

3.11 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

This section describes the existing physical affected environment and regulatory framework related to population, housing, employment, income, and ethnicity, and discusses the potential effects of the EIS Alternatives related to socioeconomics. In addition to general socioeconomic information, this section includes discussions about environmental justice and risks to children’s health and safety.

3.11.1 Affected Environment

This section presents regional and local demographic and economic information as it relates to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus and the Mission Bay area. The information relating to population, housing, and employment for the region and local jurisdiction (City and County of San Francisco) is derived from the 2000 U.S. Census, which is the most recent comprehensive source of data, as well as the California Department of Finance (CDF) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projections.

Population

Regional and Local

Approximately 7,341,700 persons resided in the greater San Francisco Bay Area in 2010, an increase of 557,938 persons since 2000 (Table 3.11-1). The Bay Area is estimated to experience an increase in total population of 1,377,600 (19 percent) between 2010 and 2030 (Table 3.11-1).

Table 3.11-1: Population of the San Francisco Bay Area and of the City and County of San Francisco

	2000	2010	2020	2030	Annual Average Growth	
					Previous (2000–2010)	Projected (2010–2030)
San Francisco Bay Area	6,783,762	7,341,700	8,018,000	8,719,300	55,794	68,880
City and County of San Francisco	776,733	815,358	810,000	867,100	3,863	2,587

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; CDF, 2011; ABAG, 2011

San Francisco’s population grew steadily from before the turn of the 20th century until World War II. Between 1890 and 1950, the city grew by an average of approximately 80,000 residents per decade; the Great Depression in the 1930s was the only period when the population level stagnated. During the latter half of the 20th century, San Francisco’s population experienced modest declines (1950–1980) and moderate growth (1990–2000), resulting in a population of approximately 776,000 in 2000, nearly the same as in the 1950s.

Approximately 815,358 persons resided in San Francisco in 2010, an increase of 38,625 persons since 2000 (Table 3.11-1). San Francisco is estimated to experience an increase in total population of 51,742 (6.3 percent) between 2010 and 2030 (Table 3.11-1).

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

The existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is located within Census Tract 602 (U,S, Census Bureau, 2000). The Campus does not have any permanent population because there are no permanent housing units on the Campus. However, there is a temporary (inpatient/outpatient) population total of approximately 1,500 persons per day on the Campus.

Mission Bay Area

The Mission Bay area encompasses Census Tracts 179.01, 180, 177, 607, 227.01, 227.02, 227.03, 226, 228.02, 229.03, and 609 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Because no SFVAMC campus currently operates in the Mission Bay area, this area does not have an existing population associated with SFVAMC facilities.

Housing

The greater San Francisco Bay Area had approximately 2,667,340 housing units in 2010, an increase of 201,320 units since 2000 (Table 3.11-2). The Bay Area is estimated to experience an increase in total housing units of 504,600 (19 percent) between 2010 and 2030 (Table 3.11-2). San Francisco had approximately 358,380 housing units in 2010, an increase of 11,853 units since 2000 (Table 3.11-2). San Francisco is estimated to experience an increase in total housing of 42,320 units (12 percent) between 2010 and 2030 (Table 3.11-2).

Table 3.11-2: Housing Units in the San Francisco Bay Area and in the City and County of San Francisco

	2000	2010	2020	2030	Annual Average Growth	
					Previous (2000–2010)	Projected (2010–2030)
San Francisco Bay Area	2,466,020	2,667,340	2,911,000	3,171,940	20,132	25,230
City and County of San Francisco	346,527	358,380	372,750	400,700	1,185	2,116

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; CDF, 2011; ABAG, 2011

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

Hoptel facilities at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus provide temporary, overnight housing for Veterans, and the Community Living Center provides short-term care to restore Veterans to their highest levels of well-being. However, there are no long-term or permanent housing units on the existing Campus.

