

SECTION III.C POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

III.C.1 Introduction

This section describes the existing and projected population, housing, and employment characteristics of the Project and examines the potential for the Project to (1) induce substantial unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly, or (2) displace existing housing or residents. This section evaluates the potential for both Project level and cumulative environmental impacts. The analysis in this section concludes that no potentially significant or significant environmental impacts would result from the Project; therefore, no mitigation measures are included.

Section III.C.3 (Regulatory Framework) also provides information regarding the City's affordable housing policies. However, because changes in housing affordability levels are socioeconomic effects, no significance determination is provided with respect to these issues; information pertaining to these topics is provided for informational purposes only.

Further, the Navy will be preparing a supplemental environmental assessment for the Hunters Point Shipyard Base Reuse. In Potential impacts on minority and low-income populations are addressed in Appendix C1 (Environmental Justice Report).

III.C.2 Setting

■ Population

Regional Overview

The San Francisco Bay Area has experienced an influx of population over the past several decades that is expected to continue into the foreseeable future, albeit at a more gradual rate than in past decades. The 2007 Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projections estimate that there were approximately 7 million residents living in the Bay Area in 2005. Between 2000 and 2005, the regional population of the Bay Area grew by just under 1 percent per year; growth through 2030 is expected to occur at approximately this same rate,⁶² adding 916,800 residents by 2030 (refer to Appendix C2 [Population Projections]).⁶³

The population in the City as of January 1, 2008, was 824,525, its highest population on record.⁶⁴ In terms of population, San Francisco is the second largest city in the Bay Area, following San Jose.

⁶² Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections 2007*, December 2006.

⁶³ Memorandum from John Rahaim, Director of Planning, San Francisco Planning Department to Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commissions, *Projections of Growth by 2030*, July 9, 2009. Population projections in this memorandum include Project populations.

⁶⁴ California Department of Finance, *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State with Annual Percent Change—January 1, 2008 and 2009*, 2009. http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-1_2006-07 (accessed online June 12, 2009). Also cited by Economic and Planning Systems, Inc., *Fiscal Analysis of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project*, 2009.

Project Site

Table III.C-1 (Existing Population [2005]) presents information on the 2005 population of the Project site. For purposes of this analysis, 2005 data is used to represent baseline conditions as 2005 data is the most current data consistently available for the Project site across all population, employment, and housing indices. However, where more current data is available for the City as a whole, those data are also provided to demonstrate how conditions have changed, or remained the same, since 2005.

Table III.C-1 Existing Population (2005)			
Analysis Area	Population	Households^a	Persons per Household^b
Candlestick Point	1,113 ^c	292 ^c	3.8
HPS Phase II	0 ^{c,d}	0 ^{c,d}	N/A
Project Site Total	1,113	292	3.8
San Francisco	783,441 ^{e,f}	341,478 ^e	2.3
San Mateo County	487,977 ^g	252,648 ^g	1.9

SOURCES:

- a. Households are occupied units, not total units.
- b. The total persons per household ratio was calculated by dividing totals in the Population column by the totals in the Households column.
- c. Population and household data for the Project site are 2005 data from San Francisco County Transportation Authority, *TAZ Model Data*, 2008. These data include 256 permanent residents of the Alice Griffith Housing Complex and approximately 36 residents located within the TAZ boundaries, but outside of the Candlestick Point site. For purposes of the EIR analysis, it is assumed that 256 households are located within the Candlestick Point portion of the Project site.
- d. The City uses traffic analysis zones, or TAZs, to predict population, employment, and housing trends at the local level. The TAZ boundaries do not completely coincide with Project site boundaries, which contributes to slight discrepancies in the data reported. The TAZ that includes the HPS Phase II site includes a portion of nearby Mariners Village and Morgan Heights residential neighborhoods. Housing unit and population attributable to these areas have been removed from the totals reported above, as there is currently no housing at HPS Phase II.
- e. The population and households data reported for San Francisco is 2005 data provided in Memorandum from John Rahaim, Director of Planning, San Francisco Planning Department to Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commissions, *Projections of Growth by 2030*, July 9, 2009.
- f. The text on page III.C-2 reports that the San Francisco population was 824,525 in 2008. This table presents 2005 numbers, as 2005 data is the most current data available across all population, housing, and employment indices for the Project site.
- g. Population and household data for San Mateo County is 2005 data from US Census, *2005–2007 American Community Survey*, 2005. <http://factfinder.census.gov> (accessed online June 12, 2009).

The existing population and household data for the Project site are taken from 2005 data from San Francisco County Transportation Authority, *TAZ Model Data* (2008), which also includes units within the TAZ boundary, but outside of the Project site. As of 2005, there were approximately 298 existing housing units within the TAZ boundary, as shown in Table III.C-1, with only 292 occupied, as shown in Table III.C-2; however, there are only 256 existing units within the Candlestick Point portion of the Project site, all of which are associated with the Alice Griffith Housing Complex. There are no households associated with the HPS Phase II portion of the Project site. For purposes of the EIR analysis, it is assumed that 256 households are located within the Candlestick Point portion of the Project site.

The 2005 population⁶⁵ at the Project site was approximately 1,113 persons,⁶⁶ about 0.14 percent of San Francisco's population in the same year. There are no existing residents at HPS Phase II. The majority of the residents at Candlestick Point live in the Alice Griffith housing complex, while a small number are residents of Jamestown Avenue.

Using the TAZ population and household data, which includes limited areas outside of the Project site, there is an average of 3.8 persons per household, 1.5 more persons than the average San Francisco household. The larger household size in comparison to other parts of the City may be due to larger housing units, occupancy above optimal housing unit capacity (overcrowding), or a combination of both factors.

The average San Francisco household size grew during the latter part of the 20th century, particularly during the 1990s as housing costs rose and forced shared rentals.⁶⁷ In the future, citywide household sizes are expected to stay relatively constant or shrink slightly as a result of changing demographic trends.⁶⁸ Factors contributing to a decrease in household size include smaller family size and lower birth rates, a greater prevalence of single-person households, longer life spans, greater geographic mobility, and greater independence for seniors. Relative to other parts of the City, the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood experiences a higher number of residents per habitable room.⁶⁹ As new housing varying in affordability, type, and size is developed in the area, existing crowding is expected to be alleviated. The Project would provide a range of housing sizes, including studios to 4 bedrooms, and the average housing unit would be 2.5 bedrooms. As a result, the household size at the Project site is expected to decrease to 2.33 people per unit by 2030, consistent with the 2005 citywide average and the average identified in the General Plan Housing Element. A 2.3-person household size is thus used to estimate future population for the Project site.

■ Housing

Regional Overview

Over the course of the past several decades, the 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 lack of local housing options causes many Bay Area residents to seek housing in the Sacramento region and Central Valley, resulting in long commutes and significant impacts on the regional transportation system.⁷⁰

This housing shortage is compounded in San Francisco by additional factors. San Francisco was historically developed as an employment center, which means that there are more jobs than housing units

⁶⁵ Data for 2005 are the most current data consistently available across all population, housing, and employment indices for the Project site. Thus, 2005 is considered to be the baseline year for existing conditions.

⁶⁶ These 1,113 persons include those temporary residents at the Candlestick Point RV Park in addition to the permanent residents (256 households) at Alice Griffith Public Housing.

⁶⁷ City and County of San Francisco, General Plan Housing Element, 2004.

⁶⁸ City and County of San Francisco, Draft General Plan Housing Element, Part 1: Data and Needs Analysis, 2009.

⁶⁹ City and County of San Francisco, General Plan Housing Element, 2004.

⁷⁰ Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections 2007*, 2006.

in the City. In addition, San Francisco is relatively built up, with few tracts of land available for development of new housing. Although the City does not have an adopted jobs-housing ratio target, Policy 1.9 of the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan encourages new commercial developments that would generate employment to also develop housing or pay in-lieu fees through the City's Jobs-Housing Linkage Program.⁷¹

As shown in Table III.C-2 (Existing Housing Characteristics [2005]), below, there were approximately 346,527 housing units in San Francisco in 2005. The City had a vacancy rate of approximately 4.9 percent, and approximately 62 percent of its total housing stock consisted of rental units. In 2005, the number of households totaled 341,478, and by 2008, the number of households had risen to 344,792.⁷² ABAG projections indicate that the number of households in San Francisco would increase by 0.6 percent annually through 2030, roughly the same as for projected population increases, although the household increases between 2005 and 2008 were only about 0.3 percent per year. Because the Project site is in the southeastern portion of the City, activities at the site contribute to housing demand in nearby San Mateo County communities. Table III.C-2 also shows existing housing characteristics for San Mateo County.

Table III.C-2 Existing Housing Characteristics (2005)					
Analysis Area	Housing Units (2005)	Vacancy Rate^a	Rental Units as Percent of Total	Households^b	Persons per Household^b
Candlestick Point	298	2.1%	100%	292	3.8
HPS Phase II	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Project Site Total	298^c	2.1%	100%	292	3.8
San Francisco	346,527 ^d	4.9%	61.6% ^e	341,478 ^g	2.3
San Mateo County ^{e,f}	266,469	5.2%	37.1% ^e	252,648	2.8

SOURCES:

- a. The number of vacant units is the difference between total housing units and households (occupied units). Vacancy rates were calculated by dividing the number of vacant units by the total in the Housing Units (2005) column.
- b. Household (occupied housing unit) data and persons per household for Candlestick Point are from Table III.C-1. Population and household data for the Project site are 2005 data from San Francisco County Transportation Authority, *TAZ Model Data, 2008*. These data include 256 permanent residents of the Alice Griffith Housing Complex and approximately 36 residents located within the TAZ boundaries, but outside of the Candlestick Point site. For purposes of the EIR analysis, it is assumed that 256 households are located within the Candlestick Point portion of the Project site.
- c. The only existing housing units at the Project site are those at the Alice Griffith housing complex.
- d. Housing unit data for San Francisco are 2005 data from ABAG, *2007 Projections, 2006*.
- e. Rental unit percentages for San Francisco and San Mateo County are 2005 data from US Census, *2005–2007 American Community Survey, 2005*. <http://factfinder.census.gov> (accessed online June 12, 2009).
- f. Housing unit data for San Mateo County are 2005 data from US Census, *2005–2007 American Community Survey, 2005*. <http://factfinder.census.gov> (accessed online June 12, 2009).
- g. The population and households data reported for San Francisco is 2005 data provided in Memorandum from John Rahaim, Director of Planning, San Francisco Planning Department to Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commissions, *Projections of Growth by 2030*, July 9, 2009.

⁷¹ City and County of San Francisco, General Plan Housing Element, 2004.

⁷² Economic and Planning Systems, Inc., *Fiscal Analysis of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project*, 2009.

Regional Housing Needs Plan

To respond to statewide population and household growth and to ensure the availability of affordable housing for all income groups, the State enacted *Government Code* Section 65584 in 1981, which requires each Council of Governments (COG) to periodically distribute State-identified housing needs to all jurisdictions within its region. The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is responsible for determining this regional need and for initiating the process by which each COG must then distribute its share of Statewide need to all jurisdictions within its region. This statute requires COGs to develop a new Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) every five years. In June 2008, ABAG released its RHNP, which documents the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the Bay Area for the June 2007 to June 2014 planning period.⁷³

Government Code Section 65584 requires that a city’s share of regional housing needs include housing needs for 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 county and city in California, are “Very Low Income,” “Low Income,” “Moderate Income,” and “Above Moderate Income.” Based on a US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) formula, San Francisco’s Area Median Income (AMI) in 2006 was estimated to be approximately \$77,450 for a two-person household and approximately \$87,100 for a three-person household.⁷⁴ San Francisco is estimated to have the income level distribution shown in Table III.C-3 (San Francisco Income Distribution).

Table III.C-3 San Francisco Income Distribution		
Income Group	Income Level	Income Range^a
Very low	≤ 50% of AMI	≤ \$38,725
Low	50–80% of AMI	\$38,725–\$61,960
Moderate	80–120% of AMI	\$61,960–\$92,940
Above Moderate	> 120% of AMI	> \$92,940

SOURCES: City of San Francisco, General Plan Housing Element, 2004; City and County of San Francisco, Mayor’s Office of Housing, *Income Limits and Sales Price Levels for MOH Homeownership Programs*. http://www.sfgov.org/site/moh_page.asp?id=62375 (accessed August 27, 2009).

a. Based on San Francisco’s AMI in 2006 of \$77,450 for a two-person household.

The ABAG Policy Board established housing needs for all jurisdictions within its boundaries for the 2007 to 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 RHNP, the Bay Area’s overall housing need would total about 214,500 new units by June 2014.⁷⁵ The jurisdictional need of the City is estimated to be 31,193 units, or an average annual need of 4,456 new units.

⁷³ Association of Bay Area Governments, *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan, 2007–2014*, 2008.

⁷⁴ City and County of San Francisco, Mayor’s Office of Housing, *Income Limits and Sales Price Levels for MOH Homeownership Programs*. http://www.sfgov.org/site/moh_page.asp?id=62375 (accessed August 27, 2009).

⁷⁵ Association of Bay Area Governments, *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan, 2007–2014*, 2008.

Although market conditions affect the City’s ability to meet the RHNA targets, the City facilitates the development of housing by providing regulatory incentives for private housing developers. If the RHNA targets are not met, the resulting competition for the limited housing supply drives the price of housing up, making it less affordable to working families. The City did not meet its RHNA targets for the 1999–2006 period. However, over 17,470 new housing units, or almost 86 percent of the housing production targets, were met.⁷⁶ During this time, the City met approximately 83 percent of its Very Low Income housing goals, 52 percent of its Low Income goals, 13 percent of its Moderate Income goals, and 153 percent of its Above Moderate Income (market-rate) housing goals.

The distribution of future housing units needed by income level in San Francisco during the 2007–2014 period is shown in Table III.C-4 (San Francisco Housing Need, 2007–2014), below.

<i>Income Group</i>	<i>Number of Units</i>
Very low	6,589
Low	5,535
Moderate	6,754
Above moderate	12,315
Total	31,193

SOURCE: ABAG, *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan, 2007 to 2014*, 2008.

San Francisco Citywide Affordable Housing Program

The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency’s Citywide Tax Increment Housing Program (Housing Program) dedicates a portion of the tax increment generated through the Agency’s real estate activities to the development of affordable housing. By state law, the Agency must expend at least 20 percent of its tax increment financing for the construction or preservation of affordable housing. The Agency also must produce affordable housing totaling at least 15 percent of all new units within the Redevelopment Project Areas. The Agency sets maximum incomes for all affordable units, which can vary from unit to unit and from location to location. The income limits are adjusted each year based on data provided by HUD.

Through the Housing Program, tax increment funds are committed as grants and loans to non-profit and for-profit housing organizations for the development of a range of affordable housing for San Francisco residents. Funds are committed at all stages of project development, from predevelopment, acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, to permanent financing.

The Housing Program has been in place since 1990, and is now concluding over 19 years of activity. During this period, over \$428 million has been committed to creating approximately 9,628 housing units for low- and moderate-income families and individuals throughout San Francisco. Housing Program funds are generated within redevelopment project areas, but are invested in affordable housing

⁷⁶ City and County of San Francisco, Draft 2009 Housing Element, *General Plan*, http://housingelement2009.sfplanning.org/docs/Housing_Element_Part_I_4.22.09.pdf (accessed August 27, 2009).

development throughout the City, both within and outside of redevelopment project areas. Approximately half of the housing units developed under the Housing Program have been created through new construction and approximately half through rehabilitation of existing structures. Over 60 percent are family apartments and single-room occupancy residential hotels; the remainder is special needs housing and emergency shelters, as well as transitional facilities.

Project Site

As previously mentioned, the existing population and household data for the Project site are taken from 2005 data from San Francisco County Transportation Authority, *TAZ Model Data (2008)*, which includes units within the TAZ boundary, but outside of the Candlestick Point site. As of 2005, there were approximately 298 existing housing units within the TAZ boundary, as shown in Table III.C-1; however, six are vacant, resulting in a total of 292 occupied households. There are 256 existing units within the Candlestick Point portion of the Project site, all of which are associated with the Alice Griffith Housing Project. For purposes of the EIR analysis, it is assumed that 256 households are located within the Candlestick Point portion of the Project site.

The housing characteristics of the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood differ from those of San Francisco as a whole, particularly within the Project site (including Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II). The 2000 Census, the most recent comprehensive study of housing characteristics by neighborhood,⁷⁷ reported that the Project site had a higher proportion of rental units (74 percent versus 62 percent), lower vacancy rates (1.3 percent versus 4.9 percent), and more persons per household (3.8 versus the 2.3 citywide average).⁷⁸

■ Employment

Regional Overview

The Bay Area is a major employment center, with over 3.2 million jobs reported in 2005.⁷⁹ A large percentage of this employment is in San Francisco. As shown in Table III.C-5 (Existing Employment [2005]), there were approximately 553,090 jobs in the City in 2005, approximately 17 percent of the total regional employment.

At the time of the 2000 Census, about 55 percent of the workers holding jobs in San Francisco lived in the City, while the remaining 45 percent lived in other jurisdictions.⁸⁰ For this reason, the daytime population associated with local employment substantially exceeds the residential (nighttime) population. Estimated City employment for 2030 would be approximately 748,100 jobs.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Comprehensive 2005 data pertaining to housing characteristics is not available at this time.

⁷⁸ San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 2008. *TAZ Model Data* (derived from US Census Bureau, *Census 2000*, Summary File 1, Tables H3 and H5, 2000).

⁷⁹ Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections 2007*, 2006.

⁸⁰ US Department of Transportation, *Census 2000 Transportation Planning Package*, 2006. It should be noted that a certain percentage of San Francisco residents also commute to other communities.

⁸¹ Memorandum from John Rahaim, Director of Planning, San Francisco Planning Department to Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commissions, *Projections of Growth by 2030*, July 9, 2009. This number includes employment projections associated with the Project.

Project Site

Table III.C-5 presents existing employment estimates for the Project site. Existing employment at Candlestick Point is minimal, generally associated with temporary stadium staffing, property management, and oversight of the CPSRA. Employment at HPS Phase II includes professional artists, security, and environmental cleanup staff. In total, there are approximately 529 full-time equivalent staff at the Project site.

Table III.C-5 Existing Employment (2005)	
<i>Analysis Area</i>	<i>Total</i>
Candlestick Point ^{a,b}	213
HPS Phase II ^{a,c}	316
Project Site Total	529
San Francisco ^{d,e}	553,090
San Mateo County ^f	337,350

SOURCES:

- a. Data for the Project site was derived from San Francisco County Transportation Authority, *TAZ Model Data*, 2008.
- b. Existing jobs at Candlestick Point include property management, oversight of the CPSRA, and part-time service jobs associated with Candlestick Park. The totals assume that there are 20 events a year at the stadium and employees work approximately 6 hours per shift. Jobs at Candlestick Point are reported in full-time equivalent (FTE) numbers.
- c. Jobs at HPS Phase II include contract and temporary jobs associated with cleanup activities, security, and approximately 300 professional artists. Jobs at HPS Phase II are reported in full-time equivalent (FTE) numbers.
- d. The employment total for San Francisco is 2005 data from Memorandum from John Rahaim, Director of Planning, San Francisco Planning Department to Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commissions, *Projections of Growth by 2030*, July 9, 2009.
- e. By 2008, the number of jobs in the City rose to 576,917 according to Economic and Planning Systems, Inc., *Fiscal Analysis of the Candlestick Point–Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project*, 2009.
- f. The employment total for San Mateo County is 2005 data from ABAG, *Projections 2007, 2006*.

III.C.3 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

There are no federal population, housing, and employment regulations applicable to the Project.

■ State

There are no State population, housing, and employment regulations applicable to the Project.

■ Regional

There are no regional population, housing, and employment regulations applicable to the Project.

■ Local

San Francisco Housing Element

The 2004 Housing Element update was adopted by the San Francisco Planning Commission on May 13, 2004, and found in compliance with state housing element requirements by HCD in October of 2004. Subsequent to adoption of the 2004 Housing Element, the California Court of Appeals 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 the EIR. As required by state law, San Francisco is due for its next five-year Housing Element Update, and the Planning Department has prepared a Draft 2009 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 draft 2009 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 draft 2009 Housing Element Update at an equal level of detail. The 2004 Housing Element, as modified by the Superior Court, contains objectives and policies that are relevant to the Project as follows:

- Objective 1 To provide new housing, especially permanently affordable housing, in appropriate locations which meets identified housing needs and takes into account the demand for affordable housing created by employment demand.
 - Policy 1.1 Encourage higher residential density in areas adjacent to downtown, in underutilized commercial and industrial areas proposed for conversion to housing, and in neighborhood commercial districts where higher density will not have harmful effects, especially if the higher density provides a significant number of units that are affordable to lower income households.
 - Policy 1.3 Identify opportunities for housing and mixed-use districts near downtown and former industrial portions of the City.
 - Policy 1.4 Locate in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established residential neighborhoods.
 - Policy 1.5 Support development of affordable housing on surplus public lands.
 - Policy 1.6 Create incentives for the inclusion of housing, particularly permanently affordable housing, in new commercial development projects.
 - Policy 1.7 Encourage and support the construction of quality, new family housing.
 - Policy 1.8 Allow new secondary units in areas where their effects can be dealt with and there is neighborhood support, especially if that

- housing is made permanently affordable to lower-income households.
- Policy 1.9 Require new commercial developments and higher educational institutions to meet the housing demand they generate, particularly the need for affordable housing for lower income workers and students.
- Objective 2 Retain the existing supply of housing.
- Policy 3.3 Maintain and improve the condition of the existing supply of public housing.
- Objective 4 Support affordable housing production by increasing site availability and capacity.
- Policy 4.1 Actively identify and pursue opportunity sites for permanently affordable housing.
- Policy 4.2 Include affordable units in larger housing projects.
- Objective 8 Ensure equal access to housing opportunities.
- Policy 8.1 Encourage sufficient and suitable rental housing opportunities and emphasize permanently affordable rental units wherever possible.
- Policy 8.4 Encourage greater economic integration within housing projects and throughout San Francisco.
- Policy 8.9 Encourage the provision of new home ownership opportunities through new construction so that increased owner occupancy does not diminish the supply of rental housing.
- Objective 9 Avoid or mitigate hardships imposed by displacement.
- Policy 9.1 Minimize the hardships of displacement by providing essential relocation services.
- Policy 9.2 Offer displaced households the right of first refusal to occupy replacement housing units that are comparable in size, location, cost, and rent control protection.
- Objective 11 In increasing the supply of housing, pursue place making and neighborhood building principles and practices to maintain San Francisco's desirable urban fabric and enhance livability in all neighborhoods.
- Policy 11.1 Use new housing development as a means to enhance neighborhood vitality and diversity.
- Policy 11.2 Ensure housing is provided with adequate public improvements, services, and amenities.
- Policy 11.3 Encourage appropriate neighborhood-serving commercial activities in residential areas, without causing affordable housing displacement.
- Policy 11.5 Promote the construction of well-designed housing that enhances existing neighborhood character.

- Policy 11.8 Strongly encourage housing project sponsors to take full advantage of allowable building densities in their housing developments while remaining consistent with neighborhood character.
- Policy 11.9 Set allowable densities and parking standards in residential areas at levels that promote the City’s overall housing objectives while respecting neighborhood scale and character.
- Policy 12.2 Support the production of well-planned housing regionwide that address regional housing needs and improve the overall quality of life in the Bay Area.

III.C.4 Impacts

■ Significance Criteria

The City and Agency have not formally adopted significance standards for impacts related to population, employment, and housing, but generally consider that implementation of the Project would have significant impacts if it were to:

- C.a Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)
- C.b Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- C.c Displace substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

■ Analytic Method

The analysis compares the population, housing, and employment that would result from implementation of the Project to existing conditions, which is defined as conditions in 2005. The 2005 data are used to represent baseline conditions because 2005 data are the most current data consistently available for the Project site across all population, employment, and housing indices. Table III.C-6 (Project Housing Units and Population) through Table III.C-8 (Project Construction Employment) provide the projected population, housing, and employment characteristics of the Project.

Table III.C-6 Project Housing Units and Population		
<i>Analysis Area</i>	<i>Total Housing Units/Households</i>	<i>Total Population</i>
Candlestick Point	7,850	18,290
HPS Phase II	2,650	6,175
Project Site Total	10,500	24,465^a

SOURCE: Lennar Urban 2009; Economic and Planning Systems, Inc., *Fiscal Analysis of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project*, 2009.

a. The population is calculated as 2.33 persons per unit, and it is assumed that all units are fully occupied.

Table III.C-7 Project Employment by Land Use						
<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Employment Factor^a</i>	<i>Development Program, Candlestick Point^b</i>	<i>Employment, Candlestick Point (jobs)</i>	<i>Development Program, HPS Phase II^c</i>	<i>Employment, HPS Phase II (jobs)</i>	<i>Total Employment (jobs)</i>
Residential	25 units/job	7,850 units	314	2,650 units	106	420
Regional Retail	350 gsf/job	635,000 gsf	1,814	0 gsf	—	1,814
Neighborhood Retail	270 gsf/job	125,000 gsf	463	125,000 gsf	463	926
Office	276 gsf/job	150,000 gsf	543	0 gsf	—	543
Research and Development	400 gsf/job	0 gsf	—	2,500,000 gsf	6,250	6,250
Hotel	700 gsf/job	150,000 gsf	214	0 gsf	—	214
Football Stadium	2,915 jobs/event ^c	0 events ^c	—	32 events/year ^c	359	359
Arena/Performance Venue	300 jobs/event ^d	150 events/year ^d	87	0 events ^d	—	87
Public Parking	270 spaces/job ^e	3,806 ^f	16	4,711	16	32
Parks and Open Space	0.26 jobs/acre ^g	104.8 ^h	27	231.6	60	87
Total			3,478		7,254	10,730

SOURCES: Economic and Planning Systems, Inc., *Fiscal Analysis of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project*, 2009.

a. Employment factors are from City and County of San Francisco, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines*, October 2002.

b. Based on buildout floor areas provided in Table II-2 of this EIR, Chapter II (Project Description).

c. Based on data provided by the 49ers. The employment projections are based on 12 football games and 20 additional events annually and 8-hour work shifts. The total excludes media jobs. A full-time equivalent is equal to 2,080 hours per year.

d. Lennar Urban, LLC estimates that there would be approximately 150 events at the arena annually and that employees would work 4-hour shifts.

e. Employment factors for public parking facilities provided by Economic and Planning Systems, Inc., 2009.

f. Parking based on Table II-2 of this EIR, Chapter II (Project Description). Includes Commercial (structured) and General and Commercial (on street).

g. Employment factors for parks and open space provided by Economic and Planning Systems, Inc., 2009.

h. Open space acreages based on Table II-2 of this EIR, Chapter II (Project Description).

Table III.C-8 Project Construction Employment						
<i>Year</i>	<i>Candlestick Point</i>		<i>HPS Phase II</i>		<i>Combined</i>	
	<i>Max. Number of Daily Workers</i>	<i>Avg. Number of Daily Workers</i>	<i>Max. Number of Daily Workers</i>	<i>Avg. Number of Daily Workers</i>	<i>Max. Number of Daily Workers</i>	<i>Avg. Number of Daily Workers</i>
2010	—	—	60	48	60	48
2011	40	32	83	66	123	98
2012	68	54	168	134	236	188
2013	121	96	239	192	360	288
2014	105	83	252	202	357	285
2015	139	110	342	275	481	385
2016	169	144	335	269	504	413
2017	172	136	171	139	343	275
2018	113	90	78	65	191	155
2019	127	101	16	14	143	115
2020	180	143	—	—	180	143
2021	133	106	—	—	133	106
2022	107	85	36	30	143	115
2023	117	93	36	30	153	123
2024	133	105	—	—	133	105
2025	78	62	—	—	78	62
2026	40	32	—	—	40	32
2027	14	10	—	—	14	10
2028	14	10	—	—	14	10

SOURCE: MACTEC, 2009.

a. Construction employment includes on-site construction, off-site roadway improvements, field management, and shoreline improvements.

The analysis considers whether the Project would contribute to substantial daytime and/or residential population growth. “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. As a result of the Project, direct and indirect growth would result at the Project site and in the surrounding Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood. Direct population growth at Candlestick Point would include the residents and employees who would occupy the new homes and businesses developed at the Project site, as well as temporary construction employment. Indirect growth is often defined as “leapfrog” development, development that occurs as infrastructure is expanded to previously un-served areas. Such development patterns usually occur in suburban areas adjacent to or near undeveloped lands.

The analysis also considers whether the Project would displace substantial numbers of residents or housing units. This analysis considers both temporary (construction-related) displacement, as well as permanent displacement. Displacement of residents would be considered to occur if residents were forced to leave their homes without being provided with temporary housing, monetary compensation, or

some other form of mitigation to help with the relocation process and if they were not given the right to return. Displacement of housing units would occur if housing units were demolished and replaced with an alternative land use.

Additionally, the Project's potential contribution to cumulative population, housing, and employment impacts are evaluated in the context of existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable future development expected in the City.

■ Construction Impacts

Impact PH-1: Population Growth

Impact PH-1 Construction of the Project would not induce substantial direct population growth. (Less than Significant) [Criterion C.a]

There would be direct, but temporary, construction job growth at the Project site as a result of the Project. Table III.C-8 shows the average and maximum number of construction workers that would be employed during the construction period on a daily basis. Peak construction employment would occur in 2016 and 2017 for Candlestick Point, with an average of 144 and a maximum of 169 workers on site in 2016 and an average of 136 and a maximum of 172 workers on site in 2017. Peak construction employment for HPS Phase II would occur in 2015 and 2016. During this time, an average of 275 workers and a maximum of 342 construction workers would be employed at HPS Phase II in 2015, and an average of 269 and maximum of 335 construction workers during 2016. A maximum of 504 construction workers would be expected to be working at the Project site at any given point during the construction period.

It is anticipated that construction employees not already living in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood would commute from elsewhere in the Bay Area rather than relocate to the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood for a temporary construction assignment, and construction hiring policies associated with this Project would aim to maximize hiring among local residents. Thus, development of the Project would not generate a substantial, unplanned population increase. Impacts associated with construction employment would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

■ Operational impacts

Impact PH-2: Population Growth

Impact of Candlestick Point

Impact PH-2a Operation of Candlestick Point would not induce substantial direct or indirect population growth. (Less than Significant) [Criterion C.a]

Direct Growth

As shown in Table III.C-6, the Project would develop approximately 10,500 housing units, of which 7,850 (approximately 75 percent) would be at Candlestick Point. Based on an average household size of 2.3 persons per unit and full occupancy of all units, population at Candlestick Point would be

approximately 18,290 residents at full build-out in 2030. The Project would also include development of new commercial, industrial, R&D/office, and retail uses, resulting in employment of 3,478 jobs at Candlestick Point (refer to Table III.C-7). In total, the population at Candlestick Point would represent approximately 2.0 percent of the citywide population of 916,800 in 2030, while employment would represent 0.5 percent of the 748,100 jobs in 2030.

Although the Project would result in an increase in population and employment at Candlestick Point, growth in this area has long been the subject of many planning activities. The primary objective of the Project is to provide new housing and non-residential uses in support of planned redevelopment. Planning activities pertaining to Candlestick Point date to 1969, with initial adoption of the BVHP Redevelopment Plan. As discussed in Chapter I, development of Candlestick Point was also anticipated in the BVHP Area Plan, and in a series of initiatives approved by San Francisco voters (Propositions D, E and G).^{82,83} The BVHP Redevelopment Plan was updated in 2005 and 2006, and uses planned for HPS Phase I under the BVHP Redevelopment Plan are currently under construction. The Project, as proposed, was developed based on the land uses, number of housing units (10,000 units total at HPS Phase II and Candlestick Point), and objectives approved by voters under Proposition G in 2008. In summary, the uses provided as part of the Project support planned growth at the Project site.

As a result of these ongoing planning activities, City service providers have been aware of, and have included future growth projections for Candlestick Point, in their long-term operations plans. Planning department population projections⁸⁴ include the population growth associated with the Project and are the basis of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's *Water Supply Availability Study*. In addition, the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant has capacity to treat wastewater from the Project site.⁸⁵ The Project would provide all on-site infrastructure for connections to City mains, and would include on-site treatment of stormwater runoff. Refer to Section II.D (Project Objectives), Section III.O (Public Services), Section III.P (Recreation), Section III.Q (Utilities), and Section III.R (Energy) for further description of the Project's potential impacts on infrastructure and services. In summary, the infrastructure needed to support the level of growth anticipated under the Project was planned based on population projections that included the housing and employment associated with the Project.

Employment growth at Candlestick Point would also be considered substantial if it resulted in housing demand that would exceed planned regional housing development. Table III.C-9 (Project Housing Demand) estimates the number of housing units that would be needed to provide housing for employees of jobs created as a result of the Project. These calculations were derived from existing Census Bureau employment and U.S. Department of Transportation commuting pattern data.⁸⁶ The average household would be expected to have 1.36 workers. This rate is based on the Planning Department's projection of the number of workers in the average City household in 2025 (no 2030 forecast data are available)⁸⁷. Utilizing the rate of 1.36 workers per dwelling unit, the Project, with a total employment of 10,730

⁸² Candlestick Point is outside the boundaries of the HPS Redevelopment Plan.

⁸³ Proposition G repealed Propositions D and F.

⁸⁴ Memorandum from John Rahaim, Director of Planning, San Francisco Planning Department to Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commissions, *Projections of Growth by 2030*, July 9, 2009.

⁸⁵ San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Sewer System, 2009.

⁸⁶ Census Bureau, 2009; US Department of Transportation, *Census 2000 Transportation Planning Package*, 2006.

⁸⁷ San Francisco, General Plan Housing Element, Table I-14, 2004.

workers, would require 0.74 housing units per worker (calculated as 1 dwelling unit/1.36 workers equals the number of dwelling units per worker, which is 0.74). Table III.C-9 assumes that approximately 55 percent of the workers would seek housing in the City, consistent with existing commuting patterns.⁸⁸ The calculations also assume a vacancy rate of 4.7 percent,⁸⁹ which requires an add-on demand to account for the vacancy rate (see footnotes c and d in Table III.C-9, below). Based on these assumptions, the development at Candlestick Point would result in a total demand for 2,677 housing units based on employee demand. A total of 7,850 units would be provided at Candlestick Point, although 10,500 units would be provided within the entire Project site.⁹⁰

Analysis Area	Project Employment^{a,b}	Project Housing Demand, San Francisco^c	Project Housing Demand, Other Communities^d	Total Demand	Project Housing^e
Candlestick Point	3,476	1,472	1,205	2,677	7,850
HPS Phase II	7,254	3,072	2,514	5,586	2,650
Project Site Total	10,730	4,544	3,719	8,263	10,500

- a. Does not include existing employment.
- b. Project employment data are derived from Table III.C-7.
- c. Calculated as the projected employment divided by 1.36, plus 4.7% additional housing units to account for vacancy rate, times 55% total demand in San Francisco.
- d. Based on existing commuting patterns, housing demand in other communities is estimated to be 45% of total housing demand; calculated as projected employment divided by 1.36, plus 4.7% additional housing units to account for vacancy rate, times 45% total demand in other communities.
- e. Employment projections are provided in Table III.C-6.

Total demand for housing at Candlestick Point would represent 1.2 percent of the total Bay Area housing need of 214,500 units (based on the RHNA targets; refer to Section III.C.2 [Setting]) projected by ABAG through 2014.⁹¹ While the population increase associated with employment at Candlestick Point could be entirely accommodated at the Project site, it is likely that employees of the Project would elect to live elsewhere in the City or within surrounding Bay Area communities.

Based on existing commuting patterns, approximately 1,472 housing units would be required in San Francisco to meet anticipated housing demand. The 7,850 housing units that would be developed at Candlestick Point would exceed the total demand for new units within the City generated by employment at Candlestick Point. Given that a broad range of housing options of varying sizes, types, and levels of affordability would be developed at Candlestick Point and that such housing would be in close proximity to the jobs provided by the Project, it is likely that future employees at Candlestick Point would seek housing at the Project site prior to searching for housing in the surrounding Bayview Hunters Point

⁸⁸ This assumption provides a conservative estimate of the housing demand that the Project would generate in other Bay Area communities, such as nearby cities in San Mateo County. Information pertaining to commuting trends was derived from US Department of Transportation, *Census 2000 Transportation Planning Package*, 2006.

⁸⁹ This rate is based on California Department of Finance, January 2008 Projections.

⁹⁰ It should be noted that one of the Project objectives is to provide employment opportunities for existing residents in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood; thus, it is anticipated that some of the future employees at Candlestick Point would include residents already living in the neighborhood. Although total housing demand could include existing households, this analysis conservatively assumes that all housing demand generated by the Project would need to be accommodated by new units.

⁹¹ The RHNP is updated every five years and does not extend through 2030.

neighborhood. However, if future employees did seek housing elsewhere in the neighborhood, the effects would not be adverse. As stated on p. 8 of the BVHP Redevelopment Plan, future development in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood should:

Eliminat[e] blighting influences and correct environmental deficiencies within the Project Area, including, but not limited to, abnormally high vacancies, abandoned, deteriorated and dilapidated buildings, incompatible land uses, depreciated or stagnant property values, and inadequate or deteriorated public improvements, facilities and utilities.⁹²

Persons associated with the Project seeking housing within the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood would help to reduce the excessive vacancies identified by the BVHP Redevelopment Plan. Moreover, the housing provided at Candlestick Point would also be available to existing residents of the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood should existing residents wish to relocate to the Project site.

A percentage of the persons employed at Candlestick Point would also be expected to commute to other communities outside of the City for various personal and socioeconomic reasons, for example, to accommodate the employment of a spouse or to maintain existing community relationships. Based on existing commuting patterns, demand for about 1,205 units would be generated in surrounding Bay Area communities by Candlestick Point development. 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.

Employment at Candlestick Point would not create a substantial demand for housing in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood, San Francisco, or the region in excess of the housing provided as part of the Project or the housing otherwise available in the Bay Area. The amount of housing provided by the Project would exceed demand generated by employees of the Project. To summarize, the need for infrastructure, public services, and housing associated with direct population growth proposed at Candlestick Point has been anticipated in ongoing local and regional planning activities. All impacts associated with direct population growth are considered less than significant for Candlestick Point. No mitigation is required.

Indirect Growth

As infrastructure, public services, roads, and other services and communities amenities are expanded, there would also be a potential for the development at Candlestick Point to generate indirect population growth. Indirect growth is often defined as “leapfrog” development, development that occurs as infrastructure is expanded to previously un-served areas. Such development patterns usually occur in suburban areas adjacent to undeveloped lands. Areas surrounding the Project site are built out, except for sites such as Executive Park or India Basin Shoreline that are currently undergoing development or are the subject of planned future development. Thus, the surrounding lands are not vulnerable to leapfrog-type development.

Infrastructure and services would be expanded to serve Candlestick Point, without significant excess capacity that might encourage additional local growth beyond that already planned for under Proposition G and under the redevelopment plans. The development at Candlestick Point would not

⁹² City and County of San Francisco, Redevelopment Agency, *Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan*, p. 8, 2006.

expand infrastructure to geographic areas that were not previously served, nor would it create new transportation access to a previously inaccessible area. All impacts associated with indirect population growth are considered less than significant for Candlestick Point. No mitigation is required.

Impact of Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II

Impact PH-2b **Operation of HPS Phase II would not induce substantial direct or indirect population growth. (Less than Significant) [Criterion C.a]**

Direct Growth

Direct population growth at HPS Phase II would include the residents and employees who would occupy the new homes and businesses developed at this site. As shown in Table III.C-6, 2,650 housing units (approximately 25 percent of the Project total) would be at HPS Phase II. The population at HPS Phase II would be approximately 6,175 residents at full build-out in 2030. The Project would also include development of new commercial, industrial, R&D/office, and retail uses, resulting in employment of 7,252 jobs at HPS Phase II (refer to Table III.C-7). In total, the population at HPS Phase II would represent approximately 0.7 percent of the citywide population of 916,800 in 2030, while employment would represent 1.0 percent of the 748,100 jobs in 2030.

Although the Project would result in an increase in population and employment at HPS Phase II, growth in this area has long been the subject of many planning activities. The primary objective of the Project is to provide new housing and non-residential uses in support of planned redevelopment. Planning activities pertaining to HPS Phase II date to 1969, preceding closure of the HPS naval shipyard. As discussed in Chapter I, development of HPS Phase II was anticipated in the HPS Redevelopment Plan and in an initiative approved by San Francisco voters (Proposition G).^{93,94} Uses planned for HPS Phase I under the HPS Redevelopment Plan are currently under construction. The Project, as proposed, was developed based on the land uses, number of housing units (approximately 10,000 units total at HPS Phase II and Candlestick Point), and objectives approved by voters under Proposition G in 2008 (Project Objectives are outlined in Section II.D). In summary, the uses provided as part of the Project support planned growth at the Project site.

As a result of these ongoing planning activities, City service providers have been aware of, and have included future growth projections for HPS Phase II, in their long-term operations plans. Planning department population projections⁹⁵ include the population growth associated with the Project and are the basis of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's *Water Supply Availability Study*. In addition, the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant has capacity to treat wastewater from the Project site.⁹⁶ The Project would provide all on-site infrastructure for connections to City mains, and would include on-site treatment of stormwater runoff. Refer to Section III.O, Section III.P, Section III.Q, and Section III.R for further description of the Project's potential impacts on infrastructure and services. In summary, the

⁹³ The HPS Phase II site is outside the boundaries of the BVHP Redevelopment Plan and BVHP Area Plan.

⁹⁴ Proposition G repealed Propositions D and F.

⁹⁵ Memorandum from John Rahaim, Director of Planning, San Francisco Planning Department to Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commissions, *Projections of Growth by 2030*, July 9, 2009.

⁹⁶ San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2009.

infrastructure needed to support the level of growth anticipated under the Project was planned based on population projections that included the housing and employment associated with the Project.

Employment growth at HPS Phase II would also be considered substantial if it resulted in housing demand that would exceed planned regional housing development. Table III.C-9 estimates the number of housing units that would be needed to provide housing for employees of jobs created as a result of the Project. The average household would be expected to have 1.36 workers, resulting in a need for 0.74 housing units per worker.⁹⁷ Table III.C-9 indicates that approximately 55 percent of the workers would seek housing in the City, consistent with existing commuting patterns.⁹⁸ The calculations also assume a vacancy rate of 4.7 percent.⁹⁹ Based on these assumptions, the development at HPS Phase II would result in a total demand for 5,586 housing units as a result of employment at HPS Phase II.¹⁰⁰

Total demand for housing at HPS Phase II would represent 2.6 percent of the total Bay Area housing need of 214,500 units (based on the RHNA targets; refer to Section III.C.2) projected by ABAG through 2014.¹⁰¹ While the population increase associated with employment at HPS Phase II could be entirely accommodated at the Project site, it is likely that employees of the Project would elect to live elsewhere in the City or within surrounding Bay Area communities.

Based on existing commuting patterns, approximately 3,072 housing units would be required in San Francisco to meet anticipated housing demand. The 2,650 housing units that would be developed at HPS Phase II would be less than the total demand for new units generated by employment at HPS Phase II; however, units being constructed at HPS Phase I and at Candlestick Point would offset HPS Phase II housing demand. Given that a broad range of housing options of varying sizes, types, and levels of affordability would be developed at HPS Phase I, HPS Phase II, and Candlestick Point, and such housing would be in close proximity to the jobs provided by the Project, it is likely that future employees at HPS Phase II would seek housing at the Project site prior to searching for housing in the surrounding Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood. However, if future employees did seek housing elsewhere in the neighborhood, the effects would not be adverse. Employees of HPS Phase II businesses seeking housing within the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood would help to reduce the excessive vacancies identified by the BVHP Redevelopment Plan. Moreover, the housing provided at HPS Phase II would also be available to existing residents of the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood should existing residents wish to relocate to the Project site.

⁹⁷ Households per worker = 1 household/ 1.36 workers. This rate is based on the Planning Department's projection of the number of workers in the average City household in 2025 (no 2030 forecast data are available). San Francisco, General Plan Housing Element, Table I-14, 2004.

⁹⁸ This assumption provides a conservative estimate of the housing demand that the Project would generate in other Bay Area communities, such as nearby cities in San Mateo County. Information pertaining to commuting trends was derived from US Department of Transportation, *Census 2000 Transportation Planning Package*, 2006.

⁹⁹ This rate is based on California Department of Finance, January 2008 Projections.

¹⁰⁰ It should be noted that one of the Project objectives is to provide employment opportunities for existing residents in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood; thus, it is anticipated that some of the future employees at HPS Phase II would include residents already living in the neighborhood. Although total housing demand could include existing households, this analysis conservatively assumes that all housing demand generated by the Project would need to be accommodated by new units.

¹⁰¹ The RHNP is updated every five years and does not extend through 2030.

A percentage of the persons employed at HPS Phase II would also be expected to commute to other communities outside of the City for various personal and socioeconomic reasons. Based on existing commuting patterns, the demand for about 2,514 units would be generated in surrounding Bay Area communities by HPS Phase II development. 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.

It is not anticipated that employment at HPS Phase II would create a substantial demand for housing in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood, San Francisco, or the region in excess of the housing provided as part of the Project or the housing otherwise available in the Bay Area. To summarize, the need for infrastructure, public services, and housing associated with direct population growth proposed at HPS Phase II has been anticipated in ongoing local and regional planning activities. All impacts associated with direct population growth are considered less than significant for HPS Phase II. No mitigation is required.

Indirect Growth

As infrastructure, public services, roads, and other services and communities amenities are expanded, there would also be a potential for the development at HPS Phase II to generate indirect population growth. Indirect growth is often defined as “leapfrog” development, development that occurs as infrastructure is expanded to previously un-served or underserved areas. Such development patterns usually occur in suburban areas adjacent to undeveloped lands. Areas surrounding the Project site are built out, except for sites such as Executive Park or India Basin that are currently undergoing development or are the subject of planned future development. Thus, the surrounding lands are not vulnerable to leapfrog-type development.

Infrastructure and services would be expanded to serve HPS Phase II, without significant excess capacity that might encourage additional local growth beyond that already planned for under Proposition G and under the redevelopment plans. The development at HPS Phase II would not expand infrastructure to geographic areas that were not previously served, nor would it create new transportation access to a previously inaccessible area. All impacts associated with indirect population growth are considered less than significant for HPS Phase II. No mitigation is required.

Combined Impact of Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II

Impact PH-2 Operation of the Project would not induce substantial direct or indirect population growth. (Less than Significant) [Criterion C.a]

The Project would develop 7,850 housing units at Candlestick Point and 2,650 units at HPS Phase II, a total of 10,500 residential units. The demand for 8,263 housing units that would be generated by the Project would be less than the total number of units provided by the Project.

The demand for housing units outside of San Francisco, conservatively assuming that 45 percent of those employed at the Project site would commute from outside of San Francisco, would be dispersed throughout the nine-county Bay Area.¹⁰² In addition, any potential Project-related increase in housing

¹⁰² Refer to the discussion of commuting patterns in Section III.D (Transportation and Circulation).

demand in the surrounding Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood would help to fill the existing and abnormally high vacancies in the neighborhood that contribute to conditions of economic blight. The Project would provide more housing units than the demand it would generate. Therefore, the Project would create a substantial demand for housing in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood, San Francisco, or the region in excess of the total number of housing units provided as part of the Project.

The Project would provide infrastructure and services that would meet the needs of the residents and employees generated at the site. However, the infrastructure would not extend to previously un-served areas, allowing indirect population growth. The jobs and housing units that would be provided at the Project site would be closely balanced (approximately 10,730 jobs and 10,500 housing units) so that neither a surplus of housing or jobs would occur, resulting in indirect residential or employment growth. As a result, the population and employment increase associated with the Project would not be substantial. The Project impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact PH-3: Residential Displacement

Impact of Candlestick Point

Impact PH-3a **Implementation of the Project would not displace existing housing units and residents at Candlestick Point, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere. (No Impact) [Criteria C.b and C.c]**

The Project would demolish and replace 256 units at the Alice Griffith public housing site. There are no other housing units or residents on the Project site. Redevelopment of the Alice Griffith site would proceed in phases and would not displace existing residents. The initial phases would develop currently vacant portions of the Alice Griffith site, and existing residents would then occupy replacement public housing units before existing structures would be demolished in subsequent phases. Overall, the Project would develop a total of 1,210 units of public housing, affordable housing, below-market rate housing, and market-rate housing in the Alice Griffith district, and 3,345 units of public housing, affordable housing, and below-market rate housing overall.

Because the Project would not displace existing housing units or residents that would necessitate the construction of new units elsewhere, beyond the units already provided as part of the Project, there would be no impact. No mitigation is required.

Impact of Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II

Impact PH-3b **Implementation of the Project would not displace existing housing units or residents at HPS Phase II, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere. (No Impact) [Criteria C.b and C.c]**

There are no existing housing units at HPS Phase II. Therefore, build-out of the Project would not replace housing units with new uses, and no existing residents would be displaced. The Project would create demand for housing; however, as discussed under Impact PH-2b, such demand would not be substantial and could be accommodated by housing provided as part of the Project. Because there would be no residential displacement at HPS Phase II, development of the Project would have no impact on displacement of housing and residents at this site. No mitigation is required.

Combined Impact of Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II

Impact PH-3 **The Project would not displace existing housing units or residents, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere. (No Impact)**
[Criteria C.b and C.c]

As discussed under Impact PH-3a, the Project would demolish and replace 256 units at the Alice Griffith public housing site. The Project would not displace existing housing units or residents that would necessitate the construction of new units elsewhere, beyond the units already provided as part of the Project. Further, as discussed in Impact PH-3b, there are no existing housing units at HPS Phase II. Therefore, build-out of the Project would not replace housing units with new uses, and no existing residents would be displaced. Development of the Project would have no impact on displacement of housing and residents. No mitigation is required.

■ Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to population and housing is the City and County of San Francisco. The past and present development in the City is described in the Setting section of this chapter, representing the baseline conditions for evaluation of cumulative impacts. Reasonably foreseeable future development forecasts are based on projections of future growth and take into account projects going through the entitlement process. The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts to employment would include the entire Bay Area (as represented by the ABAG Planning Area), since a substantial percentage of City population commutes to jobs outside City limits, and substantial numbers of residents of other cities in the Bay Area commute to jobs within the City. The existing employment conditions, representing past and present development in this geographic area, are presented in the setting description of regional employment.

The Planning Department routinely prepares projections for the purposes of analyzing impacts of plans and projects undergoing the environmental review process. The Planning Department recently developed projections for citywide growth expectations by 2030.¹⁰³ The projections also specifically took into account projects currently in various stages of the entitlement process, as well as Treasure Island, Park Merced projects, and the Project, the latter of which is being analyzed in this EIR. Development projections estimate an increase in 61,814 households, 133,359 persons, and 195,010 jobs from 2005 to 2030.

Population and Housing

Development of cumulative projects in the City and County of San Francisco would result in an increase in population, housing, and employment. As long as the cumulative project scenario generates cumulative population, housing, and employment conditions that are within the projections formulated by the Planning Department by 2030 and meet their share of the RHND, there would be no significant adverse impact to population, housing, and employment.

As noted, above, “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

¹⁰³ Correspondence from John Rahaim, Director of Planning, to SFPUC, July 9, 2009.

residents, employees, and visitors. Development of cumulative projects could result in increases in population. Population projections estimate an increase in 133,359 City residents between 2005 and 2030, an overall increase of 17.0 percent, or approximately 0.7 percent per year. Subtracting the population increase associated with the Project, as this number has been included in the overall population projections, cumulative projects could account for up to 108,894 persons and fall within the City's projections. It is possible that cumulative projects could result in localized changes in zoning or land uses that could result in substantial direct or indirect population growth and an exceedance of City population projections. Such an impact, however, is not likely for several reasons. First, during the process of considering such projects, the City would be required to prepare an environmental review pursuant to CEQA, identify any infrastructure or service-related significant impacts and provide mitigation. Second, the City is largely built and there are few opportunities for unplanned changes in zoning or land use that would cause substantial growth. Third, the City and Agency actively engage in long-range planning efforts throughout the City, such that population growth would occur in the context of these planning activities that would consider infrastructure, public services, and housing needs. Consequently, there is no anticipated significant cumulative impact associated with population and housing growth.

Direct population growth associated with the Project would be considered "planned" growth, since this Project has been considered in the City's population planning projections. In total, the Project would represent 18.3 percent of the projected population growth in the City between 2005 and 2030. Indirect growth would include residential and employment growth in surrounding neighborhoods resulting from the expansion of infrastructure and services proposed under the Project. As stated above, such growth would only be considered substantial if it were not anticipated in local planning efforts. Infrastructure and services would be expanded to serve the Project, without significant excess capacity that might encourage additional local growth beyond that already planned for under Proposition G and under the redevelopment plans. Because this population growth has been accounted for in City projections, it would not be considered substantial. Therefore, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any potential cumulative impact related to substantial increases in population, and the Project's cumulative impact would be less than significant.

Housing need as identified in the 2007–2014 Housing Element Update is 31,193 units; the Project would provide approximately 10,500 dwelling units, or over one-third of the City's portion of the regional housing need. As noted in Setting, above, over the course of the past several decades, the 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 8,263 housing units that would be generated by the Project would be less than the total number of units provided by the Project. The Project would provide a benefit to the region by constructing more housing than the demand it would generate, helping to achieve a better jobs/housing balance in the Bay Area.

The demand for housing units outside of the City, conservatively assuming that 45 percent of those employed at the Project site would commute from outside of San Francisco, would be dispersed

throughout the nine-county Bay Area.¹⁰⁴ In addition, any potential Project-related increase in housing demand in the surrounding Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood would help to fill the existing and abnormally high vacancies in the neighborhood that contribute to conditions of economic blight. The Project would not create a substantial demand for housing in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood, San Francisco, or the region in excess of the total number of housing units provided as part of the Project.

The Project's contribution to the significant cumulative housing shortage in the Bay Area would not be cumulatively considerable because it would provide more housing than is required by Project demand. The Project's cumulative impact would be less than significant.

Employment

The Bay Area is a major employment center, with over 3.4 million jobs reported in 2005.¹⁰⁵ A large percentage of this employment is in San Francisco. As shown in Table III.C-5, there were approximately 553,090 jobs in the City in 2005, approximately 17 percent of the 3.2 million total regional jobs. Development of cumulative projects in the Bay Area would be expected to result in indirect population growth through provision of increased employment opportunities. Employment growth would be considered substantial if it resulted in housing demand that would exceed planned regional housing development. It is possible that development of the cumulative projects could result in substantial employment growth that would result in a regional housing shortage. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.

Development at the Project site would provide 10,730 permanent jobs by 2030 (along with temporary construction-related jobs). Regional employment in 2005 consisted of 3.2 million jobs, with a projected increase of approximately 1.7 million jobs to 4.9 million jobs in 2030. San Francisco has traditionally experienced, and will continue to experience, ample employment opportunities that are not met by an equal supply of housing within the City, or even the Bay Area. The Project's contribution of 10,730 permanent jobs would represent 0.3 percent of the anticipated increase in regional employment through 2030. The Project's employment would result in a related increase in housing demand for 8,263 units, as shown in Table III.C-9, which would be less than the total number of units provided by the Project.

Therefore, the population growth associated with increased employment from the Project 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 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. The Project's cumulative impact would be less than significant.

Displacement of Existing Housing

Cumulative projects in the City and County of San Francisco could displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing and/or could necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

¹⁰⁴ Refer to the discussion of commuting patterns in Section III.D (Transportation and Circulation).

¹⁰⁵ Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections 2007*, 2006.

Since there is a housing shortage in the City, as noted above, any projects that result in net displacement of existing housing would be considered to result in a potentially significant impact on housing.

The Project would demolish and replace 256 units at the Alice Griffith public housing site; the Project would not displace existing residents. Current vacant portions of the Alice Griffith site would be developed, and existing residents would occupy replacement public housing units before existing structures would be demolished. Overall, the Project would develop a total of 1,210 units of public housing, affordable housing, below-market rate housing, and market-rate housing in the Alice Griffith subarea. As the Project would not permanently displace any existing residents and would have no impact with respect to this threshold, it would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any potentially significant cumulative impact with regard to displacement of persons or housing. There would be no Project cumulative impact.

