Environmental Assessment
Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects
24 CFR Part 58

Project Information

Project Name: 4th and Folsom Affordable Housing

Responsible Entity: Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, City and County of San Francisco

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

State/Local Identifier: DUNS 070384255

Preparer: Eugene T. Flannery

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Katha Hartley, Deputy Director, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Consultant (if applicable): Environmental Science Associates

Direct Comments to: Eugene T. Flannery, Environmental Compliance Manager, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103, Eugene.flannery@sfgov.org

Project Location: 266-284 4th Street San Francisco, CA, 94103; APN 3733/093

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
The project includes the development of a multi-family housing structure with 86 units (85 units for affordable housing and one manager's unit) above 3,000 square feet of retail space. Project construction would take approximately 18-24 months to complete. The project would be located above the site of the future Yerba Buena/Moscone MUNI subway station which is currently under construction. The building would consist of a maximum of seven floors and would have a maximum height of 75 feet. For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that any earthwork or ground disturbing activities would occur in areas which have already been disturbed by development of the Yerba Buena/Moscone MUNI subway station.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

The provision of adequate affordable housing remains a significant challenge for San Francisco due to the escalating cost of housing in San Francisco. This continuing trend amplifies the need for providing affordable housing to all household income levels, especially low and very low income levels.

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) identified the total housing need for the San Francisco Bay Area for an eight-year period (in this cycle, from 2014 to 2022) and distributed the need among the various jurisdictions. The Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area estimates that San Francisco will need approximately 6,234 very low income (0-50% of area median income) units.

City policies call for increased development of affordable housing in the city. The City's General Plan's Housing Element states that "Affordable housing is the most salient housing issue in San Francisco and the Bay Area." Housing Element objectives and policies direct the City to meet that demand.

Section 101.1(b) of the San Francisco Planning Code provides the City's eight Priority Policies, and designates these policies as the basis upon which inconsistencies in the General Plan are resolved, should they occur. Two General Plan Priority Policies relate specifically to housing, and are supported directly by the Housing Element. These are:

- That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced (See Objectives 1-3, Objectives 7-9, and all related policies under those objectives).
- That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods (See Objective 2, Objective 11, and all related policies under those objectives).

Between 2000 and 2013, 6,370 new affordable housing units, including inclusionary affordable units, were added to San Francisco's housing stock. San Francisco, however, did not meet its fair share of the regional housing needs production targets, especially for low and moderate income housing.

The Public Land for Housing program (PLHP) serves as a means to help San Francisco address some of its most pressing issues such as housing, transportation, and neighborhood sustainability and resiliency through the re-utilization of selected City-owned properties that have useful characteristics to maximize their use and opportunities for public benefit. The goals of the PLHP project are to coordinate development of public resources through community and stakeholder engagement; provide a range of public benefits and innovative strategies that extend beyond the sites themselves; all while still ensuring that owner agencies can further their core missions.

The proposed project would accommodate a portion of the citywide demand for new housing that is near transit, jobs, retail services, cultural institutions, and regional transportation. The proposed project would provide medium-density housing in the Western South of Market neighborhood accessible to various modes of public transit, thereby helping the City meet the objectives of the Housing Element of the General Plan to construct additional residential units in established neighborhoods that will contribute to the City's housing supply. The Proposed Action would contribute up to 85 units toward the ABAG-projected housing need.

The proposed project would provide up to 85 units of low or low income units of housing portion of identified affordable housing needs for San Francisco.

Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:

The project site is on the northwest corner of 4th Street and Folsom Street in the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood of San Francisco, California. The project site is approximately 80 feet by 105 feet with a usable area of 8,400 square feet. The project site is an active construction site which has been excavated below grade for the Yerba Buena/Moscone MUNI subway station. The project area contains residential, commercial and public land uses in a medium-density urban environment. The project site is located just south of Yerba Buena Gardens.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
M15-MC060213	HOME	$10,000,000

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: $10,000,000

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]**:**

Construction Costs:	$25,000,000
Non-Construction Costs:	$20,000,000
Total	$45,000,000

Compliance with 24 CFR 50.4, 58.5, and 58.6 Laws and Authorities

Record below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6		
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is not within an Airport Clear Zone or Accident Potential Zone or within an Airport Potential Zone. No military airfields are in San Francisco County or the nearby vicinity. Source Document(s): 1
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is not within a Coastal Barrier Resource System (CBRS) Unit, or CBRS buffer zone, as defined under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982 (PL 97-348), as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (PL 101-591). Source Document(s): 2
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project involves the construction of an 86-unit residential building. The project site is not located in a FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard Area. FEMA has not completed a study to determine flood hazard for the project site; therefore, a flood map has not been published at this time. The project is neither within a known FEMA floodplain nor within the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City and County of San Francisco on November 12, 2015. The project would not involve either direct or indirect support of development in a floodplain. Source Document(s): 3, 4
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5		
Clean Air	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project would include new construction and operation of an affordable multi-family housing development of 86 apartment units on top of a

Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93		3,000-square foot ground floor retail space. The project site is currently an active construction site to build the Yerba Buena/Moscone MUNI subway station as part of the Central Subway Alignment Project. The subway station will be covered and graded and will form the surface on which the project would be built. The scope of the project consists exclusively of the residential and retail building and is separate from the subway project. The project would result in short-term construction emissions as well as long-term operational emissions primarily from motor vehicle use from the new residents and employees and patrons of the retail space. Criteria Pollutants The CalEEMod model (version 2013.2.2) was used to estimate construction and operational-related emissions resulting from the project to determine if it would exceed federal de minimis or local Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) construction and operational thresholds. Model results indicate that maximum annual emissions from construction would be 1.47 and 0.73 tons per year of ozone precursors [reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx), respectively], 0.67 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), and 0.08 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM_{10}) and 0.05 tons per year of fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less ($PM_{2.5}$). Based on the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin's (SFBAAB) marginal nonattainment status for ozone precursors, these emissions would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG/VOC, NOx, and $PM_{2.5}$ pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the federal Clean Air Act. Average daily construction-related emissions would be 26.25 pounds per day of ROG, 13.04 pounds per day of NOx, and 0.89 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{10} and 0.71 pounds per day of exhaust $PM_{2.5}$. It is important to note that the BAAQMD only considers exhaust PM in its thresholds of significance and emphasizes implementation of its basic and enhanced construction mitigation control measures to ensure that fugitive dust impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. These average daily construction-related emissions would be below

		the respective BAAQMD significance thresholds of 54 pounds per day for ROG, NOx and $PM_{2.5}$ and 82 pounds per day for PM_{10}. Operational emissions from the project would result primarily from vehicle trips related to the apartment residents as well as employees and patrons of the retail space. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual emissions from the operation of the project would be 1.44 tons per year of ROG, 1.35 tons per year of NOx, 7.33 tons per year of CO, 0.87 tons per year of PM_{10} and 0.26 tons per year of $PM_{2.5}$. These emissions would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG/VOC, NOx, and $PM_{2.5}$ as well as below BAAQMD's maximum annual operational emission thresholds of 10 tons per year of ROG, NO_x, $PM_{2.5}$ and 15 tons per year of PM_{10}. Average daily operational emissions from the project would be 9.51 pounds per day of ROG, 7.93 pounds per day of NOx, and 1.02 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{10} and 1.01 pounds per day of exhaust $PM_{2.5}$. These average daily operational-related emissions would be below the respective BAAQMD significance thresholds of 54 pounds per day for ROG, NOx and $PM_{2.5}$ and 82 pounds per day for PM_{10}. Consequently, criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation of the project would not be significant with respect to both federal and local air quality standards. <u>Fugitive Dust</u> The City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) requires a number of measures to control fugitive dust to ensure that construction projects do not result in visible dust. The Best Management Practices (BMPs) employed in compliance with the City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance would be effective in controlling construction-related fugitive dust. <u>Asbestos Containing Materials and Lead Based Paint</u> There is no building currently on the project site, therefore, project activities would not likely

		result in a release of asbestos containing materials or lead based paint. Source Document(s): 5, 29, 30, 31, 32, Attachment 1,
Coastal Zone Management Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	Yes ☐ No ☒	The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is the federally designated State coastal management agency for the San Francisco segment of the California coastal zone. The project site is not located within Coastal Zone Management Area or BCDC's area of jurisdiction, which includes the first 100 feet shoreward from the mean high-tide-line around San Francisco Bay; therefore, no formal finding of consistency with BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan is required. Source Document(s): 6, 7
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is currently a vacant lot, occupied by construction vehicles and staging areas for the under-construction Yerba Buena/Moscone subway station. Historical uses and potential hazards for the project site and immediate vicinity were provided by the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker and EnviroStor databases and an EDR database search. From this review, a site at 800 Folsom was identified as previously housing a gas station with three closed monitoring sites. In 1981 three gasoline tanks were removed and in 1993 one waste oil tank was removed, with clean up and site closure approved as of 2002. With the development of the Yerba Buena/Moscone subway station, further cleanup was required. An underground storage tank was been removed as of July 15, 2015, and clean up and monitoring of soil is currently the responsibility of the SFMTA. Lead, a known contaminant has previously been managed as of 2014, and the release of hydrocarbons is a currently known issue, under the responsibility of the SFMTA for cleanup and management as of December 2015. For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that any earthwork or ground disturbing activities would occur in areas which have already been disturbed by development of the Yerba Buena/Moscone MUNI subway station. Due to the development of the Yerba subway

