

2.5 POPULATION AND HOUSING

2.5.1 IMPACTS AND AFFORDABILITY OF HOUSING RELOCATION

Comments

Furthermore, the Relocation Plan, as it stands today, will tear us apart. It will scatter us out onto Treasure Island indefinitely, not keep us together as a group, and then make it so onerous that we have no interest in staying. For example, I'm expected to move from a three-bedroom apartment with my wife to a one-bedroom on Treasure Island. And then after, that price us out of YBI after development. Why not designate land on Yerba Buena Island that will accommodate the residents who live there today? If we know we have somewhere to come back to, we can take care of ourselves during the redevelopment. We'll be fine (*Ken Masters*) [TR.9.1b]

Although economic impacts are not evaluated in an EIR, the project should include an analysis of funding sources to determine if the project can remain revenue neutral. The analysis should review the relocation of residents if they would not be able to afford the rates. Prior to decision making, it is important to know if San Francisco residents will be burdened by the costs, and if affordable rules can be guaranteed for Treasure Island residents.

The rate structure may limit the ability for middle-to-low-income residents to remain on Treasure Island. Once the rates are established, an analysis could be conducted for population and housing. Until then, it is unknown if the rates are acceptable and support middle-to-low-income residents. (*Rosie Masters*) [TR.17.1]

Regional housing needs allocation should be specifically reviewed to determine the personal affordable units and income levels, with the subset analysis on costs to those qualified for affordable housing application. (*Rosie Masters*) [TR.17.3]

Response

The comment correctly states that economic impacts are not evaluated in an EIR. Economic information regarding the cost of replacement housing and the affordability levels for such replacement housing will be provided to decision-makers as part of the material to be considered during deliberations about the replacement housing plan, which would be prepared in conjunction with the Infrastructure Financing District process.

In addition, as described in the EIR in Chapter II, Project Description, pp. II.28-II.29, and in Section IV.C, Population and Housing, pp. IV.C.13-IV.C.14, the Proposed Project would include a transition housing program that would provide the opportunity for existing, qualifying households on the Islands to move into new housing built during phased construction within the Project Area. The express intent of the transition housing program is to

avoid displacement of existing residents throughout the Project Area, including Yerba Buena Island residents. The transition housing program would be available for all eligible residents of the Islands at the time of the execution of the DDA who continuously remain Island residents in good standing during project development. As stated on pp. II. 28-II.29, at the time of the DDA's approval, TIDA would adopt a set of rules and regulations that would define the benefits available under the transition housing program, including the process for notifying and moving existing residents. Compliance with these transition housing rules and regulations would be a requirement under the Proposed Project's DDA.

As stated on pp. IV.C.13-IV.C.14, 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. New unit sizes for transitioning households are anticipated to remain the same as current unit sizes, with exceptions if a portion of the household moves out between the DDA date and the 'Notice to Move' date.¹ 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. These provisions of the transition housing program would help ensure that existing residents living on the Islands would be able to remain on the Islands, and have the opportunity to reside in housing that is affordable.

● The Proposed Project would include an Affordable Housing Program, which is described on EIR pp. II.28-II.29. Under the program, TIDA has agreed to provide up to 25 percent or 2,000 units that would be affordably priced at a range of below-market rates. At least 20 percent of the affordable units would be affordable to very-low-income residents.² The project would exceed the 15 percent inclusionary housing requirement of Section 415 of the Planning Code. The Proposed Project would also exceed the California Community Redevelopment Law requirement

¹ In January 2011, the Draft Transition Housing Rules and Regulations were published and presented to the Citizen's Advisory Board and TIDA Board for their comments. TIDA will not approve the program unless and until the EIR is certified and the Proposed Project is approved.

² Moderate-income households are defined as earning no more than 120 percent of the area median income levels for San Francisco, as published by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (California Health & Safety Code Section 50093). Low-income households are those earning no more than 80 percent of area median income. Very-low-income households are generally those earning no more than 50 percent of area medium income.

