

1 **4.3 SOCIOECONOMICS**

2 Potential direct and indirect impacts on employment, population, housing, and schools
3 resulting from disposal and reuse of NSTI are discussed in this section. Factors considered in
4 determining whether an alternative would have significant socioeconomic impacts include the
5 extent or degree to which its implementation would:

- 6 1. Cause a decrease in local or region of influence employment;
- 7 2. Induce growth or concentrations of population;
- 8 3. Create a demand for additional housing in San Francisco, Oakland, or the surrounding
9 communities; or
- 10 4. Generate student enrollment that exceeds the capability of responsible authorities to
11 accommodate.

12 The significance of socioeconomic impacts is related to the social and economic characteristics
13 of the region. In general, the more jobs generated, the more beneficial the socioeconomic effects
14 that may occur. Population and housing growth may have ramifications for other
15 environmental issues, such as potential traffic increases and the need for additional
16 infrastructure improvements. The significance of these other impacts is defined in pertinent
17 sections of this document.

18 Table 4.3-1 summarizes the estimated number of jobs, housing units, and residents that would
19 be associated with each reuse alternative. Assumptions used to generate the population and
20 employment estimates are provided in Appendix F, Socioeconomics.

21 The impacts presented in this section have been evaluated against the baseline environmental
22 conditions presented in Chapter 3. Navy recognizes that changes in the environmental
23 conditions may have occurred in the period between the baseline years and the present.
24 Although these changes may result in different, and in many cases, lesser impacts to certain
25 resources, changes to the impact analysis based on any interim change in resource conditions is
26 not appropriate.

27 **4.3.1 Alternative 1**

28 *Not Significant Impacts*

29 Employment (Factor 1). Alternative 1 would create approximately 4,920 full-time equivalent jobs
30 (information on employment generation factors is provided in Appendix F). Generation of this
31 employment would occur over a period of 15 or more years, dependent on market conditions,
32 land availability, and other factors.

33 Most of the jobs associated with this alternative would be created through reuse of parts of
34 Treasure Island for a themed attraction, hotel and conference facilities, restaurants, film studios,
35 community services, and a variety of recreational facilities. The largest employment generator
36 would be the themed attraction, which would employ approximately 3,500 persons, although
37 some of these jobs would be seasonal. Of the approximately 4,920 full-time equivalent jobs
38 created, full-time equivalent employment associated with the themed attraction is estimated to

4.3 Socioeconomics

1 be approximately 1,750. After the themed attraction, the next largest employment generators
 2 would be hotel facilities, the film industry, and restaurants.

3 **Table 4.3-1. Estimated Jobs, Population, and Housing Units for**
 4 **Baseline Conditions and Reuse Alternatives**

	<i>Baseline Conditions (Year)</i>	<i>Alternative 1</i>	<i>Alternative 2</i>	<i>Alternative 3</i>
EMPLOYMENT¹				
Treasure Island	-	4,740	2,640	2,015
Yerba Buena Island	-	180	180	180
Total employment	3,635 ^{3,4} (1988)	4,920	2,820	2,195
RESIDENT POPULATION				
Treasure Island ²	-	6,020	90	3,060
Yerba Buena Island	-	875	620	450
Total population	4,500 ^{3,4} (1990)	6,895	710	3,510
HOUSING UNITS				
Treasure Island	-	2,500	0	905
Yerba Buena Island	-	350	250	160
Total housing units	1,045 ^{3,4} (1990)	2,850	250	1,065
1 Jobs are reported as full-time equivalent jobs; seasonal jobs would increase the total number of jobs. 2 Treasure Island resident population includes brig inmates in all scenarios. 3 Numbers represent totals for 1988 (military employment) and 1990 (civilian employment, population, and housing); data were not available for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island separately. 4 Data are reported for Census Tract 179.02, which encompasses both Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, and therefore includes US Coast Guard data, but are representative of NSTI baseline conditions. Note: A "-" indicates that information was not available. Sources: DON 1988b; US Department of Commerce 1990; DON 1997I.				

5 The number of civilian jobs created under Alternative 1 would offset the 750 jobs lost to closure
 6 and would result in a net gain of 4,170 jobs. Therefore, the projected increase in employment
 7 under Alternative 1 would be a beneficial impact.¹ No mitigation is proposed.