		station; there are limited potential and unknown environmental conditions at the project site. SMFTA is currently responsible for cleanup and management of soil contaminants at the project site. The subway station will be covered, graded and paved, which will further limit the potential for exposure on the project site. Source Document(s): 8, 20
Endangered Species Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is a previously developed urban property, which is currently under construction. There are no existing natural habitats or federally protected species within the project site, nor does it provide any endangered species' habitat requirements. Source Document(s): 9, 10
Explosive and Flammable Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project does not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations. There is no visual evidence or indication of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at immediately adjacent to the project site. The nearest above-ground storage tanks (ASTs) is located at 747 Howard Street (Moscone Center), which is a 6,000 gallon diesel AST within an enclosed concrete building along Folsom Street. The acceptable separation distance for thermal radiation for this AST is 584 feet (if unobstructed). The project site is located at an acceptable distance, 650 feet west of the AST. Source Document(s): 8, 20, 21, Attachment 6
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site consists of urban land; therefore the project would not affect farmlands (PL 97-98, December 22, 1981). There are no protected farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco. Source Document(s): 11
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project is not located within a 100-year floodplain or 500-year floodplain identified on a known FEMA floodplain or within the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City dated November 12, 2015. Source Document(s): 3, 4
Historic Preservation	Yes No	For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that any earthwork or ground disturbing

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	☐ ☒	activities would occur in areas which have already been disturbed by development of the Yerba Buena/Moscone MUNI subway station. The subway station will be covered, graded and paved, which will limit the potential for the project to impact subsurface resources. There are currently no structures on the project site and immediately adjacent buildings are less than 50 years old. Source Document(s): 7
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	Yes ☒ No ☐	The project would introduce new noise sources to the neighborhood from vehicle use on adjacent and nearby roadways by new residents, and employees and patrons of the ground floor retail space. The project would also introduce short-term noises during the construction period of the new building. <u>HUD Noise Standards</u> Acceptable exterior noise levels set forth by HUD regulations for new construction of housing are 65 day-night average sound level (Ldn) or less. Ldn is a 24-hour average noise level with a 10-decibel penalty for noise occurring during nighttime (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM) hours. The regulations consider the range between 65 Ldn and 75 Ldn to be normally unacceptable, unless appropriate sound attenuation measures are provided. Unacceptable noise levels set by the HUD regulations are 75 Ldn and higher. Rincon Consultants performed short-term noise measurements on January 27, 2016 between approximately 5:00 PM and 6:00 PM. The noise environment at the project site is dominated by traffic noise from adjacent roadways, primarily 4th Street (motor vehicles) to the east and Folsom Street (motor vehicles) to the south. San Francisco Fire Department Station No. 1 on Folsom Street, approximately one and one-half blocks west of the project site, results in occasional siren noise when emergency vehicles leave the station. One measurement was taken at 4th Street between 5:30 PM – 5:53PM with the hourly equivalent noise level (L_{eq}) and maximum noise level (L_{max}) being 65.7 A-weighted decibels (dBA) and 88.3 dBA, respectively. Two measurements were taken at Folsom Street with the higher measurement occurring between 4:58 PM – 5:14 PM and the L_{eq} and maximum noise

		level L_{max} being 74.7 dBA and 103.7 dBA, respectively. The San Francisco city-wide background noise level map, developed by the Department of Public Health, shows traffic noise levels for these adjacent roadways to be over 70 dBA Ldn at the roadside. However, the residential structure would set back approximately 28 feet from the center of 4th Street and 41 feet from the center of Folsom Street and so exterior noise levels at the building setback would be less than those estimated in the city's map. It should be noted that 4th Street currently has a construction divider being utilized for the construction of the aforementioned subway project which has temporarily removed the leftmost lane where the project lies. Once the subway project and the project are completed, the measured distance between the center of 4th Street and the setback of project would increase to 41 feet, further reducing the exterior noise levels at the project. This increased setback for 4th Street was utilized in the HUD web-based Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) Calculator mentioned below as this would represent the actual roadway conditions once the project is operational, estimated in the year 2019 for the purposes of this analysis. ESA modeled noise levels according to the HUD DNL Calculator instructions which requires assessing noise impacts from roadways potentially affecting the project site of up to 1,000 feet away and railways potentially affecting the site of up to 3,000 feet away. The two roadways closest to the project site and having the most impact with motor vehicle and bus traffic are 4th Street and Folsom Street. There are two railways within 3,000 feet of the project site. The Muni Rail on Market Street is approximately 1,700 feet from the project site. The Caltrain terminus at 4th Street and King Street is approximately 1,580 feet from the project site. Transportation noise for 4th and Folsom Streets, Interstate 80 as well as the 4th and King Caltrain terminus were calculated using the HUD DNL Calculator using best data available based on SFMTA traffic volumes, and bus and train headway schedules. The combined DNL exterior

