Commission on May 13, 2004 and was found in compliance with state housing element requirements by HCD in October of 2004. Subsequent to adoption of the 2004 *Housing Element*, the California Courts of Appeal found that the Negative Declaration prepared in support of the 2004 *Housing Element* was
inadequate and required the preparation of an environmental impact report. Under the terms of the Writ of Mandate issued by the San Francisco Superior Court, the City may rely on the 2004 Housing Element, minus policies, objectives, and implementation measures that were stricken as a result of the lawsuit. Such policies cannot be adopted until completion of an EIR. As required by State law, San Francisco is due to complete its next five-year Housing Element Update, and the Planning Department has prepared a 2009 Draft Housing Element for environmental review. In an effort to comply with the court order requiring an EIR for the 2004 Housing Element and to review the updated 2009 Draft Housing Element pursuant to CEQA, the City is preparing an EIR to identify the environmental impacts resulting from the proposed objectives, policies, and implementation measures identified as part of the 2004 Housing Element Update and the 2009 Draft Housing Element at an equal level of detail.

At the time the 2004 Housing Element was prepared, the proposed Project Area remained in U.S. Navy ownership, although there were ongoing discussions between the City and the Navy at the time to transfer ownership in the future. Consequently, Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island were not explicitly included in the housing policies or background housing supply and needs assessments of the 2004 Housing Element update. However, Policy 12.2 of the 2004 Housing Element supports well-planned housing regionwide to address regional housing needs and to support improved overall quality of life in the Bay Area. Treasure Island is identified as a large surplus public land/redevelopment area where the City plans to continue to support efforts to develop high-density housing and new jobs and services.

The 2009 Draft Housing Element identifies Treasure Island as one of three areas of public land within San Francisco that are identified as opportunity sites expected to accommodate additional housing units.23

**IMPACTS**

**SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

The City and County of San Francisco has not formally adopted significance thresholds for impacts related to population and housing. The Planning Department’s Initial Study Checklist form provides a framework of topics to be considered in evaluating potential impacts under CEQA. Implementation of a project could have a potentially significant impact related to population and housing if it were to:

- Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for instance, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

---

23 San Francisco Planning Department, Draft Housing Element 2009, April 2009, p. 63.
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- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing.
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(e) notes that an economic or social change by itself would not be considered a significant effect on the environment. Population growth is considered in the context of local and regional plans and population, housing, and employment projections. Generally, a project that induces population growth is not viewed as having a significant impact on the environment unless this growth is unplanned or results in significant physical impacts on the environment. Thus, the growth and changes in employment and population that would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project would not be adverse physical impacts in and of themselves. However, the physical changes needed to accommodate project-related growth may have physical impacts on the environment. Project-related growth and the increase in population on the Islands would primarily result in physical changes in transportation, noise, air emissions, increased demand for public services, increased demand for utility capacity, and increased demand for recreational facilities. These physical impacts are evaluated under other environmental topics in this chapter such as Section IV.E, Transportation; Section IV.F, Noise; Section IV.G, Air Quality; Section IV.H, Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Section IV.J, Recreation; Section IV.K, Utilities; Section IV.L, Public Services; and Section IV.Q, Minerals and Energy Resources.

The Proposed Project would replace the existing occupiable 805 units on Treasure Island (about 725 units) and Yerba Buena Island (about 80 units) with up to approximately 8,000 new residential units; about 140,000 square feet (“sq. ft.”) of new commercial and retail space; approximately 100,000 sq. ft. of new office space; adaptive reuse of historic Buildings 1, 2, and 3 with up to approximately 311,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, which includes about 67,000 sq. ft. of adaptively reused retail space; approximately 500 hotel rooms; 300 acres of parks and open space; bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities; a Ferry Terminal and intermodal Transit Hub; and new and/or upgraded public services and utilities, including a new or upgraded wastewater treatment plant, public school, and a new combined police and fire station. Initial buildout under the Proposed Project would be implemented in four phases, anticipated to occur over a 15- to 20-year period from approximately 2011 through 2030. For purposes of population impact analysis in this EIR, project buildout is assumed to be the year 2030.