8 **Population (Factor 2).** The development of the reuse plan area would result in an increase in San
 9 Francisco's population through the provision of new housing units. As shown in Table 4-1,
 10 development under Alternative 1 would result in an estimated total population of about 6,895
 11 people. This estimate is based on the assumption that the average household size for existing
 12 and newly constructed housing units is 3.2 and 2.3 persons, respectively (see Appendix F.2,
 13 Socioeconomics). Subtracting the baseline residential population of approximately 4,500 in
 14 1990, the net population increase would be approximately 2,395 persons. This increase of 2,395
 15 persons represents 0.3 percent of the projected population in San Francisco by 2015 and is
 16 accounted for in ABAG's projected population increases; therefore, this is not considered a
 17 significant impact (ABAG 2001). No mitigation is proposed.

1 Housing (Factor 3). Alternative 1 would provide up to 2,850 housing units on the site at
2 buildout (Table 4-1). Approximately 290 units (200 on Treasure Island and 90 on Yerba Buena
3 Island) are existing military housing that would be converted to civilian use. Because none of
4 the NSTI housing units were previously available to the general public, the total contribution to
5 the City and County of San Francisco housing market would be 2,850 units.

6 Alternative 1 also addresses housing needs of the homeless. TIHDI initially would manage the
7 leasing of 375 units (285 units on Treasure Island and 90 units on Yerba Buena Island) from the
8 existing housing stock on the two islands, with promise of additional land for TIHDI housing if
9 new housing is developed. As stated in the Draft Reuse Plan, TIHDI would be provided one
10 acre for every 1,000 new residential units developed (San Francisco 1996e). The buildout
11 housing mix would range from affordable to market-rate under this agreement.

12 Given San Francisco's lack of affordable housing and its lack of housing for those employed in San
13 Francisco, Alternative 1 would have a beneficial impact on housing by providing housing for all
14 income levels and by increasing the number of housing units within the San Francisco housing
15 market (ABAG 1995b). No mitigation is proposed.

16 Jobs-housing balance (Factor 3). In regional terms, Alternative 1 would add both housing (2,850
17 units) and jobs (4,920 employees) to the City and County of San Francisco. Assuming that 55
18 percent of people working in San Francisco are expected to live in the city in 2015, and given
19 that the average number of San Francisco workers in households with workers is 1.6 (MTC
20 undated in San Francisco 1998b; Keyser Marston Associates and Gabriel Roche 1997 in San
21 Francisco 1998b), projected employment growth under Alternative 1 translates to about 1,690
22 San Francisco households. The housing units provided under Alternative 1 can easily
23 accommodate this demand. Because Alternative 1 provides housing units in excess of the
24 demand generated by employment under this alternative, Alternative 1 would not create a
25 demand for additional housing in San Francisco. Alternative 1 would not result in an adverse
26 jobs-housing balance or a significant impact. No mitigation is proposed.

27 Schools (Factor 4). As described in section 3.3, enrollment at elementary schools throughout the
28 SFUSD is at or near capacity; at the middle school and high school levels, some schools are at
29 capacity, while others are underenrolled. Enrollment in the district has remained constant since
30 1990, averaging approximately 63,000 to 64,000 students.

31 Under Alternative 1, the Treasure Island Elementary School would continue to operate. The
32 middle school and high school students at NSTI would be bussed to San Francisco schools. As
33 demonstrated by US Census data, San Francisco households have fewer children compared to
34 Navy households on NSTI. In 1990, there were 1,134 school-aged children (5 to 19 years of age)
35 at NSTI, representing 25 percent of the total NSTI population. In comparison, 96,173 school-
36 aged children lived in San Francisco in 1990, only 13 percent of the total citywide population
37 (US Department of Commerce 1990). Given the population figure of 6,895 derived in the
38 previous section, the number of school-aged children living at NSTI under this alternative is
39 estimated to be approximately 896 in 2015, or about 80 percent of the number of school-aged
40 children who resided there in 1990. This would lead to an overall decrease in enrollment for the
41 San Francisco school system. This is not considered a significant impact. No mitigation is
42 proposed.

4.3 Socioeconomics

1 4.3.2 Alternative 2

2 *Not Significant Impacts*

3 Employment (Factor 1). Alternative 2 would create approximately 2,820 full-time equivalent jobs
4 (information on employment generation factors is provided in Appendix F). This alternative
5 would generate this level of employment over a period of roughly 15 or more years, dependent
6 on market conditions, land availability, and other factors.