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 affordable units (up to about 316) in market-rate buildings, which would be sold or leased as inclusionary housing. Up to around 1,684 units (which could be a mix of rental and for-sale units) would be in stand-alone, affordable buildings, of which up to around

1,249 units would be constructed by developers selected by TIDA, and approximately 435 units would be in programs developed and operated by the Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative (“TIHDI”) or its designee.

The TIHDI units would consist of land and funding to replace 250 units in the existing housing managed and operated by TIHDI housing providers, as well as land for an additional 185 residential units. These TIHDI units would generally be for formerly homeless (extremely low-income) families.

A minimum of 20 percent of the proposed residences would be sized for families. EIR pp. IV.C.15-IV.C.16 describe the Proposed Project’s compliance with the affordable housing

- production requirements and compare them with the requirements under State law and the City’s Inclusionary Housing Program (Section 415 of the Planning Code).

The second bullet on p. II.28 is revised as follows to clarify the total number of stand-alone affordable housing units proposed (deletions are shown in ~~strike through~~ and new text is underlined):

- - Stand-alone Affordable Housing. Up to 1,684 units (which could be a mix of rental and for-sale units) would be in stand-alone, affordable buildings, of which up to around 1,249 units would be developed by developers selected by TIDA or its designee. ~~Up to 1,685 units would be in stand-alone, completely affordable buildings implemented by TIDA or others.~~ The TIDA units would likely include a mix of rental and for-sale units and would target very-low-, low-, and moderate-income households.

A comment also notes that the Association of Bay Area Governments’ (“ABAG”) regional housing needs allocation should be specifically reviewed to determine the affordability and

- income levels needed for the proposed units. As noted above, the Proposed Project, as a whole, would exceed the 15 percent affordable housing requirement of Section 415 of the Planning Code, and also would exceed the CRL requirement that 15 percent of all new housing units be affordable to low- and moderate-income households, although a Redevelopment Plan is no longer proposed and the CRL requirement would not apply. In addition, within an Infrastructure Financing District 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 of 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 of 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. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that the housing programs on the Islands complement the City’s efforts to meet the Housing Element goals and objectives.

2.5.2 ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Comment

Furthermore, the DEIR fails to study the job locations and effect on transportation and consequential trip generation for affordable housing residents. There has been a complete failure of the DEIR to study the project's social economic effects on the Project's demographics and surrounding communities. In particular, it is most likely that a non-profit affordable housing entity in partnership with the San Francisco Housing Authority will end up being the owners of the projected affordable housing units. As such, in anticipation of the future costs and burdens having to be sustained by that affordable housing partnership, there will be significantly less resources available to develop future affordable housing. This affordable housing would be in existing San Francisco housing locations that are more properly situated where such residents are likely to have access to local employment, readily-available, public transportation (i.e., transit villages), and retail/necessary services – all of which are not only major factors on the budgets of those individuals (and they are the ones that can least afford these budget burdens), but will also significantly reduce traffic greenhouse and air quality impacts. In fact, this very concept has been addressed by the passage of recent state laws, including but not limited to AB-32. Consequently, these matters constitute a significant impact that should be studied in the DEIR with viable proposed mitigation measures. (*Nick S. Rossi, Esq., representing Kenneth and Roseanna Masters*) [19.36]

Response

The comment raises concerns about the socio-economic effects the Proposed Project's demographics would have on surrounding communities, and asserts that the non-profit affordable housing on Treasure Island would likely be owned by the San Francisco Housing Authority. The comment also asserts that the proposed affordable housing would drain resources from development of other affordable housing at existing locations in San Francisco that would provide better access to employment, public transit, and retail services.

