5.14 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

The San Francisco Bay Area is attractive not only for its geographic setting, but also for its relatively strong and diverse economy. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) estimates that the population of the nine-county Bay Area region will increase by 1.4 million people in the next 25 years, from approximately 6.8 million in the year 2000 to 8.2 million in the year 2025. During the same time period, 252,800 acres would be available for development (residential and commercial/industrial), which is about 5.7 percent of the region's total area. This population growth rate is not as dramatic as in the late 1990s and early 2000s (ABAG 2001).

According to the General Plans of the nine counties, only San Francisco and Marin counties are not projected to have a housing shortage over the next 25 years. Over the same time period, these two counties are also projected to have the smallest increase in population and number of households. Based on general plan projections at the city and county level, the other seven counties will experience housing shortages. Those shortages will range from 5,450 housing units in Alameda County to 26,480 housing units in Santa Clara County in the year 2025. The average number of persons per household is expected to remain at approximately 2.7 for the Bay Area as a whole. The mean household income for the Bay Area is expected to rise from $93,800 in the year 2000 to $116,400 by the year 2025 (ABAG 2001).

The housing crisis in the Bay Area is negatively affecting the regional transportation system because the centers of population growth (i.e., where people are living or moving to) are not located where the most economic activity is occurring (i.e., where the employment opportunities are). Between the years 2000 and 2025, the projected increase in jobs will exceed the number of employed residents by approximately 149,000 people (ABAG 2001). This trend is expected to continue because Bay Area cities and counties seek to maximize job production without commensurate emphasis on housing production (ABAG 2001).

Impact GRO-1 **The expansion of ferry service and the placement of new ferry terminals in communities around the Bay Area could induce growth in the region.**

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 all have the potential to induce growth that is not currently planned for at the local level. Individually, local growth impacts may not be significant on the regional level. However, if a number of terminals are found to be growth inducing, the combined impact may be potentially significant. Furthermore, when growth inducement impacts are considered in conjunction with the impacts of other planned development in the area, cumulative impacts could be significant. Given that Alternative 3 would not establish new terminals, the unplanned growth that could occur as a result of terminal enhancement would be minimal at the regional level, and is therefore not considered to be significant.

New Development

According to Table 5.7.1, Alternatives 1 and 2 propose to build new terminals in the following locations that are currently undeveloped:

Facility	Land Use Designation	Local Planning Agency
Candlestick Park	Parks and Open Space; Public Facilities	San Francisco Planning Department
Coyote Point	Parks and Open Space	City of San Mateo Planning Department
Fort Baker	Public Institutional	Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA)
Fort Mason	Public Open Space	GGNRA
Gnoss Field / Port Sonoma	Data not available	Sonoma County Permit & Resource Management Department
Point Molate	Open Space Recreation	Richmond Planning Department
Presidio	Public Open Space	GGNRA

In the case of Candlestick Park, Coyote Point, Gnoss Field/Port Sonoma, and Point Molate, the placement of ferry terminals would require compliance with local planning policies as contained in the applicable local general plan, which usually has specific policies to protect open space land uses. It is likely that a proposed ferry terminal within GGNRA jurisdiction would need to be located in accordance with the findings of GGNRA's independent ferry terminal location analysis.

Of the proposed terminal locations above, Coyote Point, Gnoss Field/Port Sonoma, and Point Molate are the three locations where no identified local planning efforts are currently underway to establish ferry terminals. Unlike the other potential sites listed above, the lack of current planning at these three locations would result in Alternative 1 or 2 proposing ferry terminals that could induce unplanned growth. Candlestick Park, Fort Baker, Fort Mason, and the Presidio are all being analyzed independent of the Water Transit Initiative by their local agencies.

Coyote Point is composed mostly of open space park, Bay shoreline wetlands and wildlife habitat, a marina, public museum, and a golf course (City of San Mateo 2002). Gnoss Field/Port Sonoma is a large agricultural area with a lot of ecological importance, which makes any form of development difficult (Sonoma County 2002). Point Molate is a closed Navy brownfield with limited shoreline development, and the City of Richmond's redevelopment agency is tentative to approve any development there due to difficult access to the site, minimal public services/infrastructure, and the high cost of site cleanup (City of Richmond 2002).