The Development Program would increase the average overall residential density within the Development Plan Area from about 13.5 housing units per acre to about 100–110 housing units per acre.
The analysis compares the population, housing, and employment characteristics that would result from implementation of the Proposed Project to existing conditions, defined as 2010 in ABAG’s 2007 Projections. The 2010 ABAG data are used because they are the most current data consistently available for the Development Plan Area across all population, employment, and housing indices. Table IV.C.3 shows the number of housing units and the population within the Development Plan Area for 2010 and 2030. Table IV.C.4 shows existing and projected (2030) employment within the Development Plan Area.

**Table IV.C.3: Existing (2010) and Future (2030) Number of Housing Units and Total Population within the Development Plan Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Year 2030</th>
<th>Net New Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Units within Development Plan Area</td>
<td>805 units&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replaced Units&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>805 units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>805 units</td>
<td>8,000 units</td>
<td><strong>7,195 net new units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>1,820 persons</td>
<td>18,640 persons</td>
<td><strong>16,820 net new persons</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Total population is calculated using ABAG’s projected 2.26 persons per household for 2010 and 2.33 persons per household for 2030 from Projections 2007, and it is assumed that all units are fully occupied. This calculation does not include population or housing on the Job Corps or Coast Guard sites that would remain within the Project Area.
- <sup>a</sup> Total number of occupiable units.
- <sup>b</sup> Existing units that would be replaced as new units with the Proposed Project.

**Source:** ABAG Projections 2007, Turnstone Consulting

The analysis considers whether the Proposed Project would contribute to substantial<sup>24</sup> residential population growth. Direct population growth in the Development Plan Area would include the residents and employees who would occupy the newly developed housing units and businesses, as well as temporary construction employment. Indirect growth is often defined as development that occurs as infrastructure is expanded to previously un-served or under-served areas. These types of development patterns typically occur in suburban areas adjacent to or near undeveloped lands. The analysis also considers whether substantial numbers of residents or housing units would be displaced.

---

<sup>24</sup> Substantial growth is defined as increases in population that are unplanned, without consideration of or planning for infrastructure, services, and housing needed to support proposed residents, employees, and visitors.
## Table IV.C.4: Employment Projections for the Development Plan Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Employment</th>
<th>Proposed Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Development Project</th>
<th>Proposed Employment (2030)</th>
<th>Net New Employment (2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential^b</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8,000 units</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (new)</td>
<td>140,000 sq ft.</td>
<td>465^c</td>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings 1, 2, and 3</td>
<td>110^d</td>
<td>311,000 sq ft.</td>
<td>680^e</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes retail entertainment, community services, food production uses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (new)</td>
<td>100,000 sq ft.</td>
<td>360^f</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>500 rooms</td>
<td>400^g</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>95^h</td>
<td>105,000 sq ft.</td>
<td>75^i</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>48,500 sq ft.</td>
<td>10^j</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Museum</td>
<td>75,000 sq ft.</td>
<td>120^k</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-Fire Station</td>
<td>30,000 sq ft.</td>
<td>110^l</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing Center/Ferry Terminal/Marina</td>
<td>15,000 sq ft.</td>
<td>5^m</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Fields/Open Space</td>
<td>300 acres</td>
<td>100^n</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Miscellaneous^p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

^a Due to the range of proposed uses, and the adaptive reuse of existing buildings that were formerly used as naval facilities, estimation of existing and projected employment was developed using a number of sources. Unless otherwise noted, existing and proposed employment data is provided by Economic Planning Systems: Table 1b, Employment Projections (2007–2020) Treasure Island Redevelopment, EPS #12100, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. March 31, 2008, and April 13, 2010; TIDA written communication on April 12–13, 2010; the San Francisco Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (2002); and employment projections from recent San Francisco EIRs (such as the Exploratorium Relocation EIR, and Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard EIR).

^b Residential employment factors: Existing (48) and Proposed 8,000 units x 15 units/employee (533). (Figures are rounded.)