Mission Bay Area

Because no SFVAMC campus currently operates in the Mission Bay area, this area does not have any existing housing associated with SFVAMC facilities.

Employment

The greater San Francisco Bay Area had approximately 3,475,840 jobs in 2010, a decrease of 277,620 jobs since 2000 (Table 3.11-3). The Bay Area is estimated to experience an increase in total jobs of 1,262,890 (36 percent) between 2010 and 2030 (Table 3.11-2).

Table 3.11-3: Employment in the San Francisco Bay Area and in the City and County of San Francisco

	2000	2010	2020	2030	Annual Average Growth	
					Previous (2000–2010)	Projected (2010–2030)
San Francisco Bay Area	3,753,460	3,475,840	4,040,690	4,738,730	-27,762	63,145
City and County of San Francisco	642,500	568,730	647,190	748,100	-7,377	8,969

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; CDF, 2011; ABAG, 2011

In 2000, the majority of San Francisco had an unemployment rate of only 2–4 percent (SF Public Health, 2011d). However, San Francisco had approximately 568,730 jobs in 2010, a decrease of 73,770 jobs since 2000 (Table 3.11-2). San Francisco is estimated to experience an increase in total jobs of 179,370 (32 percent) between 2010 and 2030 (Table 3.11-3).

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

The existing Fort Miley Campus has a total daily-employment population (staff, volunteers, and contractors) of approximately 3,500 persons per day (SFVAMC, 2012). It is assumed that estimates of the daily-employment population include SFVAMC employees as well as visiting employees from the University of California, San Francisco Medical Center and other hospital-affiliated employees.

Mission Bay Area

Because no SFVAMC campus currently operates in the Mission Bay area, this area does not have any existing employment associated with SFVAMC facilities.

Income

Regional

San Francisco's households represent a wide income range. The majority have a median income range of \$63,610 to \$84,218 (SF Public Health, 2011b), with a few areas that have a high median income range of \$114,772 to \$187,131 (the Seacliff, West of Twin Peaks, Marina, Glen Park, Presidio Heights, and Pacific Heights neighborhoods) and a few areas that have a low median income range of \$11,227 to \$39,073 (the Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, and Financial District neighborhoods) (SF Public Health, 2011b). In addition, in one

San Francisco neighborhood (the Financial District), more than 25 percent of the area's population is living below the federal poverty level (SF Public Health, 2011c).

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus Area

The outer Richmond District neighborhood has a median household income range of \$63,610 to \$84,218 (SF Public Health, 2011b). In addition, less than 10 percent of the population of this neighborhood lives below the federal poverty level (SF Public Health, 2011c).

Mission Bay Area

The Mission Bay area contains the Potrero Hill and Mission Bay neighborhoods. These neighborhoods have a wide median household income range of \$28,275 to \$187,131 (SF Public Health, 2011b). Anywhere from 0 to 25 percent of the population of these neighborhoods lives below the federal poverty level (SF Public Health, 2011c).

Ethnicity

Regional

Because San Francisco is a metropolitan area, the city does not consist of a single ethnicity. However, San Francisco's population is predominantly European American, with a few areas that are predominantly Asian American (Chinatown, the inner Richmond District, outer Sunset District, Crocker Amazon, and Excelsior neighborhoods), one area that is predominantly Hispanic American (Mission neighborhood), and one area that is predominantly African American (Bayview neighborhood) (SF Public Health, 2011a).

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus Area

Most of the outer Richmond District neighborhood is diverse and does not have a majority ethnicity. However, the portion of this neighborhood that is closest to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is predominantly European American (SF Public Health, 2011a).

Mission Bay Area

The Mission Bay area contains the Potrero Hill and Mission Bay neighborhoods. These neighborhoods are predominantly European American (SF Public Health, 2011a).

3.11.2 Regulatory Framework

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S. Code 2000d et seq., and agency implementing regulations prohibit recipients of federal financial assistance from taking actions that discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, or religion. If an agency is aware that a recipient of federal funds may be taking action that is causing a racially discriminatory impact, the agency should consider using Title VI as a means to prevent or eliminate that discrimination.

Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations”

Executive Order (EO) 12898 requires federal agencies to make achieving environmental justice part of their missions by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. These provisions also apply fully to programs involving Native Americans. In addition, EO 12898 requires federal agencies to conduct their programs, policies, and activities in a manner that ensures that such programs, policies, and activities do not have the effect of excluding persons (including populations) from participation in, denying persons (including populations) the benefits of, or subjecting persons (including populations) to discrimination under, such programs, policies, and activities, because of their race, color, or national origin.

EO 12898 particularly emphasizes four issues that are pertinent to the NEPA process:

1. The order requires the development of agency-specific environmental justice strategies. Thus, agencies have developed and should periodically revise their strategies providing guidance concerning the types of programs, policies, and activities that may, or historically have, raised environmental justice concerns at the particular agency. This guidance may suggest possible approaches to addressing such concerns in the agency’s NEPA analyses, as appropriate.
2. The order recognizes the importance of research, data collection, and analysis, particularly with respect to multiple and cumulative exposures to environmental hazards for low-income populations, minority populations, and Indian tribes. Thus, data on these exposure issues should be incorporated into NEPA analyses as appropriate.
3. The order provides for agencies to collect, maintain, and analyze information on patterns of subsistence consumption of fish, vegetation, or wildlife. Where an agency action may affect fish, vegetation, or wildlife, that agency action may also affect subsistence patterns of consumption and indicate the potential for disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on low-income populations, minority populations, and Indian tribes.
4. The order requires agencies to work to ensure effective public participation and access to information. Thus, in its NEPA process and through other mechanisms, each federal agency must translate crucial public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment for the benefit of limited-English-speaking populations, wherever doing so is practicable and appropriate. In addition, each agency should work to ensure that public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment are concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public.

Executive Order 13045, “Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks”

A growing body of scientific knowledge demonstrates that children may suffer disproportionately from environmental health risks and safety risks. These risks arise because children’s neurological, immunological, digestive, and other bodily systems are still developing; children eat more food, drink more fluids, and breathe

more air in proportion to their body weight than adults; children's size and weight may diminish their protection from standard safety features; and children's behavior patterns may make them more susceptible to accidents because they are less able to protect themselves. Therefore, to the extent permitted by law and appropriate, EO 13045 requires federal agencies to make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children. Federal agencies also must ensure that their policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks.

3.11.3 Environmental Consequences

Significance Criteria

A NEPA evaluation must consider the context and intensity of the environmental effects that would be caused by, or result from, the EIS Alternatives. The Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ's) national guidance suggests that federal agencies consider opportunities to reduce socioeconomic impacts caused by proposed federal actions and address these issues in their agency NEPA procedures. According to CEQ's draft national guidance, there are two main considerations when addressing socioeconomic impacts in environmental documentation: (1) the impacts of a proposed action or alternatives on local or regional socioeconomic conditions, and (2) the environmental justice impacts of a proposed action or alternatives. Therefore, this analysis discloses both the LRDP's contribution to socioeconomic effects and the environmental justice effects that could result from implementing the LRDP.

An alternative would be considered to result in an adverse impact related to socioeconomic impacts if it would:

- result in an economic gain or loss for affected communities or surrounding area;
- result in displacement of populations, residences, and/or businesses;
- result in impacts on the availability of housing or accommodation;
- cause the inducement of growth;
- displace or modify existing activities as a result of the nature and duration of construction and operational activities; or
- cause any diversion or temporary suspension of access associated with a proposed action.