		noise from these sources was calculated to be 73.7 dBA Ldn at the project site. Noise produced from the Muni F-Line on Market Street was assessed outside of the HUD DNL Calculator because it is an unusually aged fleet when compared to the other more modern and quieter rail lines that run on Market Street. Based on an existing noise study of the F-Line operating on a straightaway performed by Wilson, Ihrig & Associates, the L_{eq} was 68 dBA at 25 feet from the railway. When using an attenuation rate of 3 dBA per doubling distance at 1,700 feet from the F-Line to the project, the L_{eq} is reduced to 49.67 dBA, which is well below the HUD acceptable exterior noise Ldn. As a general comparison, the HUD DNL Calculator noise level of 70.4 Ldn at 4th Street is higher than the Rincon noise measurements of 65.7 L_{eq} but much lower than the Rincon noise measurements of 88.3 L_{max}. The HUD DNL Calculator noise level of 66.4 Ldn at Folsom Street is lower than the Rincon noise measurements of 74.7 L_{eq} and much lower than 103.7 L_{max}. Taking into account the combined DNL from the DNL Calculator and the adapted and attenuated noise level from the F-Line Market Streetcars, the exterior noise at the project site would fall within HUD's "normally unacceptable" range between 65 dBA and 75 dBA Ldn and mitigation would be required. Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations establishes uniform noise insulation standards for residential projects. Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or DNL) of at least 45 dB. The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall and floor/ceiling assemblies meet state standards regarding sound transmission. Compliance with this requirement would ensure that interior noise levels of the project residential units would meet the interior noise goal of HUD and the State of California. <u>Construction Noise</u>

		The sensitive receptors nearest to the project site are the residences surrounding the project site, notably an apartment building adjacent to the project. Construction of the project would not require demolition as the subway project will ensure the project site is graded and ready for new vertical construction. Project construction would consist of off-road equipment along with other construction-related noise sources including vehicle trips for deliveries and construction workers and would be expected to impact surrounding receptors. Construction equipment would consist of concrete industrial saws, rubber tired dozers, tractors/loaders/backhoes, cranes, forklifts, cement and mortar mixers, pavers, rollers and air compressors. The loudest of these pieces of equipment would be the concrete saw with a measured L_{max} at 50 feet of 90 dBA but the construction subphase requiring this equipment would only last for two days. Building construction would by far be the longest subphase at 100 days with the loudest piece of equipment being the crane with a measured L_{max} at 50 feet of 81 dBA. However use of this equipment would be intermittent as work progresses from one level to the next. Construction at the project site generally would be limited to daytime hours. The San Francisco noise ordinance limits noise levels from individual pieces of equipment to 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet. Impact equipment, such as jackhammers and pile drivers, are exempt from the noise ordinance limits; however, none of this equipment is expected to be used for the construction of the project. Construction activities of the project shall comply with San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code). Section 2908 of the Ordinance prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Therefore construction noise impacts from the project would be less than significant. Source List: 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50 Attachments 2, 3, 4
Sole Source Aquifers	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project is not served by a US EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer.

Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149		Source Documents: 12
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is not located near, or within, a wetland area. Therefore, the project would not affect wetland or riparian areas. Source Document(s): 13
Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes ☐ No ☒	No federally designated Wild and Scenic Rivers are located within the City and County of San Francisco; therefore the project would not affect any wild and scenic rivers. Source Document(s): 14
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is currently vacant and serves no population. The project site is located in census block which is made up of 71.8% ethnic minorities. The project would not result in disproportionately adverse environmental effects on minority or low income populations. Construction of affordable housing would provide result in a beneficial impact by providing housing for low-income populations. Source Documents: 15, Attachment 5

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27] Recorded below is the qualitative and quantitative significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the project area. Each factor has been evaluated and documented, as appropriate and in proportion to its relevance to the proposed action. Verifiable source documentation has been provided and described in support of each determination, as appropriate. Credible, traceable and supportive source documentation for each authority has been provided. Where applicable, the necessary reviews or consultations have been completed and applicable permits of approvals have been obtained or noted. Citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

Impact Codes: Use an impact code from the following list to make the determination of impact for each factor.

(1) Minor beneficial impact
(2) No impact anticipated
(3) Minor adverse impact – May require mitigation
(4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The project is located within the South of Market area of San Francisco. The project area contains residential, commercial and public land uses in a medium-density urban environment. The site is immediately adjacent to a low-rise building housing a restaurant. Yerba Buena Gardens is located across 4th Street and a private school opening in the fall of 2016 is located directly across Folsom Street. The project site is under construction for the Yerba Buena/Moscone Muni subway station. The project site is currently zoned M-1 Light Industrial and allows for industrial uses within building up to 130 feet in height. The project would be up to 75 feet in height and thus compatible with existing height requirements. Under the pending Central SoMa Plan, the lot would be reclassified to MUO (Mixed Use Office), which allows for housing and increases the height limit to 180 feet. If the project were developed prior to the adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, local approvals would be needed to allow residential use on the site; however, the project is compatible with surrounding development which includes multi-family residential. Source Document(s): 16, 17
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	3	<u>Geology and Soils</u> The project site is located in the Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province which extends along the California coast south to the Transverse Ranges and north to the Oregon border. The province is characterized by northwest-southeast trending mountains and faults sub-parallel to the San Andreas Fault Zone. The province comprises marine and terrestrial sedimentary deposits underlain by Salinian Block granitic rocks west of the San Andreas Fault Zone and the Franciscan Assemblage east of the San Andreas Fault Zone. The project site is underlain by Quaternary age sediments deposited in the last 1.8 million years, including dune sand and Franciscan complex. The San Francisco Planning Department's CatEx Determination Layers Map shows that majority of the project site is not located in a Seismic Hazard Zone designated as vulnerable to liquefaction or landslide and does not contains slopes over a 20% grade. The project site is currently excavated but will be graded and paved flat prior to construction of the project. Potential impacts of site development will be mitigated by adherence to the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC). The SFBC derives from the adopted 2013 California Building Code. This code is administered and enforced by DBI, and compliance with all provisions is mandatory for all new development and redevelopment in the City. Throughout the permitting, design, and construction phases of a building project, Planning Department staff, DBI engineers, and DBI building inspectors confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations.