^c Assumes 300 sq. ft./employee.

^d There are currently about 10 existing employees in the TIDA office. Assumes an average of 26 employees (Hangar 2) and an average of 76 employees (Hangar 3) for Island Creative commercial.

^e Square footage totals in Buildings 1, 2, and 3 include 150,000 sq ft. in entertainment space; 67,000 sq ft. in retail space; 30,000 sq ft. in community services space; 22,000 sq ft. in food production; and 42,000 sq ft. in excess building circulation space. Projected employment for the historic buildings after reuse is: Building 1, 363 gross square feet ("gsf") per employee; Building 2, 500 gsf/employee; and Building 3, 500 gsf/employee.

^f Assumes 276 gsf/employee pursuant to the Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, October 2002.

^g Assumes 0.8 employees/room.

^h Based on the employment factor of 675 sq. ft./employee. Assumes about 65,000 sq. ft. of existing school buildings on Treasure Island.

^i Assumes 75 proposed employees for school and daycare-type uses.

^j Assumes 11 proposed employees for community center-type uses.

^k Based on the employment factor of 606 sq. ft./employee. (Exploratorium Relocation Project Initial Study, November 2007.)

^l Assumes 110 proposed police and fire employees.

^m Assumes 3 proposed sailing center and 4 total Ferry Terminal and Marina (landside) employees.

^n Assumes 0.3 employees per acre of open space, 4 employees for cultural park, and 6 employees for urban farm.

^p Assumes proposed employees for paid parking spaces (5), recycling center (4), energy generation (12), wastewater treatment (6), and on-island shuttles (28).

**Source:** Economic Planning Systems 2008 and April 13, 2010, Turnstone Consulting 2010
PROJECT IMPACTS

Construction Impacts

Impact PH-1: *The Proposed Project would induce substantial direct temporary population growth during project construction.* *(Less than Significant)*

The Proposed Project would be phased over a 15- to 20-year construction period. Direct, but temporary, construction job growth within the Development Plan Area would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. Daily average construction employment is estimated for the various construction phases of the Proposed Project. During Phase 1, an average of 930 and a maximum of 1,250 construction employees are anticipated. During Phase 2, an average of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,350 construction employees are anticipated. During Phase 3, an average of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,500 construction employees are anticipated. During Phase 4, an average of 1,150 and a maximum of 1,300 construction employees are anticipated. Lastly, during Phase 5, an average of 800 and a maximum of 950 construction employees are anticipated.

The Bay Area has an adequate pool of skilled construction workers from which the Proposed Project would be able to draw. It is anticipated that construction employees would commute from elsewhere in the Bay Area rather than relocate to the Project Area for a temporary construction assignment. Construction programs associated with the Proposed Project would aim to maximize hiring among locally disadvantaged City residents, as stated in the Project Objectives (see Chapter II, Project Description, pp. II.4–II.6). Thus, development of the Proposed Project would not generate a substantial, unplanned population increase. Impacts associated with construction employment would be less than significant, and therefore no mitigation is required.

Operations Impacts

Impact PH-2: *The Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people and/or existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing.* *(Less than Significant)*

There are approximately 805 households currently residing within the Development Plan Area. To ensure that the households occupying these units have the opportunity to continue living within the Project Area if they choose, the Proposed Project would include a transition housing program detailed in the Disposition and Development Agreement (“DDA”). The DDA would require that all existing residents of the Islands who reside on the Islands as of the date of the DDA approval and who continuously remain residents in good standing during project construction and development be given an opportunity to move into new housing built during phased construction of the Proposed Project. The express intent of the transition housing program is to avoid displacement of existing residents. The new housing would be leased to the existing residents eligible for transition housing at a price no greater than their rent at the time...
of DDA approval, plus annual adjustments for inflation. Depending upon the income of the household, the housing may be leased at rents lower than the household’s rent at the time of DDA approval, plus annual adjustments for inflation. Transitioning households would also receive moving assistance to cover the costs associated with their move to the new units. Finally, the transition housing program would include down payment assistance for eligible transitioning households who wish to purchase a home on the island, as long as they can qualify to do so.