VA does not have any specific guidance thresholds for the effect of an action in the context of environmental justice. However, absent guidance and established quantitative thresholds, an Alternative analyzed in this EIS would be considered to result in an adverse impact related to environmental justice if it would:

- result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of a proposed agency action on low-income populations, minority populations, or Indian tribes;
- result in health effects, which may be measured in risks and rates, that are adverse (i.e., bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or death) or above generally accepted norms;

- result in a risk or rate of hazard exposure by a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe to an environmental hazard that is adverse and appreciably exceeds or is likely to appreciably exceed the risk or rate to the general population or other appropriate comparison group; or
- result in cumulative or multiple adverse exposures by a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe to environmental hazards where health effects already occur in such populations.

Assessment Methods

General socioeconomic impacts resulting from a proposed action can lead to an economic gain or loss for affected communities or surrounding area. Socioeconomic impacts refer to the basic attributes and resources associated with the human environment, with particular emphasis on population, employment, and housing. Potential impacts can be related to the displacement of populations, residences, and/or businesses; effects on the availability of housing or accommodation; and the inducement of growth. Socioeconomic impacts can also stem from the nature and duration of construction and operational activities that, in turn, may lead to displacement or modification of existing activities. They can also be caused by any diversion or temporary suspension of access associated with a proposed action.

Because the Alternatives analyzed in this EIS would not involve adding or removing housing, this analysis does not address impacts related to the availability of housing. However, daily-employment population totals for the proposed Alternatives were estimated using information provided in the *San Francisco Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines*. In accordance with Table C-1 of the guidelines, the employee density for land uses with travel demand characteristics similar to that of the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is 276 square feet per employee (SF Planning, 2002). Therefore, the square footage for each proposed land use was divided by the employee density value to determine daily employment population.

Environmental justice impacts refer to disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of a proposed agency action on low-income populations, minority populations, or Indian tribes. When determining whether human health effects are disproportionately high and adverse, agencies are to consider all of the following factors to the extent practicable:

- (a) Whether the health effects, which may be measured in risks and rates, are significant, or above generally accepted norms. Adverse health effects may include bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or death.
- (b) Whether the risk or rate of hazard exposure by a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe to an environmental hazard is significant and appreciably exceeds or is likely to appreciably exceed the risk or rate to the general population or other appropriate comparison group.
- (c) Whether health effects occur in a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental hazards.

When determining whether environmental effects are disproportionately high and adverse, agencies are to consider all of the following factors to the extent practicable:

- (a) Whether there is or will be an impact on the natural or physical environment that significantly and adversely affects a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe. Such effects may include ecological, cultural, human health, economic, or social impacts on minority communities, low-income communities, or Indian tribes when those impacts are interrelated to impacts on the natural or physical environment.
- (b) Whether environmental effects are significant and are or may be having an adverse impact on minority populations, low-income populations, or Indian tribes that appreciably exceeds or is likely to appreciably exceed those on the general population or other appropriate comparison group.
- (c) Whether the environmental effects occur or would occur in a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental hazards.

Environmental health and safety risks to children were assessed in terms of whether potential health and safety hazards would disproportionately affect children.

Alternative 1: SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus Buildout Alternative

Near-Term Projects

Construction

Induced Employment Growth

Construction of Alternative 1 near-term projects at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is anticipated to require a temporary crew of approximately 66 persons who are available from the local labor pool. The greater San Francisco Bay Area and the City and County of San Francisco have experienced a notable reduction in employment availability, including construction jobs, over the last decade (between 2000 and 2010). Therefore, the addition of approximately 66 construction jobs can be supported by the skill sets available in the Bay Area's labor pool. The impact related to induced employment growth would be minor.

Displacement of Populations, Residences, and/or Businesses

Construction of Alternative 1 near-term projects is not expected to impede residential or business activity within the community surrounding the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, because all construction activities would occur on the Campus. There would be no displacement of persons, residences, or businesses. Thus, no displacement impact would occur.

Operation

Induced Population, Housing, or Employment Growth

Because no permanent housing is proposed at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus under Alternative 1 near-term projects, the permanent population and housing would not change with operation of Alternative 1 near-term (Phase 1) projects. Thus, no population or housing impact would occur.