		Stormwater The project site was developed with impervious surfaces prior to construction for the subway station and served by the combined sewer and wastewater system. As the project would replace the previous impervious surfaces and would continue to be served by the combined sewer and wastewater system, impacts to the stormwater system would be less than significant. Source Document(s): 16, 18, 19
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise	2	Hazardous Materials As described above in "Contamination and Toxic Substances," for the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that any earthwork or ground disturbing activities would occur in areas which have already been disturbed by development of the Yerba Buena/Moscone MUNI subway station. Due to the development of the Yerba subway station; there are limited potential and unknown environmental conditions at the project site. SMFTA is currently responsible for cleanup and management of soil contaminants at the project site. Noise Construction noise as discussed above "Noise Abatement and Control" would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with the City's noise ordinance.
Energy Consumption	2	The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulation as enforced by the DBI. In addition, San Francisco's Green Building Code places more stringent energy, materials, and construction debris management requirements on new residential buildings than Title 24. New residential buildings are required to achieve at least 75 GreenPoints from the GreenPoints Multi-family New Construction Checklist, or LEED "Silver" certification. Other than natural gas and coal fuel used to generate the electricity for the project, the project would not have a substantial effect on the use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource. Source Document(s): 19, 21

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	2	Construction on the project site would provide over 100 full-time construction jobs but is not expected to affect employment in the long-term. No impact is anticipated from the project on employment and income within the project area.
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	Demographics The project would not result in physical barriers or reduced access that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group.

		Construction would result in temporary, construction job growth at the project site as a result of the project. It is anticipated that construction employees not already living in San Francisco would commute from elsewhere in the Bay Area rather than relocating to the SoMA area for a temporary construction assignment. Thus, construction is not anticipated to generate a substantial, unplanned population increase. The project would develop 85 affordable housing units onsite resulting in permanent changes to population in the project area; however, additional affordable housing is needed to keep pace with anticipated demands from growth established in the Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area. Displacement The project would not displace existing and thus there would be no impact with respect to displacement. Source Document(s): 51

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	The project would not displace educational or cultural facilities. Cultural facilities within the City are accessible from the project site within walking distance and via public transportation. The neighborhood has cultural facilities such as the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, the Contemporary Jewish Museum, the Museum of the African Diaspora, and the San Francisco Modern Art Museum within walking distance and other cultural facilities are available by public transit.
Commercial Facilities	2	The project site is within adequate and convenient distance to retail services that provide essential items such as food, medicine, banks and other convenience shopping. Existing retail and commercial services will not be adversely impacted or displaced by the project. The project also provides room for retail space on the first floor which will serve the area.
Health Care and Social Services	2	There are several Urgent Care Clinics located less than one mile from the project site, which are accessible via public transportation. In addition, the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay and the UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital is 1.5 miles from the project site and also accessible via public transportation. Emergency health services are available within approximately three to five minutes. Social services are located both within a convenient and reasonable distance to residents of the project. Furthermore, there is adequate public transportation available from the project to these services.
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	Recology, Inc. provides residential and commercial solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services for the City of San Francisco. Recyclable materials are taken to Recology's Pier 96 facility, where they are separated into commodities (e.g., aluminum, glass, and paper) and transported to other users for reprocessing. Compostables (e.g., food waste, plant trimmings, soiled paper) are transferred to a Recology composting facility

		in Solano County, where they are converted to soil amendment and compost. The remaining material is transported to a landfill. In September 2015, San Francisco approved an Agreement with Recology, Inc., for the transport and disposal of the City's municipal solid waste at the Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. The City began disposing its municipal solid waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in January 2016, and is anticipated to continue for approximately nine years, with an option to renew the Agreement thereafter for an additional six years. The Recology Hay Road Landfill is permitted to accept up to 2,400 tons of waste per day, and, at this maximum rate of acceptance, the landfill has permitted capacity to continue to receive waste approximately through the year 2077. The project would be subject to the City's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires the separation of refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, thereby minimizing solid waste disposal and maximizing recycling and composting. Although the project could incrementally increase total waste generation from the City by increasing the number of residents at the project site, the increasing rate of diversion through recycling and other methods would result in a decreasing share of total waste that requires deposition into the landfill. Source Document(s): 22, 23, 24
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	The project site is within an urban area that is well served by the combined sewer/stormwater collection, storage and treatment facilities and is in an area where projected population and employment growth has been accounted for by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Wastewater generated at the project site would be treated by the SFPUC, which provides wastewater collection and transfer service in the City. The SFPUC has a combined sewer and wastewater system, which collects sewage and stormwater in the same pipe network. San Francisco comprises two drainage basins: Bayside and Westside drainage basins, which collect wastewater and stormwater from the east and west sides of the City, respectively, which are further divided into five distinct urban watersheds. The project site is located in the Channel urban watershed, which is the largest urban watershed in the Bayside Drainage basin. Combined wastewater and stormwater from the project area is transported for treatment to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. Treated wastewater is discharged to San Francisco Bay through outfalls at Pier 80 (dry and wet weather), and in Islais Creek (wet weather). During dry weather, the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant has a dry weather capacity of 84.5 million gallons per day (mgd). During wet weather, the plant processes up to 250 mgd of combined wastewater. The combined sewer and wastewater system currently operates under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits. The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant is currently operating under the 2008 NPDES Permit No. CA0037664 (Order No. R2-2008-0007) issued and enforced by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, which