Thus, the transition housing program included in the Proposed Project would ensure that the Project would not result in the displacement of existing residents, which would necessitate the construction of new housing elsewhere or generate demand for new housing, beyond the number of units already provided as part of the Proposed Project. Although the existing 805 units would be demolished, the Proposed Project would construct 7,195 net new units (for a total of 8,000 units) resulting in a net increase in the total number of residential units. Therefore, even if a substantial portion of the existing residents were to choose to move from the Islands to other locations, the Proposed Project would result in a net increase in housing supply and thus would not create demand for additional housing that would require construction of housing elsewhere. Overall, the Proposed Project would result in a net new increase in housing supply that would help meet the region’s unmet demand for housing.

For these reasons, displacement impacts as a result of construction of the Proposed Project would have less-than-significant impacts on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, and mitigation is not necessary.

**Impact PH-3: The Proposed Project would not induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly. (Less than Significant)**

The Proposed Project would concentrate population growth on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.25 As shown in Table IV.C.2, on p. IV.C.6, full occupancy of the 7,195 net additional residential units within the Development Plan Area would increase the existing on-site residential population from about 1,820 people to about 18,640 people in 2030.26 The net increase of about 16,820 residents would increase population to approximately ten times that of the existing population in the Project Area. ABAG’s *Projections 2007* estimates that the City will gain about 113,900 persons between 2010 and 2030. Though population increase on the Islands would be

---

25 The Job Corps campus is located within the Project Area, but is not included as part of the Proposed Project. Therefore, this facility is not included in any population, housing, or employment factors.

26 ABAG *Projections 2007* uses 2.26 persons per household for 2010 and 2.33 persons per household for 2030 forecasts. Existing population was calculated by multiplying the number of existing housing units on the Islands by this number (805 x 2.26 = 1,819 (rounded to 1,820). Projected population for 2030 was calculated by multiplying the total number of proposed housing units in the Development Plan Area by projected persons per household.
considerable from a localized perspective, the total projected population would represent about 14.8 percent of the Citywide population growth expected by 2030.

The Proposed Project would increase residential units per acre from approximately 13.5 dwelling units per acre to about 100 to 110 dwelling units per acre and would establish design guidelines to enhance the residential neighborhood character of the area while accommodating the increase in population growth on site. If the Proposed Project is implemented, at buildout the Development Plan Area would have a total population of about 18,640 residents. The increase in residential population would conform with ABAG’s designation of Treasure Island as one of ten urban areas with the potential to accommodate substantial population growth in the City and Bay Area region.

The Proposed Project would increase the City’s housing stock and would therefore contribute to the City’s ability to meet its need for housing options of varying sizes, types, and levels of affordability. TIDA has agreed to provide up to 2,000 units that would be affordably priced at a range of below-market rates, which is 25 percent of the total project housing units. At least 20 percent of the affordable units would be affordable to very low-income residents. The Proposed Project, as a whole, would exceed the 15 percent inclusionary housing requirement in Section 415 of the Planning Code. The Proposed Project would also exceed the California Community Redevelopment Law requirement that 15 percent of all new housing units be affordable to low- and moderate-income households, although this requirement would no longer be applicable. The Proposed Project would also exceed the requirements of State law for an Infrastructure Financing District (“IFD”). Under State law, within an IFD, if residential units housing low- or moderate-income persons or families are destroyed or taken out of the low- and moderate-income market as part the activities of an IFD, the district must cause replacement of those units with new or rehabilitated low- and moderate-income units within four years after they are destroyed or removed from the housing market. In addition, within an IFD, 20 percent of the units that are destroyed or removed that are occupied by persons or families above moderate income must be replaced within the four-year time frame. Replacement units may be located anywhere within the district. All of the replacement units must be affordable to low- or moderate-income households. The Proposed Project is expected to include approximately 5 percent of the units (up to about 316) in market-rate buildings, which would be sold or leased as inclusionary housing.