Under Alternative 1 near-term projects, the daily-employment population at the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus would experience a net increase of an estimated 149 employees (Table 3.11-4). Because 3,500 employees (staff, volunteers, and contractors) currently work at the Campus, this would represent a 4 percent net increase in employees at the Campus between 2013 and mid-2015. The greater Bay Area and the City and County of San Francisco have experienced a notable reduction in employment availability over the last decade (between 2000 and 2010). Thus, the addition of an estimated 149 jobs that could be filled by Bay Area and/or San Francisco residents is not anticipated to result in an adverse growth-inducement impact. This impact would be minor.

Table 3.11-4: Estimate of the Net New Daily-Employment Population for the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus under Alternatives 1 and 2, Phase 1 (Near Term)

Phase	ITE Land Use Category	Proposed Use	Size (net new sf)	Net New Daily-Employment Population
1.1	Research & Development (760)	Building 41 Research	12,500	45
1.2	N/A	Emergency Operations Center and Building 211 Parking Garage Expansion	155,000	0
1.3	Motel (320)	Building 22 Hoptel Addition	8,700 (8 net new rooms)	7
1.4	Office Building (710)	Patient Welcome Center	13,450	49
2.5	Hospital (610)	Building 24 Mental Health Clinic Expansion	13,300	48
TOTAL			202,950	149

Notes:

ITE = Institute of Transportation Engineers; N/A = not applicable; sf = square feet; SFVAMC = San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center

The average density per employee of 276 square feet was used for the Office Building (710), Hospital (610), and Research & Development Center (760) ITE land use categories. The average density of 0.9 employee per room was used for the Motel (320) ITE land use category.

Source: VA, 2012; AECOM, 2012

Environmental Justice

The outer Richmond District neighborhood of San Francisco, which is adjacent to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, does not represent low-income populations, minority populations, or Indian tribes. Therefore, implementing Alternative 1 near-term projects could not result in disproportionate and/or adverse human health or environmental impacts on such populations. Thus, no environmental justice impact would occur.

Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children

Alternative 1 near-term projects would be implemented on the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, which is primarily surrounded by the GGNRA, City recreational facilities, and residential uses. The only facility frequently used by children (e.g., schools, childcare centers, or neighborhood parks) located in the immediate vicinity of the project site for Alternative 1 near-term projects is the existing privately owned childcare center on the Campus itself. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 3.2, “Air Quality,” near-term localized emissions of air pollutants

from both on-site and off-site mobile sources would not adversely affect either patients or children on the Campus or residents, including children, off-site. Therefore, SFVAMC operational activities under Alternative 1 near-term projects are not anticipated to present risks to children's health and safety, and this impact would be minor.

Long-Term Projects

Construction

Induced Employment Growth

Construction of Alternative 1 long-term projects at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is anticipated to require a temporary crew of approximately 61 persons who are available from the local labor pool. The greater Bay Area and the City and County of San Francisco have experienced a notable reduction in employment availability, including construction jobs, over the last decade (between 2000 and 2010). Therefore, the addition of approximately 61 construction jobs can be supported by the skill sets available in the Bay Area's labor pool. Therefore, the impact related to induced employment growth would be minor.

Displacement of Populations, Residences, and/or Businesses

Construction of Alternative 1 long-term projects is not expected to impede residential or business activity within the community surrounding the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, because all construction activities would occur on the Campus. There would be no displacement of persons, residences, or businesses. Thus, no displacement impact would occur.

Operation

Induced Population, Housing, or Employment Growth

Because no permanent housing is proposed under Alternative 1 long-term projects, the permanent population and housing would not change with operation of Alternative 1 long-term (Phase 2) projects. Thus, no population or housing impact would occur.