The comment does not provide data to support the conclusions stated. The affordable housing on the Islands is not expected to be owned or managed by the Housing Authority. The stand-alone affordable housing in the Proposed Project is assumed to be developed by experienced affordable housing developers selected by TIDA or by one of TIHDI's housing development member organizations. TIHDI is a coalition of approximately nine private, non-profit service and housing providers, some of which currently manages approximately 250 units of existing housing for the homeless and formerly homeless (extremely low-income) families on Treasure Island; refer also to the response presented in Section 2.5.1, Impacts and Affordability of Housing Relocation, above. Under the proposed DDA, TIHDI would continue to operate these units until an equivalent number of new replacement units is built, and would also be provided land on Treasure Island for an additional 185 residential units, expanding the program to a total of 435 units, subject to conveyance of the property from the Navy to TIDA and implementation of the Proposed Project. The Term Sheet between TIHDI and TIDA contemplates that the land for the

TIHDI housing would continue to be owned by TIDA, but could also be sold by TIDA to a qualified TIHDI housing developer.

The Proposed Project would provide a dense, mixed-use residential community that would be supported by neighborhood retail, community services, cultural facilities, recreation and open space, and new and improved transit service, all of which would provide opportunities for residents to meet their day-to-day needs on the Islands. Proposed new and improved inter- and intra-Island transit service would also maximize job access for residents. These characteristics of the Proposed Project would also help to reduce potential greenhouse gas emissions and air quality impacts. The analyses of greenhouse gas emissions and air quality in the EIR (Sections IV.H and IV.G, respectively) account for all residents in the proposed housing, including residents of the affordable units. Mitigation measures are identified in the EIR where needed to reduce identified significant impacts.

2.5.3 POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Comment

Simple application of population to housing units (either present or 2030 ABAG projected) would place the islands' residents at around 18,500. In addition there would be the normal daytime influx of workers, tourists and recreational users, less those residents who go off-island. A usable comparison statistic might be the 2030 San Francisco Supervisorial District average of about 72,700 residents. The TI/YBI plan should consider what amount of retail, office, services, etc. is commensurate with a mere quarter of such a District. Obviously transit, both inter- and intra-island creates a unique situation due to the geography – and it must also account for the anticipated recreational and tourist use. (*Ron Miguel, President, San Francisco Planning Commission*) [7.2]

Response

The comment questions whether an adequate amount of services proposed for the daily population on the Islands, which would include residents, workers, recreational users, and other visitors, would be provided. As stated in the response in Section 2.5.2, Economic Effects, above, and in EIR Section IV.C, Population and Housing, p. IV.C.14, 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. As described in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, p. II.2, 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; and provide retail, commercial, and community services that include 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;

and 300 acres of parks and open space supported by 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. The intended purpose of an EIR is to inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a defined project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. The intent of an EIR is not to evaluate the adequacy of programmatic features of a project. The adequacy of the proposed development program may be considered by decision-makers as part of their decision to approve or disapprove the Proposed Project; however, it is not a physical environmental impact that requires analysis in this EIR.

This comment questions population projections cited and analyzed in the EIR and asserts that more appropriate comparison statistics should be used. As stated above, 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. As described on EIR p. IV.C.1, the existing and proposed population and employment projections presented in the EIR section are based on 2000 U.S. Census data, *American Community Survey 2006-2008* data, ABAG's *Projections 2007* data,³ ABAG's *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan 2007-2014*, and the City's 2009 *Draft Housing Element Part 1: Data and Needs Analysis*. Estimates of existing housing units and characteristics presented in the EIR are based on 2000 U.S. Census data and *Projections 2007* data. These various projections provide the most recognizable and widely used sources for population and employment data in San Francisco and throughout the San Francisco Bay Area region, and therefore provide the most reliable data for analysis in this EIR.

Comments are also raised about the adequacy of transit service, both inter- and intra-island. Potential effects on transit services, including impacts to Muni, ferry services, Golden Gate Transit, and SamTrans, are discussed in EIR Section IV.E, Transportation. Travel demand for the Proposed Project takes into account intra-and inter-Island trips as well as visitor/tourist/recreational trips to and from the Islands, as discussed on EIR pp. IV.E.55-IV.E.61. Refer also to information presented in EIR Appendix C, *Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Transportation Impact Study*, pp. 63-100.