27 San Francisco County Priority Development Area Projects include the Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point project; Balboa Park and Market Octavia Neighborhoods; Downtown Neighborhoods and Transit Infill Areas; Eastern Neighborhoods; Mission Bay; Port of San Francisco; Transbay Terminal; Treasure Island; San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area; and the 19th Avenue Corridor (County Line to Eucalyptus Drive).
The Proposed Project would also include land and funding to replace 250 units in the existing TIHDI housing, as well as land for an additional 185 residential units, expanding the program to a total of 435 units subject to conveyance of the Property to TIDA and implementation of the Proposed Project. These TIHDI housing units would generally be for formerly homeless (extremely low-income) families. Up to around 1,249 units (a mix of rental and for-sale units) would be in stand-alone, completely affordable buildings. A minimum of 20 percent of the proposed residences would be sized for families.28

Below-market-rate units included in the Proposed Project would be affordable to very low-, low-, or moderate-income levels. The proposed number of market-rate (6,000) and below-market-rate (2,000) units would be expected to support the City’s efforts to meet its regional housing needs allocation (31,190 units) and the total Bay Area housing need of 214,500 units projected by

---

28 For analysis purpose, it is assumed that the proposed 8,000 residences would include about 2,005 studio and one-bedroom units, and about 5,995 units with two or more bedrooms.
ABAG through 2014.\textsuperscript{29} The proposed units would increase the City’s supply of affordable housing units available for “very low” income levels.

Overall, the Proposed Project would be expected to increase the average residential density in the Development Plan Area and concentrate growth in one of the City’s Priority Development Areas: Treasure Island. The net increase in residential population is conservatively estimated to be up to 16,820 persons. This would substantially increase the existing total population on the Islands, but not beyond that which has been expected and incorporated into local and regional planning efforts. Portions of the Development Plan Area are underdeveloped and have the potential to absorb substantially more residential population growth if adequate infrastructure and transportation services are provided as with the Proposed Project. The resulting residential densities in the Development Plan Area would not exceed levels that are permitted, common, and accepted in urban areas such as San Francisco. The number of residential units would increase from 13.5 housing unit per acre of land area to 100–110 units for every acre of land area.

The Development Plan Area is geographically isolated from other development areas. Proposed infrastructure to serve the Proposed Project is planned to connect to the existing facilities and capacity of the City water and wastewater facilities. There would no expansion or increase in facilities beyond what is required to provide service to the proposed Development Plan Area. The on-site infrastructure needed to support the level of growth anticipated under the Proposed Project was based on projections that included the residential component of the Proposed Project.

The need for infrastructure, public services, and housing associated with direct population growth proposed for the Project Area has been anticipated in the proposed Development Program, Infrastructure Plan, and Design for Development that would be adopted as part of the Project approval process. Infrastructure and services would be expanded to serve the Proposed Project, without significant excess capacity that would encourage additional local growth beyond that already planned for in this Priority Development Area.

The Proposed Project would provide on-site infrastructure, public service facilities, and utilities, including on-site treatment of wastewater. Expansion to infrastructure and facilities (i.e., road and transit expansions and new utilities), would be necessary to provide adequate services, to the Proposed Project. However, given the geographic isolation of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island from other areas in and around San Francisco, there would be no significant excess capacity associated with infrastructure improvements that might encourage additional local growth. As a result, impacts associated with direct and indirect population growth are considered less than significant, and mitigation is not necessary.

\textsuperscript{29} ABAG, \textit{San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan 2007–2014}, p. 43.
Therefore, the Proposed Project would increase residential population in an established urban area with a high level of planned local and regional transit access. It would not expand or build new infrastructure that would support growth beyond what is planned by Proposed Project. Thus, impacts associated with direct population growth would be less than significant and mitigation is not necessary. As stated earlier, the physical impacts of the increased population on the Project Area are addressed within other relevant sections of this EIR.

**Employment Impacts**

**Construction**

There would be direct, but temporary, construction job growth within the Development Plan Area as a result of the Proposed Project. It is anticipated that construction employees not already living on the Islands would commute from elsewhere in the City or the Bay Area rather than relocate from more distant cities or towns. The Bay Area has an adequate pool of skilled construction workers from which the Proposed Project would be able to draw. Thus, construction of the Proposed Project would not generate a substantial, unplanned population increase. Impacts associated with construction employment would be less than significant, and mitigation is not necessary.

**Operations**

The increase in the residential population of the Development Plan Area would generate new demand for local goods and services. New uses include about 140,000 sq. ft. of new commercial and retail space; approximately 100,000 sq. ft. of new office space; adaptive reuse of historic Buildings 1, 2, and 3 with up to approximately 311,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, which includes about 67,000 sq. ft. of adaptively reused retail space; approximately 500 hotel rooms; 300 acres of parks and open space; bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities; a Ferry Terminal and intermodal Transit Hub; and new and/or upgraded public services and utilities, including a new or upgraded wastewater treatment plant, public school, and combined police and fire station. Table IV.C.4, p. IV.C.12, shows the existing and future employment characteristics of the Development Plan Area. There are currently about 320 employees on the Islands. The Proposed Project would result in changes in business activity throughout the Islands, resulting in an increase in on-site employment. Employment growth would be considered substantial if it resulted in housing demand that would exceed planned regional housing development.

Employment generated by the Proposed Project is expected to total about 2,920 employees, with net new employment totaling about 2,600 jobs in the Development Plan Area. Table IV.C.5 presents the number of housing units that would be needed in San Francisco and other Bay Area communities to provide housing for the net new project-generated employees. Based on assumptions about commute patterns, household size, and employment, employment under the Proposed Project could generate a demand for up to 2,095 new dwelling units in the
San Francisco Bay Area (assuming that the employees do not already live in the San Francisco Bay Area).\textsuperscript{30}

### Table IV.C.5: Project Housing Demand (2010 to 2030)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net New Employment\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>2030 Demand, San Francisco\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>2030 Demand, Other Bay Area Communities\textsuperscript{c}</th>
<th>Total Demand</th>
<th>Proposed Net New Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,600 employees</td>
<td>1,595 units</td>
<td>500 units</td>
<td>2,095 units</td>
<td>7,195 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
\textsuperscript{a} It is assumed that all leasable space is fully occupied.
\textsuperscript{b} Net new project employment divided by 1.24 wage-earners per household (Year 2030) and multiplied by 76 percent.
\textsuperscript{c} Net new project employment divided by 1.24 wage-earners per household (Year 2030) and multiplied by 24 percent.

**Source:** Turnstone Consulting

The total project-related demand for housing resulting from the increase in on-site employment would represent about 5.4 percent of the City’s demand for housing and about 0.43 percent of the demand for housing in the Bay Area region in the period between 2010 and 2030.\textsuperscript{31} The 7,195 net new housing units that would be developed in the Development Plan Area would exceed the demand for new units in the City (1,595) generated by employment by the Proposed Project as well as the total demand generated by the Proposed Project for new units in the Bay Area (2,095). There would be a range of housing options provided in the Development Plan Area of varying sizes, types, and levels of affordability. These options would be developed in close proximity to the jobs provided by the Proposed Project, and therefore would provide opportunities for future employees on the Islands to seek housing in the Development Plan Area prior to searching for housing on the San Francisco mainland or the greater Bay Area region. However, if future employees did seek housing elsewhere in the area, the effects would not be significant in relation to the overall housing supply.

While the population increase associated with Proposed Project’s employment could be entirely accommodated within the Development Plan Area, it is likely that some employees would elect to live elsewhere in the City or within surrounding Bay Area communities. A percentage of the persons employed in the Development Plan Area would be expected to commute from other communities outside of the City. As noted in Table IV.C.5, based on existing commuting patterns, demand for about 500 units would be generated in surrounding Bay Area communities by the Proposed Project. This housing demand would be dispersed throughout the nine-county Bay Area, which would result in negligible potential increases in housing demand within the Bay Area.

\textsuperscript{30} This method divides the estimated project-generated employment (approximately 2,600 net new employees) by the projected number of workers per household in San Francisco in 2030 (1.24). This result, approximate housing demand of project-related employees (2,095), is multiplied by 76 percent, the proportion of jobs in San Francisco held by people who live in the City.

\textsuperscript{31} Percentages are calculated as a proportion of the anticipated growth in City and Bay Area households between 2010 and 2030 (38,350 new City households and 480,960 new Bay Area households.) Households are equivalent to housing units.
Employment on the Islands would not create a substantial demand for housing within the Development Plan Area, mainland San Francisco, or in the region that would be in excess of the housing provided as part of the Proposed Project or housing otherwise available in the Bay Area. The number of net new housing units provided by the Project would exceed demand generated by project-generated employees by about 5,100 units. Therefore, project-related demand for housing resulting from the increase in on-site employment would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Impact PH-4: The Proposed Project would not induce substantial cumulative growth in an area either directly or indirectly. (Less than Significant)

The Proposed Project would potentially contribute to cumulative population and housing in the context of existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable future development expected in the City and County of San Francisco. The geographic context for this analysis of cumulative impacts to population and housing is the City. The existing level of development in the City, described in the Setting on pp. IV.C.1–IV.C.3, represents the baseline conditions for the evaluation of cumulative impacts. Reasonably foreseeable future development forecasts are based on projections of future growth and take into account projects currently going through the entitlement process.

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts to employment includes the entire Bay Area (as represented by the ABAG Planning Area32), since a percentage of the City population commutes to jobs outside City limits, and significant numbers of residents of other cities in the Bay Area commute to jobs within the City. The existing employment conditions, representing past and present trends in this geographic area, are presented in Setting, on pp. IV.C.3–IV.C.4.

Population

ABAG recently developed projections for citywide growth in Projections 2009. These projections took into account San Francisco County Priority Development Area projects33 currently in various stages of the entitlement process, including the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Project. ABAG 2009 Projections estimate an increase in San Francisco of 54,020 households (400,700 total households), 124,800 persons (934,800 total

33 San Francisco County Priority Development Area Projects include the Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point project; Balboa Park and Market Octavia Neighborhoods; Downtown Neighborhoods and Transit Infill Areas; Eastern Neighborhoods; Mission Bay; Port of San Francisco; Transbay Terminal; Treasure Island; San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area; and the 19th Avenue Corridor (County Line to Eucalyptus Drive).
IV. Environmental Setting and Impacts
C. Population and Housing

population), and 179,370 jobs (748,100 total jobs) from 2010 to 2030.34 By 2035 San Francisco is expected to have 415,000 households, 969,000 persons, and 806,830 jobs. In 2035, the projected Citywide growth from these Priority Development Area projects is expected to account for about 56 percent of the anticipated number of households, 56 percent of the anticipated population growth, and about 81 percent of the anticipated number of jobs.35

The population increase associated with the Proposed Project has been included in ABAG’s overall population projections. Cumulative projects (i.e., the Proposed Project plus other anticipated development) fall within ABAG’s population projections for the City. The City and County of San Francisco actively engages in long-range, Citywide planning efforts. These planning efforts consider anticipated population growth, as well as demand on infrastructure, public services, and housing. Consequently, there is no anticipated significant cumulative impact associated with population and housing growth.

The Proposed Project would directly increase the on-site population within the context of an established urban area with high levels of local and regional transit services and facilities and would include other neighborhood amenities and services that could accommodate this increase. This direct population growth is considered planned growth since the Proposed Project has been considered in the City’s population planning projects. By 2035, approximately 56 percent of project population growth is expected to occur within the City’s Priority Development Areas, which includes the Proposed Project.36 Indirect growth (or unplanned growth) includes residential and employment growth in surrounding neighborhoods resulting from an expansion of local infrastructure and public services. The Proposed Project would improve the on-site infrastructure and transit services but would not build or expand infrastructure or public services that could encourage additional local growth beyond that already planned. The Project Area is physically separated from the other development sites in the region by San Francisco Bay and is not situated next to land that could accommodate new large-scale or infill development. Within the City and County of San Francisco, there are two other large-scale development projects being proposed, Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project (“Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Project”) and the Parkmerced Project; these, when combined with the Proposed Project, would create substantial population increases on a regional level. The Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Project includes about 10,500 dwelling units, and Parkmerced includes about 5,680 new dwelling units. However, because this population growth has been accounted for in ABAG’s population projections for the City, it would not be considered substantial, since the increase in population is forecasted, with consideration of planning for infrastructure, services, and housing needed to support proposed

---

34 These calculations are based on ABAG Projections 2009, p. 92. ABAG Projections 2007 did not specifically account for proposed developments at the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, Parkmerced, or Candlestick Point/Hunters Point sites.
35 ABAG Projections 2009, pp. 93-94.
36 Ibid.
residents, employees, and visitors. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to any potential cumulative impact related to substantial increases in population, and its cumulative impact would be less than significant.

**Housing**

As identified in ABAG’s *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan 2007–2014*, the regional housing needs allocation for the nine-county Bay Area is 214,500 dwelling units, with San Francisco’s share at 31,193 units. The Proposed Project would provide approximately 7,195 net new dwelling units, or over 23 percent of the City’s regional housing needs allocation and 3.3 percent of the total regional housing need. As noted on pp. IV.C.5–IV.C.7, over the course of the past several decades construction of housing in the region has failed to keep pace with population growth in the Bay Area. Although population growth has slowed and is predicted to continue at a relatively moderate rate through 2030, the region is still attempting to make up for housing shortages from previous growth periods. The demand for 2,095 housing units that would be generated by employment in the Proposed Project would be considerably less than the total number of units provided by the Proposed Project. Thus, the Proposed Project would provide a benefit to the region by constructing more housing than the demand it would generate, helping to improve the jobs-housing balance in the Bay Area. As a result, the Proposed Project’s contribution to the substantial cumulative housing shortage in the Bay Area would not be cumulatively considerable because it would provide more housing than is required by project-related demand, and the Proposed Project’s cumulative impact would be less than significant.

**Housing Demand**

The demand for housing units outside of the City generated by the Proposed Project, conservatively assuming that 24 percent of those employed within the Development Plan Area would commute from outside of San Francisco, would be dispersed throughout the nine-county Bay Area. The Proposed Project would not create a substantial demand for housing in San Francisco or the region in excess of the total number of housing units provided as part of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the population growth associated with increased project-related employment would not result in a housing demand that would exceed planned regional housing development, and would not be substantial. Because the employment increase associated with the Proposed Project would not be individually substantial or contribute to an exceedance of the City’s employment projections, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a potentially significant cumulative impact related to employment. Cumulative impacts related to physical environmental topics (like transportation, noise, and air quality) are discussed in other sections of this EIR.
Employment

Development at the Development Plan Area would provide about 2,600 net new permanent jobs by 2030 (in addition to temporary construction-related jobs generated by the Proposed Project). Regional projections indicate that by 2030 the San Francisco Bay Area will have about 4,738,730 jobs (up from 3,693,920 in 2010). Citywide projections indicate that by 2030 San Francisco will have about 782,560 jobs (up from 593,370 in 2010).37 San Francisco has traditionally experienced, and will continue to experience, employment opportunities that are not met by an equal supply of housing within the City, or even the Bay Area. The Proposed Project’s contribution of about 2,600 net new permanent jobs would represent about 0.05 percent of the anticipated increase in regional employment and 0.3 percent of the anticipated employment in San Francisco through 2030. The project-related employment would result in a related increase in housing demand for 2,095 units, as shown in Table IV.C.5, p. IV.C.18, which would represent about 26 percent of the total number of units provided by the Proposed Project.

Therefore, the population growth associated with increased project-related employment would not result in housing demand that would exceed planned regional housing development, and would not be substantial. Because the employment increase associated with the Proposed Project would not be individually substantial or contribute to an exceedance of ABAG’s employment projections for the City, the Proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a potentially significant cumulative impact related to employment.

---

37 ABAG Projections 2007, p. 139.