		monitors discharge prohibitions, dry-weather effluent limitations, wet-weather effluent performance criteria, receiving water limitations, sludge management practices, and monitoring and reporting requirements. The permits prohibit overflows from the combined sewer and wastewater system structures during dry weather and require wet-weather overflows to comply with the nine minimum controls specified in the federal combined sewer and wastewater system Control Policy. The project would incrementally increase demand for and use of waste water and sanitary sewer services, but not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in this area. Source Document(s): 25
Water Supply	2	Water would be provided to the project by the SFPUC. The SFPUC forecasted future water demand using regional growth projections that incorporate existing land use designations and reasonably foreseeable future projects within San Francisco. According to the *2010 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco* (UWMP) and the updated retail demand forecasts contained in the 2013 Water Availability Study, the SFPUC would be able to meet the future demand in years of average precipitation as well as in a single dry year and a multiple dry year event, for each five-year projection beginning in 2020. Implementation of the project, which consists of the development of 86 dwelling units, would incrementally increase the demand for water in San Francisco. Since project water demand could be accommodated by the existing and planned supply anticipated under SFPUC's UWMP, it would not result in a substantial increase in water use on the project site that could not be accommodated by existing water supply entitlements and water resources. Source Information: 19, 33, 34
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), headquartered at 850 Bryant Street, provides police protection in the City and County of San Francisco. The project site would be served by the Southern Police Station located at 1251 Third Street, approximately 1.3 miles from the project site. The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), headquartered at 698 Second Street, provides fire suppression services and unified emergency medical services (EMS) and transport, including basic life support and advanced life support services, in the City and County of San Francisco. The project site would be served by the SFFD through two fire stations near the project site, Fire Station No 1 at 935 Folsom Street, at Fifth Street, and Fire Station No. 8 at 36 Bluxome Street, at Fourth Street. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes. Implementation of the project could increase the demand for fire protection, emergency medical and police protection services. However, the increase would be incremental, funded largely through project-related increases to the City's tax base, and would not be substantial given the overall demand

		for such services on a citywide basis. Fire protection, emergency medical, and police protection resources are regularly redeployed based on need in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. Moreover, the proximity of the project site to Fire Station No. 1 and No. 8 would help minimize Fire Department and Police Department response times should incidents occur at the project site. Source Document(s): 26, 27
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	Within two blocks of the project site is Yerba Buena Gardens, including its children's garden and carousel, which provides publicly accessible recreational facilities. It includes a five-acre Esplanade atop Moscone North, a grassy area and waterfall. The Children's Garden is surrounded by the Children's Creativity Museum, Child Development Center, Bowling Center and Ice Rink. In addition, the Gene Friend Recreation Center, a one-acre recreational facility, located at the intersection of Sixth and Folsom streets, provides a full indoor gymnasium, multiple recreational/physical fitness rooms, outdoor basketball and volleyball courts, and a playground. Residents of the project would utilize existing parks, open space and public recreational facilities. Source Document(s): 28
Transportation and Accessibility	2	The project site is adequately served by pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and parking facilities. Sidewalks and crosswalks are provided throughout the project area on all surrounding roadways. In addition, this project is part of the Central Subway Project and the Yerba Buena/Moscone subway station will be located below the project. While there will be an increase in residents as a result of the project, the addition of the new Central Subway station at the project site will increase accessibility to the public transit system. The project is located in an infill area where new residential uses are anticipated to maximize use of public transportation and average vehicle miles traveled would be consistent with the project area. Source Document(s): 52, 53

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	No unique natural, or water features are present onsite. Implementation of the project would not affect water resources, nor would it increase demands on groundwater resources. As noted above, water service would be provided by SFPUC. No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site. Source Document(s): 13
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	The project site and surrounding area are fully developed and does not support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife.

		Source Document(s): 9, 10
Other Factors		

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

1. February 10, 2016; ESA

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

1. City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2012 (November). Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport. Available: http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Consolidated_CCAG_ALUCP_November-20121.pdf. Accessed February 23, 2016. Prepared by Ricondo & Associates, Inc., Jacobs Consultancy, and Clarion Associates.
2. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016 (Last Updated: March 10, 2016). Results of Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper electronic database search for San Francisco, California. Available: http://www.fws.gov/cbra/Maps/Mapper.html. Accessed March 10, 2016.
3. City and County of San Francisco, Office of the City Administrator, November 12, 2015. Interim Floodplain Map, NE San Francisco. Available: http://sfgsa.org/sites/default/files/Document/SF_NE.pdf. Accessed February 23, 2016.
4. U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2015. Flood Map Service Center, San Francisco County. Available: http://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor. Accessed February 23, 2016.
5. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, 2016. Central Subway. Available: http://www.centralsubwaysf.com/content/central-subway-alignment. Accessed March 7, 2016.
6. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016. Coastal Zone Management Program. Office for Coastal Management. Available: https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/mystate/?redirect=301ocm. Accessed February 23, 2016.
7. City of San Francisco, 2016. City of San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Report for 266 4th Street. Available: http://propertymap.sfplanning.org. Accessed February 23, 2016.
8. California State Water Resources Control Board, 2016. GeoTracker. Available: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=266+4th+street%2C+san+francisco. Accessed February 24, 2016.
9. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016. 4th and Folsom Housing Development IPaC Trust Resources Report. Results of electronic database search. Accessed on March 10, 2016.
10. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2016. California Natural Diversity Database, Results of electronic records search. Sacramento, California: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat Data Analysis Branch. [USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles San Francisco North, Point Bonita, San Rafael, San Quentin, Richmond, Oakland West, Hunters Point, San Francisco South]. Accessed March 10, 2016.
11. Natural Resources Conservation Service. Results of electronic Web Soil Survey database. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available: http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed February 23, 2016.
12. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016. Sole Source Aquifers in Region 9. Available: http://www3.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html. Accessed February 24, 2016.
13. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016. National Wetlands Inventory, Results of electronic mapping search. Madison, Wisconsin: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Habitat and Resource Conservation Branch of Resource and Mapping Support. Available: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html. Accessed February 24, 2016.
14. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 2016. Electronic Database Search for National Wild and Scenic Rivers in California, Available: http://www.rivers.gov/index.php. Accessed on February 24, 2016.
15. U.S. Census Bureau, 2010. Summary File 1, Race Alone or in Combination and Hispanic or Latino: 2010. Available:

http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_SF1_QTP6&prodType=table. Accessed February 24, 2016.
16. City of San Francisco, 2015. CatEx Determination Layers Map. Available: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2426. Accessed March 3, 2016.
17. City of San Francisco Planning Department, 2016. Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, Height and Bulk Districts Sheet HT01. Last updated January 2016.
18. City of San Francisco, 2015 (Last updated: July) Zoning Map Available: http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9016. Accessed on March 7, 2016.
19. City and County of San Francisco, 2014. Central SoMa Plan Initial Study. San Francisco Planning Department, February 12, 2014.
20. EDR Radius Map with Geocheck, 4th and Folsom Affordable Housing Project, Inquiry Number: 04520280.2r, January 22, 2016.
21. Northgate Environmental Management, 2013. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Moscone Center North and South, 747 and 750 Howard Street, San Francisco, California, March 21, 2013.
22. California Integrated Waste Management Board, 2016. Solid Waste Information System. Available: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/48-AA-0002/Detail/. Accessed February 29, 2016.
23. San Francisco Planning Department, Agreement for the Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste and Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County, Case No. 2014.0653E, Final Negative Declaration, July 21, 2015. Available: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2014.0653E_Revised_FND.pdf. Accessed March 14, 2016.
24. City and County of San Francisco, 2015. Notice of Availability of and Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for the Agreement for Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. Available: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1828. Accessed September 24, 2015.
25. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, ORDER NO. R2-2008-0007, NPDES NO. CA0037664. Available: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb2/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2008. Accessed March 7, 2016.
26. San Francisco Police Department, 2016. City and County of San Francisco Police Department District Stations and Map. Available: http://sf-police.org/index.aspx?page=796. Accessed February 29, 2016.
27. San Francisco Fire Department, 2016. City and County of San Francisco Fire Department Fire Station Locations. Available: http://www.sf-fire.org/index.aspx?page=176. Accessed February 29, 2016.
28. San Francisco Recreation and Parks. SF Park Finder, Find-A-Destination. Available: http://sfrecpark.org/parks-open-spaces/find-a-destination/. Accessed February 29, 2016.
29. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), July 2013. Available: http://caleemod.com/. Accessed March 9, 2016.
30. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2010. Draft California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, May 2010. Available: http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines. Accessed March 9, 2016.
31. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 2012. 2008 Ground-level Ozone Standards – Region 9 Final Designations, April 2012. Available: https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/ozonepollution/designations/2008standards/final/region9f.htm. Accessed March 9, 2016.
32. USEPA, 2016. General Conformity De Minimis Levels, February 2016. Available: http://www3.epa.gov/airquality/genconform/deminimis.html. Accessed March 9, 2016.
33. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), *2010 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco*, adopted June 2011. Available online at online at http://sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=1055. Accessed March 14, 2016.
34. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), 2013 *Water Availability Study for the City and County of San Francisco*, May 2013. Available online at http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=75. Accessed March 14, 2016.
35. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Noise Guidebook, March 2009. Available: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/. Accessed March 11, 2016.
36. San Francisco Department of Public Health, March 2009. Areas Potentially Requiring Noise Insulations. March 2009. Accessed March 11, 2016.
37. Rincon Consultants, January 2016. Noise Measurements at 4th Street and Folsom Street.