³ 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*).

2.5.4 IMPACTS ON EXISTING RESIDENTS

Comment

Vol. 1, IV.C.7, Population and Housing: Where is an analysis of impact on the existing resident population on TI and YBI? When are they impacted, how often, and how long will they be impacted -when and where? (*Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission*) [20.29]

Response

The impacts of the Proposed Project on the existing residents, including construction-related and project operational impacts, are addressed in the appropriate sections of the EIR.

As discussed in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, on p. II.78, construction and buildout of the proposed Development Program would be phased over an approximately 15- to 20-year period. Buildout of the Proposed Project is expected to result in a resident population of about 18,640 persons, an increase in about 16,820 persons from the existing 1,820 persons currently residing on the Islands. As discussed on EIR pp. IV.C.13-IV.C.14, and in the response in Section 2.5.1, Impacts and Affordability of Housing Relocation, above, existing residents would have the opportunity to move into new housing built during phased construction within the Project Area. The express intent of the transition housing program is to avoid displacement of existing residents throughout the Project Area. The proposed DDA, which is part of the Proposed Project, would require compliance with the Transition Housing Rules and Regulations that would be adopted by TIDA and attached to the Housing Plan.

Impacts on the existing population related to other environmental topics during project construction and operation, including the topics of land use, transportation, noise, air quality, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, hazards and hazardous materials, are discussed in Chapter IV of the EIR in Section IV.A, Land Use; Section IV.E, Transportation; Section IV.F, Noise; Section IV.G, Air Quality; Section IV.J, Recreation; Section IV.K, Utilities and Service Systems; Section IV.L, Public Services; and Section IV.O, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Mitigation measures have also been identified in these sections, where appropriate, to avoid or to minimize significant impacts to less than significant.

2.5.5 EXISTING BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT

Comment

I am writing as a resident on Treasure Island and ask that you consider the impact of redevelopment on current businesses on the Island.

For several years now businesses have added to our quality of life that have been unfulfilled by others. They have brought us services and in some cases, cultural opportunities.

Such companies as Treasure Island Wines, Jade Studio, the Gaelic Football League, the convenience store at the front gate, and others have brought services and a "flavor" to the island that has helped to build the sense of community.

I recognize that not all current business may be a good fit for the redevelopment, but certainly those listed above, and others, should receive consideration as they are contributing to the established community on Treasure Island.

Please help us find a place for these current business partners in future of Treasure Island. (*Mark Connors, Resident, Treasure Island*) [34.1]

Response

The comment requests that existing businesses be afforded the opportunity to continue operating on the Islands as part of the Proposed Project. As identified in EIR Section IV.C, Population and Housing, p. IV.C.12, along with the approximately 8,000 new residential units, the Proposed Project includes 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; and 300 acres of parks and open space.

- Existing businesses, other than those that are on the Islands on an interim or temporary basis, would be extended a reasonable preference to reenter in business on the Islands.

Under CEQA, specific proposed retail and commercial tenants within the planned land uses on the Project Site are not required to be individually analyzed in an EIR. Decision-makers may consider project-related impacts to existing businesses along with other non-environmental considerations when deliberating on whether to approve or disapprove the Proposed Project.

2.5.6 HOUSING AND DESIGN CONCEPT

Comment

I think that this project, as much as any we've seen, is going to push the envelope, really expand what's possible, and where the direction of new housing and new community and design and balance is going to go in the United States. (*Tim Colen, San Francisco Housing Action Coalition*) [TR.2.1]

Response

The comment expresses general support for the Proposed Project and states that it would provide a new direction for housing and community design. The comment, however, does not address the adequacy or accuracy of the information presented in the EIR and no further response is required. This comment may be considered by decision-makers as part of their decision to approve or disapprove the Proposed Project. EIR Chapter II, Project Description, pp. II.16-II.22, summarizes the development plan characteristics and overall development and design concept.

2.5.7 JOBS AND HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

Comments

The plan represents real opportunities to provide housing and jobs for 4 million homeless and very low income San Franciscans. EIR cites both the housing that will be available for TIDI and the job opportunities that will be created through redevelopment. We look forward to both expanding the number of formerly homeless people who will now have a place to call home, as well as those who will earn income through the TI Redevelopment.

A key component of this for us is that none of our existing residents will be displaced. (*Sherry Williams, Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative*) [TR.4.2]

...but to the facts that the jobs that are needed in the entire California. It's a known fact that for every construction worker employed it creates many residual jobs in the process. (*Richard Weller, Local 34, Pile Drivers*) [TR.7.1]

We can support Treasure Island with many new jobs. It would also create jobs, full-time jobs, other than construction work. (*Richard Weller, Local 34, Pile Drivers*) [TR.7.3]

Response

The comments express general support for the Proposed Project, stating that it would provide needed housing, and employment opportunities on the Islands, both during construction and operation of the Proposed Project. The comments also state the opinion that is important that the Proposed Project provide facilities to serve the daily needs of Island residents.

EIR Chapter II, Project Description, pp. II.28-II.29, describes the Proposed Project's transition housing program, which would be established before existing residential units are deconstructed, to ensure that existing, qualifying, households have the opportunity to continue living on the Islands if they choose. The express intent of the transition housing program would be to avoid displacement of existing residents.

As described in the response in Section 2.5.1, Impacts and Affordability of Housing Relocation, above, and in EIR Section IV.C, Population and Housing, p. IV.C.15, 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.

The EIR identifies operational and construction employment opportunities and impacts in Section IV.C, Population and Housing, pp. IV.C.12-IV.C.14 and pp. IV.C.17-IV.C.19. Direct, but temporary, construction job growth within the Development Plan Area would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. Data on construction-generated worker trips is analyzed in the EIR both in Section IV.H. Greenhouse Gas Emissions, pp. IV.H.35-IV.H.36, and in Section IV.C, Population and Housing p. IV.C.13. The estimated number of daily average and maximum construction employment is presented in slightly more detail than the overall phasing described in Chapter II, Project Description. These analyses break construction employment into five construction phases: during Phase 1, an average of 930 and a maximum of 1,250 construction employees; during Phase 2, an average of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,350 construction employees; during Phase 3, an average of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,500 construction employees; during Phase 4, an average of 1,150 and a maximum of 1,300 construction employees; and during Phase 5, an average of 800 and a maximum of 950 construction employees.

These comments, which generally express support of the Proposed Project, may be considered by the decision-makers as part of their decision to approve or disapprove the Proposed Project.

2.5.8 DEMOGRAPHICS

Comment

And I don't find that essence of the story here. This project, of course, is creating a whole new neighborhood, actually the size of a small city, in a uniquely physically isolated location, in the Bay, in the City of San Francisco. That makes it very different than the other similarly-scaled projects at Mission Bay and Hunter's Point Shipyard, where there are adjacent neighborhoods right next to them, literally, physically, to support them. And in my mind, that's a critical thing that really is crucial when considering the environmental consequences of what we're doing.

I looked to find out the details of the population of this future new small city we're building in the Bay, and I could find a number of 18,000 and some in the Public Services section, but I really couldn't find anything else about who they might be in that location. Looking around, you could find a school-age population, but I couldn't find a preschool population. I couldn't find a senior population. I didn't see estimates for how many would be lower income households for affordable housing. I just really couldn't get a handle on who is going to live there. (*John Elberling, TIDA*) [TR.23.1]

Response

The comment raises questions about the environmental consequences of constructing the Proposed Project given its physically isolated location, but does not raise any specific comment on the adequacy and accuracy of the analysis presented in the EIR. The comment may be

considered by decision-makers as part of their decision to approve or disapprove the Proposed Project.