7 As in Alternative 1, many new jobs would be associated with a themed attraction or similar
8 visitor attraction. This facility would create about 1,400 seasonal and permanent jobs, or
9 approximately 700 full-time equivalent jobs. The remaining new jobs would be created through
10 the development of a major hotel and conference facility on Treasure Island, as well as smaller
11 scale bed-and-breakfast and reception facilities on Yerba Buena Island.

12 The number of civilian jobs created under Alternative 2 would offset the 750 jobs lost to closure
13 and would result in a net gain of 2,070 jobs. Therefore, the projected increase in employment
14 under Alternative 2 would be a beneficial impact, and no mitigation is proposed.

15 Population (Factor 2). The development of the reuse plan area would result in an increase in San
16 Francisco's population through the provision of new housing units. As shown in Table 4-1,
17 development under Alternative 2 would result in an estimated total population of about 710
18 people; this is because no housing other than the brig is proposed on Treasure Island.
19 Subtracting the baseline residential population of approximately 4,500 in 1990, there would be a
20 net population decrease of approximately 3,790 persons. This decrease represents 0.5 percent of
21 the projected citywide population of 810,500 residents by 2015 and would not be a significant
22 impact. No mitigation is proposed.

23 Housing (Factor 3). Alternative 2 would provide up to 250 housing units on Yerba Buena Island
24 at build-out (Table 4-1); no housing other than the brig is proposed on Treasure Island.
25 Approximately 50 units on Yerba Buena Island are existing military housing that would be
26 converted to civilian use. Because none of the NSTI housing units were previously available to
27 the general public, the total gain would be 250 units. There may be replacement homeless
28 housing for TIHDI to manage and lease elsewhere off-island. By increasing the number of
29 housing units, Alternative 2 would provide a beneficial impact. No mitigation is proposed.

30 Jobs-housing balance (Factor 3). In regional terms, Alternative 2 would add both housing and
31 jobs to the City and County of San Francisco. However, only 250 housing units would be
32 provided for 2,820 full-time equivalent jobs. Assuming that 55 percent of people working in
33 San Francisco are expected to live in the city in 2015, and given that the average number of San
34 Francisco workers in households with workers is 1.6 (MTC undated in San Francisco 1998b;
35 Keyser Marston Associates and Gabriel Roche 1997 in San Francisco 1998b), projected
36 employment growth under Alternative 2 translates to about 970 San Francisco households.
37 Therefore, implementing Alternative 2 would create a demand for additional housing in San
38 Francisco. Based on current vacancy rates, this increased housing demand could be
39 accommodated by existing vacant housing units in San Francisco.

1 An imbalance of housing to jobs is not a physical environmental effect but rather a regional
2 economic and social issue. Certain indirect project and cumulative effects caused by the
3 imbalances in local employment and housing opportunities would be physical environmental
4 impacts, primarily transportation and related air quality impacts created by increased
5 commuting distances for employees living farther from their place of employment. The
6 physical impacts of NSTI's housing supply shortfall under Alternative 2 relate primarily to
7 project-induced and cumulative traffic and air quality effects. These impacts can be reduced
8 through proposed transportation demand management measures (see section 4.5,
9 Transportation and Chapter 5, Cumulative Projects and Impacts).

10 It is expected that demands for new employees on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island
11 under Alternative 2 would be met by the local Bay Area population. Outside of San Francisco,
12 it would be reasonable to presume that any additional housing demand not met locally would
13 be dispersed over the regional housing market and would not be concentrated in any particular
14 location. This additional demand would therefore not have a significant impact on regional
15 housing conditions and land development. No mitigation is proposed.

16 Schools (Factor 4). Under Alternative 2, the Treasure Island Elementary School would be closed.
17 Based on a residential population of 710, the population of school-aged children associated with
18 Alternative 2 would be approximately 92 children in 2015, or less than a tenth the number who
19 resided at NSTI in 1990. These children would be bussed to San Francisco elementary, middle,
20 and high schools. The 80 children represent about 13 percent of the population projected to be
21 living in the 250 units on Yerba Buena Island. Because the 1,042-person decrease in the
22 population of school-aged children at NSTI would more than offset the loss of the 852-student
23 capacity elementary school, there would be an overall decrease in enrollment for San Francisco
24 schools. The impact on schools would be less than significant. No mitigation is proposed.

25 4.3.3 Alternative 3

26 *Not Significant Impacts*

27 Employment (Factor 1). Alternative 3 would create approximately 2,195 full-time equivalent jobs
28 (information on employment generation factors is provided in Appendix F). Generation of this
29 employment would occur over a period of 15 or more years, dependent on market conditions,
30 land availability, and other factors.