Out of all the proposed terminal locations in Alternatives 1 and 2, these three locations represent the areas where there is little or no urban development, and the local planning agencies are not planning for new development. As discussed above, land use designations and zoning ordinances dictate the type and location of development to ensure compatibility of adjoining land uses. However, it is possible that through a general plan amendment or a Conditional Use Permit (or other form of local variance), a local jurisdiction could place a ferry terminal in an area where current policy says it is incompatible. A general plan amendment would require review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) at a site-specific level, at which time the significance of a conversion of agricultural land, parkland, recreational land, or other open space would need to be addressed. However, a Conditional Use Permit may or may not, in which case the conversion of an open space, agriculture, recreation, or parkland use designation may not receive adequate environmental review. In other words, by proposing ferry terminals in open space locations where no ferry terminal planning is currently occurring, Alternatives 1 and 2 may induce growth in undeveloped or otherwise protected areas. This would constitute a significant impact.

Public Services

Most of the new ferry terminals identified in Alternatives 1 and 2 would be located in an urban setting. By proposing to build the majority of ferry terminals in already built-up areas, the proposed project would minimize impacts to open space resources and limit the expansion of the urban environment. However, redevelopment of an urban area can carry its own set of environmental impacts, such as creating a demand for additional public services and infrastructure, causing the displacement of people or businesses, or physically dividing a community or neighborhood. For community impacts related to the displacement of people or businesses and the division of community, refer to the discussions of Impacts LU-1 and LU-2 in Section 3.7 (Land Use).

A new ferry terminal or a major expansion of an existing terminal in an urban area can have a significant adverse affect on local public services such as police, fire, sewer, and water if the demand is great enough to require the expansion of those services. Likewise, the increase of ferries on the Bay could result in impacts to regional public services provided by the U.S. Coast Guard (see the Navigation Report for a discussion on impacts to U.S. Coast Guard operations). Typically, all public services are designed to provide adequate services for the growth planned in the local general plan or management plan. However, the exact size and nature of future planned development is not always known, so the capacity of public services is often determined by the maximum development allowed by the local zoning ordinance. Therefore, although many of the proposed ferry terminal locations are not identified in local planning documents, new terminals may not adversely impact public services.

Each terminal location will have a different set of impacts on the existing public services and infrastructure of a city or county, depending on the current capacity of local sewer and water infrastructure and the capabilities of the existing public safety workforce. Therefore, it is important that each potential ferry terminal site be considered in light of the local conditions. This is especially true of ferry terminals that are being considered by local agencies as part of a larger project to provide amenities adjacent to the terminal, such as retail or commercial centers (see Cumulative Growth Inducement Impacts, below, for more discussion on adjacent land uses).

Population/Employment

If implemented, the proposed project could cause an unanticipated increase in population in the Bay Area that could result in an increased demand for public services, housing, and other services that could induce growth. Specifically, people may move into the areas due to a perceived increase in the regional quality of life here or job opportunities afforded by the proposed increase in ferry services. However, a population increase as a result of either of these would not be significant relative to the number of people projected to move to the Bay Area in the next 25 years overall (see Section 3.7.1.1).

In regard to population increases in Bay Area communities due to quality of life, the number of people that actually move here because of the proposed project is unpredictable. In reality, people moving into communities from outside the Bay Area to improve their quality of life would require more than just a regional ferry service, such as availability of affordable housing, climate, and cultural amenities beyond the scope of the project.

With regard to an unplanned population increase due to new jobs created by the project, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would all create new employment opportunities in the ferry industry to

some degree. Alternative 1 would create the most jobs out of all the alternatives considered, with Alternatives 2 and 3 increasing job opportunities to a lesser degree. On a regional scale, the increase in job opportunities related to Alternatives 1 and 2 is potentially significant, considering the number of new terminals and ferries proposed. However, while the actual number of employment positions is unknown, it is reasonable to assume that most if not all of the positions would be filled by people currently residing in the Bay Area. Furthermore, job opportunities that are created as a result of the project would occur incrementally, as opposed to all at once, which would make any immigration to the Bay Area as a result of jobs in the ferry industry insignificant. Therefore, the potential impacts due to creating employment opportunities would be less than significant.

Cumulative Growth Inducement Impacts

Cumulative growth inducement impacts would involve the implementation of other projects adjacent to a ferry terminal that are not associated with the proposed WTA initiative. Cumulative growth inducement impacts due to unplanned development may occur in communities where ferry terminals are proposed because: (1) terminals function as transportation hubs where the transit riders condense, creating a potential real estate market; or (2) ferry service would increase accessibility to communities.

As a transportation nexus, a ferry terminal attracts people using a variety of transportation modes, including cars, buses, bicycles, walking, and potentially rail. The placement of a new terminal facility or the enhancement of an existing terminal could change the local transportation patterns in a community, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Furthermore, ferry terminals can also become destinations for tourists or Bay Area residents, given their accessibility and location along the shoreline. This concentration of transit-users as well as destination-seekers represents a potential market for real estate development or redevelopment that could result in a potentially significant impact on the existing community beyond the presence of the terminal itself.

Changes at the local level as a result of providing new or enhanced ferry service could also occur as a result of making local communities more accessible. The benefits of ferry service may be perceived by many as an improvement to their current quality of life, making these communities attractive for commuters to live in. This could have more significant impacts in more suburban or rural areas, such as Gnoss Field/Port Sonoma, where undeveloped land could be put at risk as a result of a demand for more adjacent services (see discussion above under New Development). Conversely, increased accessibility to a suburban community, such as San Leandro or Benicia, may benefit the people already living there due to increased economic activity from tourists and commuters.

Although it is quite possible that a ferry terminal would operate independent of services provided by adjacent development indefinitely, the potential for a terminal to lead to additional development may cause cumulative growth inducement impacts. Therefore, as discussed above, it is important that each potential ferry terminal site be considered in light of the local conditions and the potential for additional growth to occur. Without proper planning, cumulative growth associated with the proposed project and other currently unplanned development could lead to significant environmental impacts on communities, public services, or open space resources, depending on the location.

Summary of Impact GRO-1

- Alternative 3 would not result in significant growth inducing impacts.
- Alternatives 1 and 2 may result in potentially significant impacts due to development in areas where growth is unplanned. Specifically, by proposing ferry terminals at Coyote Point, Gnoss Field/Port Sonoma, and Point Molate, the proposed project would encourage growth where there is little urban development and the local planning agencies are not planning to develop there.

Depending on the capacity of local infrastructure and public safety services, some ferry terminals may increase the demand for services, which would result in a significant impact.

The increase in population due to a perceived increase in quality of life or employment opportunities provided by the expanded ferry services of Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 would not result in a significant impact.

Unplanned development beyond the scope of the proposed project could, in conjunction with the implementation of Alternatives 1, 2, or 3, result in cumulative growth inducement impacts.

Mitigation GRO-1.1: Implement Mitigation LU-1.1.

Mitigation GRO-1.2: The California Legislature has given local governments the primary responsibility to make land use decisions. As such, growth inducement impacts should be considered by planning staffs at the local level because growth can be considered a negative or positive impact depending on the objectives of the local government and the community. If growth is an objective of an applicant for new or expanded ferry service, then the applicant must clearly demonstrate to WTA how the growth has been addressed and planned for. Appropriate documentation includes but is not limited to an adopted Specific Plan, Master Plan, or other local plan, or an adopted amendment of a land use designation in a general plan. If a ferry terminal is proposed independently of any other growth, then the applicant must clearly demonstrate to WTA how unplanned growth will be prohibited.

WTA shall be responsible for ensuring the adopted alternative does not induce unplanned growth. To do so, adequate CEQA environmental review or other comprehensive planning process for the waterfront must be prepared by or presented to WTA on a project-by-project basis that clearly defines how planned growth will be managed or how unplanned growth will be avoided.

Mitigation GRO-1.3: Without the implementation of Mitigations LU-1.1 and GRO-1.2, Alternatives 1 or 2 shall not be implemented with ferry terminals proposed for Coyote Point, Gnoss Field/Port Sonoma, or Point Molate, so as to not encourage growth in areas where there is little urban development and to protect open space resources.

Impact After Mitigation: Impact GRO-1 would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigations GRO-1.1, GRO-1.2, and GRO-1.3.

References

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2001. Projections 2002. Oakland, California. December.

City of Richmond. 2002. Personal Correspondence between M. Kim of URS Corporation and Richmond Planning Department. May.

County of San Mateo. 2002. Personal Correspondence between M. Kim of URS Corporation and San Mateo County Environmental Services Agency, Planning and Building Division. May.

County of Sonoma. 2002. Personal Correspondence between M. Kim of URS Corporation and Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. May.