Under Alternative 1 long-term projects, the daily-employment population at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus would experience a net increase of an estimated 687 employees (Table 3.11-5). A total of 3,500 employees (staff, volunteers, and contractors) currently work at the Campus; an additional 149 employees would be working at the Campus at the completion of Alternative 1 near-term projects, for a total of 3,649 employees at the Campus in mid-2015. Therefore, a net increase of 687 employees under Alternative 1 long-term projects would represent a 19 percent increase in employees at the Campus between late 2015 and 2023. The greater Bay Area and the City and County of San Francisco have experienced a notable reduction in employment availability over the last decade (between 2000 and 2010). Thus, the addition of an estimated 687 jobs that could be filled by Bay Area and/or San Francisco residents is not anticipated to result in an adverse growth-inducement impact. This impact would be minor.

Table 3.11-5: Estimate of the Daily-Employment Population at the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus under Alternative 1, Phase 2 (Long Term)

Phase	ITE Land Use Category	Proposed Use	Size (sf)	Daily-Employment Population
2.1	Hospital (610)	Operating Room Expansion (D-wing)	5,300	19
2.2	Office Building (710)	IT Support Space Expansion (Building 207)	7,000	25
2.3	Research & Development (760)	Building 23 (Mental Health Research)	15,000	54
2.4	Research & Development (760)	Building 40 Research	42,400	154
2.5	Medical-Dental Office Building (720)	Ambulatory Care Center	120,000	435
TOTAL			189,700	687

Notes:

ITE = Institute of Transportation Engineers; sf = square feet; SFVAMC = San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center
 The average density per employee of 276 square feet was used for the Hospital (610), Medical-Dental Office Building (720), Office Building (710), and Research & Development Center (760) ITE land use categories.

Sources: VA, 2012; AECOM, 2012

Environmental Justice

The outer Richmond District neighborhood of San Francisco, which is adjacent to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, does not represent low-income populations, minority populations, or Indian tribes. Therefore, implementing Alternative 1 long-term projects could not result in disproportionate and/or adverse human health or environmental impacts on such populations. Thus, no environmental justice impact would occur.

Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children

Alternative 1 long-term projects would be implemented on the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, which is primarily surrounded by the GGNRA, City recreational facilities, and residential uses. The only facility frequently used by children (e.g., schools, childcare centers, or neighborhood parks) located in the immediate vicinity of the project site for Alternative 1 long-term projects is the existing privately owned childcare center on the Campus itself. As discussed in Section 3.2, "Air Quality," long-term localized emissions of air pollutants from both on-site and off-site mobile sources would not adversely affect either patients or children on the Campus or residents, including children, off-site. Therefore, SFVAMC operational activities under Alternative 1 long-term projects are not anticipated to present risks to children's health and safety, and this impact would be minor.

Alternative 2: SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus Plus Mission Bay Campus Alternative

Near-Term Projects

Alternative 2 near-term projects (both construction and operation) would be the same as Alternative 1 near-term projects (see Tables 2-1 and 2-2 and Figures 2-1 and 2-2). Therefore, the impacts of Alternative 2 near-term projects would be the same as the impacts of Alternative 1 near-term projects. These impacts would range in significance from no impact to minor.

Long-Term Projects

Alternative 2 long-term projects (both construction and operation) at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus would be the same as Alternative 1 long-term projects, except that the ambulatory care center would be located at the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus under Alternative 2 (see Tables 2-1 and 2-2 and Figures 2-1 and 2-2). Therefore, the impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects at the existing Campus would be the same as or less than the impacts of Alternative 1 long-term projects. The impact discussion below focuses primarily on the impacts that may result from construction and operation of the ambulatory care center, research building, and associated parking structures at the potential new Campus, as proposed as part of Alternative 2, Phase 2.