31 The majority of new jobs would be associated with mixed use/office space and film production
32 on Treasure Island. The themed attraction would create about 700 seasonal and permanent
33 jobs, or approximately 350 full-time equivalent jobs. The remaining new jobs would be created
34 through the development of smaller scale bed-and-breakfast and reception facilities on Yerba
35 Buena Island.

36 The number of civilian jobs created under Alternative 3 would offset the 750 jobs lost to closure
37 and would result in a net gain of 1,445 jobs. Therefore, the projected increase in employment
38 under Alternative 3 would be a beneficial impact, and no mitigation is proposed.

39 Population (Factor 2). The development of the reuse plan area would result in an increase in San
40 Francisco's population through the provision of new housing units. As shown in Table 4-1,

4.3 Socioeconomics

1 development under Alternative 3 would result in an estimated total population of about 3,510
2 people. Subtracting the baseline residential population of approximately 4,500 in 1990, there
3 would be a net population decrease of approximately 990 persons. This decrease represents 0.1
4 percent of the projected citywide population of 810,500 residents by 2015 and would not be a
5 significant impact. No mitigation is proposed.

6 Housing (Factor 3). Alternative 3 would provide up to 1,065 housing units on the site at build-
7 out (Table 4-1). Approximately 995 units (905 on Treasure Island and 90 on Yerba Buena Island)
8 are existing military housing that would be converted to civilian use. Since the military housing
9 units were not previously available to the civilian market, the total gain would be 1,065 units.

10 Alternative 3 also addresses housing needs of the homeless. The 200 units of the existing housing
11 units on Treasure Island would be made available to TIHDI for leasing. The buildout housing mix
12 would range from affordable to market-rate under this agreement. Through provision of housing
13 for all income levels and by increasing the number of housing units, Alternative 3 would provide
14 a beneficial impact. No mitigation is proposed.

15 Jobs-housing balance (Factor 3). In regional terms, Alternative 3 would add both housing (1,065
16 units) and jobs (2,195 employees) to the City and County of San Francisco. Assuming that 55
17 percent of people working in San Francisco are expected to live in the city in 2015, and given
18 that the average number of San Francisco workers in households with workers is 1.6 (MTC
19 undated in San Francisco 1998b; Keyser Marston Associates and Gabriel Roche 1997 in San
20 Francisco 1998b), projected employment growth under Alternative 1 translates to about 755 San
21 Francisco households. The housing units provided under Alternative 3 can easily accommodate
22 this demand. Because Alternative 3 provides housing units in excess of the demand generated
23 by employment under this alternative, Alternative 3 would not create a demand for additional
24 housing in San Francisco. Alternative 3 would not result in an adverse jobs-housing balance or
25 a significant impact. No mitigation is proposed.

26 Schools (Factor 4). Under Alternative 3, the Treasure Island Elementary School would continue
27 to operate. The projected 2015 population described above would include approximately 456
28 school-aged children, or about 40 percent of the school-aged children who resided on NSTI in
29 1990. The middle school and high school students at NSTI would be bussed to San Francisco
30 schools. Because the number of school-aged children at NSTI, and also in San Francisco, would
31 decline, the schools impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is proposed.

32 4.3.4 No Action Alternative

33 Employment (Factor 1). Under this alternative, property available for disposal at NSTI would
34 continue under federal ownership in an inactive caretaker status, and existing interim leases
35 would be allowed to expire. There would be minimal use of the property and facilities under
36 this alternative. Ongoing activities would include maintenance, to minimize deterioration, and
37 essential security operations.

38 The caretaker program would provide employment for approximately 50 personnel on the site.
39 This basewide level of employment represents a decrease of 700 jobs from the operational
40 baseline. Employment generated by existing leases to nonfederal agencies would cease,

1 because these leases would be allowed to expire and would not be renewed or extended. Given
2 the number of jobs available in the region, this would be a less than significant impact.

3 Population, housing, jobs-housing balance, and schools (Factors 2, 3, and 4). Under the No Action
4 Alternative, the population would decrease to zero once the interim leases expire and the
5 existing military housing would no longer be used. In addition, the No Action Alternative
6 would mean no additional school children enrolling in the SFUSD. No impacts would occur
7 under the No Action Alternative.

8

This page intentionally left blank.