The comment further queries the potential demographics of the new residents who would occupy buildings constructed as part of the Proposed Project. EIR Section IV.C, Population and Housing, pp. IV.C.14-IV.C.17, states that the projected population of the Project Area at buildout would total about 18,640 persons. The Planning Department's Initial Study Checklist does not require analysis of specific demographic data, including gender, age, race, or income. EIR Chapter II, Project Description, pp. II.28-II.29, and pp. IV.C.13-IV.C.14 discuss the Proposed Project's transition housing program and the number of affordable units planned under the Project. See also the response in Section 2.5.1, Impacts and Affordability of Housing Relocation, above.

The comment also questions why preschool population information is not presented in the EIR. As stated above, the Planning Department's Initial Study Checklist does not require analysis of specific demographic data, including gender, age, race, or income in the Population and Housing section. However, the analysis of school capacity and the potential impacts on the school-aged population on the San Francisco Unified School District ("SFUSD") at full buildout is discussed in EIR Section IV.L, Public Services, pp. IV.L.25-IV.L.29. There would be an estimated 1,695 school-aged students that would enroll in SFUSD schools. Of these children, 808 would be of preschool and elementary school-age, 380 would be of middle school-age, and 507 would be teenagers of high-school age.

The last sentence on p. IV.L.25 and the paragraph at the top of p. IV.L.26 are revised as follows (deletions are shown in ~~strike through~~ and new text is underlined):

The new school would likely serve pre-kindergarten (preschool), elementary, and middle school students;²⁵ high school students would most likely continue to attend schools in other parts of San Francisco.²⁶ For planning purposes, about 48 preschool aged children were estimated.²⁷ The remaining 1,647 ~~1,695~~ students were distributed evenly by grade. ~~Currently, a~~ As shown in Table IV.L.1, a total of approximately 1,695 school-age children would live on the Islands following full build-out of the Project. As of 2009, approximately 320 students live on the Islands.²⁸

The new footnote for this text change, to be added to p. IV.L.26, is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in the section will be renumbered accordingly. There are no other changes to the footnotes on this page.

²⁷ Factor is based on the 2010 SFUSD Child Development Center (CDC) enrollment of 1,559 students, or about 2.86 percent of total 2010 SFUSD student enrollment. (1,695 students x 0.0286 = about 48 preschool aged students.)

Table IV.L.1: Public School Enrollment at Project Buildout Compared to SFUSD Capacity, on p. IV.L.27, is revised as follows (deletions are shown in ~~strike through~~ and new text is underlined):

(Revised) Table IV.L.1: Public School Enrollment at Project Buildout Compared to SFUSD Capacity

Area	<u>Preschool / Elementary School (Grades Preschool-5 K- 5)</u>	Middle School (Grades 6-8)	High School (Grades 9-12)	Total
Project Area (estimated)	<u>808</u> 785	<u>380</u> 390	<u>507</u> 520	1,695
2030 Citywide Enrollment ¹	33,036	16,518	22,024	71,573
2009 SFUSD Capacity	29,260	11,700	17,575	63,835 ²
2030 Projected Shortfall	3,776	4,818	4,449	7,738
New Treasure Island School Capacity ³	1,200	800	0	2,000

Notes:

¹ Categories may not add up to total due to rounding.

² Total includes capacity for 5,300 students in varying grade levels in alternative schools and public charter schools.

³ Based on combined average size of elementary and middle schools within SFUSD. See Comparison of Number of Students Living in Each SF City Planning Neighborhood with Elementary and Middle School Capacity, found at <http://portal.sfusd.edu/data/epc/Comparison%20of%20Number%20of%20Students%20Living%20in%20Each%20SF%20City%20Planning%20Nhood.pdf>, accessed June 20, 2010.

Source: ABAG Projections, 2007; Turnstone Consulting, 2009.