38. Federal Highway Administration, January 2006. Construction Noise Model User's Guide. Available: www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf. Accessed March 14, 2016.
39. San Francisco Metropolitan Transit Agency (SFMTA). Traffic Count Data 1995 – 2013, March 2014. Available: https://www.sfmta.com/about-sfmta/reports/sfmta-traffic-count-data-1995-2013. Accessed March 11, 2016.
40. SFMTA. Muni Map, March 2014a. Available: https://www.sfmta.com/maps/muni-system-map. Accessed March 11, 2016.
41. Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Schedules and Route Maps, 2016. Available: http://transit.511.org/schedules/index.aspx?#m1=S&m2=bus&cid=SF. Accessed March 13, 2016.
42. Golden Gate Transit. San Francisco System Map, 2015. Available: http://goldengatetransit.org/services/index.php#maps. Accessed March 11, 2016.
43. California Department of Transportation. Technical Noise Supplement, October 1998. Available: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/Technical Noise Supplement.pdf. Accessed March 11, 2016.
44. California Department of Transportation. Traffic Census Program: Vehicle AADT, 2014. Available: http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/. Accessed March 11, 2016.
45. California Department of Transportation. Traffic Census Program: Truck AADT, 2014a. Available: http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/. Accessed March 11, 2016.
46. Caltrain. Schedules, 2016. Available: http://www.caltrain.com/schedules.html. Accessed March 13, 2016.
47. Wilson, Ihrig & Associates, Inc. Noise and Vibration Settings Report: San Francisco Muni Historic Streetcar Service to Fort Mason, April 2009.
48. SFMTA. Historic Streetcars, 2016. Available: https://www.sfmta.com/about-sfmta/our-history-and-fleet/sfmta-fleet/historic-streetcars. Accessed March 14, 2016.
49. SFMTA. F-Market & Wharves Map, September 2015. Available: https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/transit/routes-stops/f-market-wharves. Accessed March 14, 2016.
50. American Legal Publishing Corporation. Article 29: Regulation of Noise, 2015. Available: http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/police/policecode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sync=1. Accessed March 15, 2016.
51. Association of Bay Area Governments. Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area 2014-2022. Available: http://abag.ca.gov/files/ABAG_Final_RHNA_Publication.pdf Accessed March 18, 2016.\
52. San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, October 2002.
53. US Census, American Community Survey 2010-2014 Five-Year estimates for Census Tracts 176.01, 178.01, 178.02, and 615. U.S. Census American Factfinder. Available: http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml. Accessed March 4, 2016.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Criteria Pollutant Emission Summary and CalEEMod Output
2. Noise Assessment Preparation Calculations
3. HUD DNL Calculator Output
4. Noise Abatement and Control Worksheet
5. Environmental Justice Worksheet
6. HUD Acceptable Separation Distance Tool

List of Permits Obtained:

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]**:**

The proposed project is part of the Central SoMa Plan for which the San Francisco Planning Department conducted considerable outreach and received public comments from over 200 persons.

Public outreach was conducted

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]**:** The project is not part of a series of activities. The project would not result in additional cumulative impacts from future related actions.

Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]:

Alternative size configurations and locations for the project have been contemplated; however, the project best meets the purpose and need for new affordable housing in the SoMa area. A larger development could have greater impacts on the human environment although they may be mitigated depending on the size of the development. A smaller development would not maximize the potential use of the property for affordable housing and would not serve to avoid any impacts.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]: The no action alternative would mean that the project site is not developed with affordable housing. Due to the lack of available development sites within the City it is likely that the project site would be developed with either residential, commercial, office, or mixed uses.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions: For one environmental issue (noise), the project would result in minor adverse but mitigable impacts. No impacts are potentially significant to the extent that an Environmental Impact Statement would be required. The project would result primarily in less than significant impacts to the environment with a beneficial impact related to environmental justice.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]

Summarize below all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance (San Francisco Health Code Article 22B, and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.3.2.6)	All site preparation work, demolition, or other construction in San Francisco that could create dust or expose or disturb more than 10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of soil, must comply with specified dust control measures.
24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	It is a HUD goal that the interior auditory environment shall not exceed a day-night average sound level of 45 decibels.

	administered and enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI), and compliance with all provisions is mandatory for all new development and redevelopment in the City. Throughout the permitting, design, and construction phases of a building project, Planning Department staff, DBI engineers, and DBI building inspectors confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations.

Determination:

☒ **Finding of No Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

☐ **Finding of Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Preparer Signature: Jennifer Wade Date: 4/5/2016

Name/Title/Organization: Jennifer Wade / Senior Managing Associate / ESA

Certifying Officer Signature: Katha Hartley Date: April 5, 2016

Name/Title: Katha Hartley, