

Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway

The Presidio Parkway Alternative would require the permanent removal of Buildings 201, 204, 205, 230, 231, 670, 605, 606 and 1158. Buildings 201, 204, 205, 230 and 231 are occupied by the Presidio Trust and National Park Service (NPS) and would require relocation. Buildings 606 and 670 are vacant. Building 605 is occupied by Shurguard Storage and Building 1158 is occupied by the Presidio Dance Theatre.

The Circle Drive Option would require the permanent removal of Building 1151 (the YMCA pool) in addition to those listed above. Both the Diamond and Circle Drive Options have a slip ramp option at Merchant Road. The Merchant Road Slip Ramp Option would also require the removal of the Armistead Road Buildings 1253, 1254, 1255 and 1256, all of which are residential buildings. No residential buildings would be removed under either option.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Avoidance is a primary consideration in the development and screening of project alternatives. Minimizing the impacts to buildings was considered throughout the design of the alternatives, and temporary relocation – as part of the alternative’s design – was a key component. As a result, avoidance and relocation impacts have been minimized.

Direct property acquisition would be consistent with the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970*, as amended and the *Civil Rights Act of 1964*. The project proponent will provide relocation assistance services to affected homeowners, renters and tenant businesses. In addition, property owners will be compensated in accordance with the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970* and other applicable law.

3.2.7 Environmental Justice

An environmental justice analysis considered project impacts on minority and/or low-income populations. Determination of the presence of environmental justice populations and the potential effects on those populations rely, to a large degree, on analysis of demographic information, such as the U.S. Census data, and information gathered through public involvement and outreach activities.

Regulatory Setting

Federal laws and regulations guide the analysis of environmental justice.

Executive Order No. 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994) – directs Federal agencies to achieve

environmental justice by identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including interrelated social and economic effects of the programs, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations of the United States.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes – prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. Direct property acquisition under the Doyle Drive Project alternatives would require implementation of this *Act* along with the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970*.

The environmental justice analysis was prepared following *Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (1994). The methodology was based on FHWA Order 6640.23 (December 2, 1998). Ethnic and racial minority and/or low-income population groups in the affected community are identified in this report using 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census data that describe racial and income characteristics, and project impacts that disproportionately affect these groups, if any, are evaluated.

As defined in *Executive Order 12898* and subsequent agency guidance, the term “minority” includes any individual who is an American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander (including Native Hawaiian), Black/African American (not of Hispanic origin), or Hispanic/Latino. The term “low-income” is defined in accordance with Executive Order 12898 and agency guidance as a person with household income at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines (California Department of Transportation, *Desk Guide: Environmental Justice in Transportation Planning and Investments*, January 2003).

Minority and/or low-income populations are identified when (a) the minority or low-income population of the affected area exceeds fifty percent or (b) the minority or low-income population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority or low-income population percentage in the general population. For the purposes of this analysis, this difference was assumed to be more than ten percentage points. The study area for environmental justice analyses included U.S. Census Tracts within the project study area and adjacent tracts in which direct access patterns may be modified. The minority and/or low-income populations within these census tracts were compared to the city and county of San Francisco and the Bay Area as a whole.

Affected Environment

The 2000 U.S. Census race data in this section (summarized in **Exhibit 3-13**) shows that none of the minority (non-white) populations comprise more than 50 percent of the population as a whole within the study area. The data indicates that the minority populations within the study area as compared to the city and county of San Francisco or the Bay Area is not greater than ten percentage points for any group. As such, the study area does not have a large minority population.

Poverty status was used to identify populations as low-income. These data are summarized in **Exhibit 3-14** (on the following pages). Poverty status, as defined by the U.S. Census, is determined by comparing a person's total family income with the poverty thresholds appropriate for that person's family size and composition. For example, the threshold for a family comprised of two adults and one child is \$13,410 (U.S. Census Bureau, *Current Population Survey*, March 2000).

For the census tracts within the study area, the percent of individuals below the poverty level ranges from 3.3 percent to 17.3 percent. On average, the percent below poverty level is 6.8 percent. The table shows the study area does not have a majority (more than fifty percent) of individuals with incomes below the poverty level. Also, the overall average is less than the city and county of San Francisco (6.8 percent versus 11.3 percent) and the Bay Area as a whole (6.8 percent versus 8.6 percent). The Presidio Trust and the National Park Service (NPS) have several outreach programs located in the project study area that are characterized as being oriented towards populations that are typically underserved in the national parks, primarily minority and/or low-income populations. Based on correspondence memorandums from the GGNPC, almost 18,000 people representing underserved populations, or about half of all visitors, used the Crissy Field Center between March 2003 and March 2004. The San Francisco Conservation Corps serves minority and/or low-income populations. Previously located in Building 1163, which is within the Doyle Drive study area, it recently moved to Building 1243 which is outside of the area. Buildings 1029 and 1030 are home to the community-based, nonprofit Swords to Plowshares. The Archaeology Lab provides educational programs in partnership with the Crissy Field Center and targets many of the same groups. Swords to Plowshares provides counseling, employment and training, housing, and legal assistance to veterans in the San Francisco Bay Area. Part of their mission is to reduce homelessness and poverty among veterans. According to the website, Swords to Plowshares provides assistance to nearly 1,500 veterans in need each year (www.swords-to-plowshares.org/FAQ.htm).

**Exhibit 3-13
Population and Race Characteristics 2000**

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY CENSUS TRACTS	POPULATION	% WHITE ALONE	% BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN ALONE	% AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE ALONE	% ASIAN ALONE	% NATIVE HAWAIIAN AND OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER ALONE	% HISPANIC ¹	% OTHER ²
0126	4,915	86.0%	0.4%	0.0%	9.4%	0.2%	3.7%	3.9%
0127	3,497	87.4%	0.1%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%	2.9%	3.5%
0128	4,209	84.8%	0.5%	0.0%	8.4%	0.4%	3.3%	5.9%
0129	5,706	84.2%	0.2%	0.2%	12.2%	0.0%	5.0%	3.2%
0130	4,130	86.6%	0.3%	0.4%	10.2%	0.2%	4.3%	2.3%
0132	4,436	87.5%	0.3%	0.2%	10.3%	0.0%	2.8%	1.7%
0133	4,145	86.5%	0.7%	0.4%	5.7%	0.4%	4.8%	6.2%
0154	5,762	69.5%	3.4%	0.3%	20.0%	0.3%	7.5%	6.5%
0156	2,821	57.9%	3.8%	0.6%	32.6%	0.0%	5.2%	5.1%
0157	6,875	59.2%	8.1%	0.6%	24.1%	0.5%	8.0%	7.5%
0401	4,348	58.3%	1.7%	0.2%	33.7%	0.2%	5.7%	6.1%
0402	5,364	54.1%	0.5%	0.3%	39.7%	0.0%	3.8%	5.4%
0426	7,200	55.2%	0.7%	0.2%	38.4%	0.1%	5.2%	5.5%
0451	5,102	43.6%	2.5%	0.2%	50.6%	0.0%	3.7%	3.1%
0452	6,695	47.5%	0.7%	0.5%	44.2%	0.0%	3.2%	7.0%
0476	5,431	42.8%	1.9%	1.4%	51.3%	0.1%	3.7%	2.5%
0601	2,338 ³	81.5%	2.8%	1.5%	4.9%	0.0%	9.6%	9.3%
Study Area Total or Average	82,870	69.0%	1.7%	0.4%	23.8%	0.1%	4.9%	5.0%
City & County of San Francisco	776,733	49.6%	7.6%	0.5%	30.9%	0.5%	14.1%	11.0%
Bay Area	6,783,760	58.0%	7.4%	0.6%	19.0%	0.5%	19.4%	14.5%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census.

Notes: ¹ Percentages do not add to 100% because Hispanic is not counted as a separate race in the U.S. Census.

² Includes "some other race alone" and "two or more races."

³ Data from the Presidio Trust, June 2004.

**Exhibit 3-14
Poverty Status 2000**

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY CENSUS TRACTS	ALL INCOME LEVELS (INDIVIDUALS)	BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (INDIVIDUALS)	PERCENT BELOW POVERTY LEVEL
0126	4,915	177	3.6%
0127	3,497	141	4.0%
0128	4,209	146	3.5%
0129	5,706	211	3.7%
0130	4,130	153	3.7%
0132	4,436	147	3.3%
0133	4,145	141	3.4%
0154	5,662	346	6.1%
0156	2,776	313	11.3%
0157	5,379	695	12.9%
0401	4,217	381	9.0%
0402	5,337	364	6.8%
0426	7,200	531	7.4%
0451	5,102	407	8.0%
0452	6,668	571	8.6%
0476	5,431	427	7.9%
0601	2,236	387	17.3%
Study Area Total or Average	81,046	5,538	6.8%
City & County of San Francisco	765,356	86,585	11.3%
Bay Area	6,661,540	573,333	8.6%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, Table QT-P34.

Temporary Impacts

Transportation projects can potentially create social impacts on a community by affecting transportation choices or community facilities that are used by minority or low-income populations. A review of population and income (poverty status) data indicate that the study area does not contain higher than average concentrations of minority and/or low-income groups. Therefore, these groups could not be subject to disproportionate impacts.

The potential for negative impacts to minority and/or low-income residents was evaluated for the Presidio facilities that are used by these groups. This analysis looked at the changes, both temporary and permanent, to the buildings used for these programs and access, both transit and private vehicles, to these buildings. Based on the analysis it is determined that minority and/or low-income residents would not be affected disproportionately by the project.

Alternative 1: No-Build and Alternative 2: Replace and Widen

Under these alternatives, Building 603, which currently houses the Crissy Field Center, would be maintained for cultural and educational purposes. The building would not be temporarily displaced by either alternative. Also, Buildings 1151 and 1152, which are currently occupied by the YMCA pool and gym, respectively, and the two Swords to Plowshares buildings (Buildings 1029 and 1030) would not be temporarily displaced by either alternative. Access to all facilities, including ADA approved access to the Crissy Field Center, would be maintained during the construction period and during the long-term operation of Doyle Drive.

No adverse impacts to community facilities serving minority or low-income populations would occur with these alternatives.

Alternative 2: Replace and Widen

Temporary impacts resulting from Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the No-Build Alternative as discussed above, with the exception of temporary noise impacts to the Crissy Field Center for the Detour Option. As discussed in the Noise and Vibration Section of this document, with the possible exception of pile driving construction, noise levels would be in the range of 85-90 dBA within fifteen meters (fifty feet) of the corridor. Operational as well as construction noise impacts during the construction phase of the proposed project could be minimized by management of the Crissy Field Center and the construction contractor. Together, they could aid in reducing or eliminating potential noise impacts through careful coordination between noisy construction activities and noise sensitive activities at the Crissy Field Center.

Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway

Under the Presidio Parkway Alternative – Diamond Option there would be no temporary displacement of Buildings 603, 1029, 1030, 1151 and 1152. Access to all facilities, including ADA approved access to the Crissy Field Center, would be maintained during construction of Doyle Drive.

No adverse impacts to community facilities serving minority or low-income populations would occur with this alternative.

Permanent Impacts

Alternative 1: No-Build

No adverse impacts to community facilities serving minority or low-income populations would occur with these alternatives.

Alternative 2: Replace and Widen

No adverse impacts to community facilities serving minority or low-income populations would occur with these alternatives.

Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway

Under the Presidio Parkway Alternative – Diamond Option there would be no permanent displacement of Buildings 603, 1029, 1030, 1151 and 1152. Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) would, however, be permanently displaced with the Presidio Parkway Alternative - Circle Drive Option. However, because the use of this facility is not oriented towards serving minority and/or low-income populations, the displacement of this building would not disproportionately impact environmental justice populations. Access to all facilities, including ADA approved access to the Crissy Field Center, would be maintained during the long-term operation of Doyle Drive.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Mitigation and avoidance measures would not be required because it is not anticipated that the project would disproportionately impact either minority or low-income populations.

3.2.8 Traffic and Transportation

This section presents a summary of existing and future traffic and transportation conditions, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, within the Doyle Drive Project study area. Detailed information regarding methodology, traffic data, and projections can be found in the *South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge: Doyle Drive Project Revised Traffic and Transportation Study*, December 2004.

Methodology

An inventory of transportation facilities within the study area was conducted by the project team. Following this inventory, existing traffic and facility data were obtained from local, regional, and state agencies. Using these data, approved regional traffic models³ were used to project future travel conditions on the study area roadways for each alternative.

³This study used a version of the San Francisco Countywide Travel demand model which was enhanced for this project. This model is consistent with assumptions for the last adopted MTC Regional Transportation Plan Forecasts (2002).