Construction

Induced Employment Growth

Construction of Alternative 2 long-term projects at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is anticipated to require a temporary crew of approximately 31 persons who are available from the local labor pool. In addition, construction of Alternative 2 long-term projects at the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus is anticipated to require a temporary crew of approximately 54 persons derived from the local labor pool, depending on the concurrent phase(s) of project construction. The greater Bay Area and the City and County of San Francisco have experienced a notable reduction in employment availability, including construction jobs, over the last decade (between 2000 and 2010). Therefore, the addition of a total of approximately 85 construction jobs at both campuses can be supported by the skill sets available in the Bay Area's labor pool. The impact related to induced employment growth would be minor.

Displacement of Populations, Residences, and/or Businesses

Construction of Alternative 2 long-term projects is not expected to impede residential or business activity in the Mission Bay area, because all construction activities are anticipated to occur at the future site of the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus. There would be no displacement of persons, residences, or businesses. Thus, no displacement impact would occur.

Operation*Induced Population, Housing, or Employment Growth*

Because no permanent housing is proposed under Alternative 2 long-term projects, the permanent population and housing would not change with operation of Alternative 2 long-term (Phase 2) projects. Thus, no population or housing impact would occur.

Under Alternative 2 long-term projects, there would be a net increase in the daily-employment population of 252 employees at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus and 1,268 employees at the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus (Tables 3.11-6 and 3.11-7). A total of 3,500 employees currently work at the existing Campus; an additional 149 employees would be working at the Campus at the completion of Alternative 2 near-term projects, for a total of 3,649 employees at the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus in mid-2015. Therefore, a net increase of 252 employees under Alternative 2 long-term projects would represent a 7 percent increase in employees at the existing Campus between late 2015 and 2023. Because there are currently no SFVAMC employees in the Mission Bay area, adding 1,268 employees would represent a 100 percent increase in employees at the potential new Campus between 2023 and 2027. The greater Bay Area and the City and County of San Francisco have experienced a notable reduction in employment availability over the last decade (between 2000 and 2010). Thus, the addition of a total of 1,520 jobs, at both campuses, that could be filled by Bay Area and/or San Francisco residents is not anticipated to result in an adverse growth-inducement impact. This impact would be minor.

Table 3.11-6: Estimate of Daily-Employment Population at the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus under Alternative 2, Phase 2 (Long Term)

Phase	ITE Land Use Category	Proposed Use	Size (sf)	Daily-Employment Population
2.1	Hospital (610)	Operating Room Expansion (D-wing)	5,300	19
2.2	Office Building (710)	IT Support Space Expansion (Building 207)	7,000	25
2.3	Research & Development (760)	Building 23 (Mental Health Research)	15,000	54
2.4	Research & Development (760)	Building 40 Research	42,400	154
TOTAL			60,700	252

Notes:

ITE = Institute of Transportation Engineers; sf = square feet; SFVAMC = San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center
The average density per employee of 276 square feet was used for the Hospital (610), Office Building (710), and Research & Development Center (760) ITE land use categories.

Sources: VA, 2012; AECOM, 2012

Table 3.11-7: Estimate of Daily-Employment Population at the SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus under Alternative 2, Phase 2 (Long Term)

Phase	ITE Land Use Category	Proposed Use	Size (sf)	Daily-Employment Population
2.5	Medical-Dental Office Building (720)	Ambulatory Care Center	150,000	543
2.6	N/A	Clinical Parking Garage	0 (parking structure space is not included)	0
2.7	Research & Development (760)	Research Building	200,000	725
2.8	N/A	Research Parking Garage	0 (parking structure space is not included)	0
TOTAL			350,000	1,268

Notes:

ITE = Institute of Transportation Engineers; N/A = not applicable; sf = square feet; SFVAMC = San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center

The average density per employee of 276 square feet was used for the Medical-Dental Office Building (720) and Research & Development Center (760) ITE land use categories.

Sources: VA, 2012; AECOM, 2012

Environmental Justice

The Mission Bay area of San Francisco does not represent minority populations or Indian tribes. However, it is unknown specifically where in the Mission Bay area the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus would be located. Thus, the proximity of the potential new Campus to low-income populations that exist in the Mission Bay area is also unknown at this time. However, project-level NEPA analysis would be required once a specific location and site plan for the potential new Campus is determined. It is anticipated that the development of the project would take into account the context of the neighborhood and address environmental justice impacts to ensure only a minor impact, consistent with federal guidance.

Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children

Alternative 2 long-term projects would be implemented on the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, which is primarily surrounded by the GGNRA, City recreational facilities, and residential uses. The only facility frequently used by children (e.g., schools, childcare centers, or neighborhood parks) located within the immediate vicinity of the project site for Alternative 2 long-term projects is the existing privately owned childcare center on the Campus itself. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 3.2, "Air Quality," long-term localized emissions of air pollutants from both on-site and off-site mobile sources would not adversely affect either patients or children on the Campus or residents, including children, off-site. Therefore, SFVAMC operational activities under Alternative 2 long-term projects are not anticipated to present risks to children's health and safety, and this impact would be minor.

Alternative 2 long-term projects would also be implemented at a potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus. However, it is unknown specifically where in the Mission Bay area the potential new Campus would be located. Thus, the proximity of the potential new Campus to facilities frequently used by children in the Mission Bay area

is also unknown at this time. However, project-level NEPA analysis would be required once a specific location and site plan for the potential new Campus is determined. It is anticipated that the development of the project would take into account the location and potential impacts to ensure that the health and safety risks to children were addressed, so that the impact would be minor, as required by federal, State, and local codes and requirements.

Alternative 3: No Action Alternative

Near-Term and Long-Term Projects

Construction

Under Alternative 3, there would be no demolition, no new building construction, and no seismic retrofitting of existing buildings. Therefore, under Alternative 3, zero persons from the local labor pool would be needed for construction of near-term or long-term projects. The greater Bay Area and the City and County of San Francisco have experienced a notable reduction in employment availability, including construction jobs, over the last decade (between 2000 and 2010). Therefore, the addition of zero construction jobs that could be filled by Bay Area and/or San Francisco residents would result in no impact related to induced population growth. In addition, because no housing would be built under Alternative 3, no impact related to displacement of population, housing, or businesses would occur.

Operation

Under Alternative 3, no housing would be built and no demolition, grading, or new construction would occur. As a result, the permanent population and housing, the natural and physical environment, and environmental health and safety risks to children would not change. Thus, no growth-inducement or environmental justice impacts would occur.

3.11.4 References

AECOM. 2012. *San Francisco VA Medical Center Long Range Development Plan Draft EIS Transportation Impact Study*. San Francisco, CA.

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2011. *ABAG Regional Transportation Plan Growth Forecast-2020 and 2030 Projections*. Oakland, CA.

California Department of Finance (CDF). 2011. *2009 Population Estimates*. Sacramento, CA.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SF Public Health). 2011a. Areas with a Majority Race/ Ethnic Population. Available: <<http://www.thehdmt.org/indicators/view/161>>. Accessed July 22, 2011.

———. 2011b. Median Household Income. Available: <<http://www.thehdmt.org/indicators/view/162>>. Accessed July 22, 2011.

———. 2011c. Proportion of Population Living at or Below 200% of the Census Poverty Threshold. Available: <<http://www.thehdmt.org/indicators/view/163>>. Accessed July 22, 2011.

———. 2011d. Employment Rate. Available: <<http://www.thehdm.org/indicators/view/165>>. Accessed July 22, 2011.

San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning). 2002 (October). *San Francisco Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines*. San Francisco, CA.

San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center Engineering Department (SFVAMC). 2012. Data provided by e-mail by SFVAMC staff regarding existing employment population. March 15.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. American FactFinder, 2000 Census. Washington, DC.

———. 2011. 2005–2009 American Community Survey, Census 2000. Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). 2012. *San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center Fort Miley Campus Long Range Development Plan*. San Francisco, CA.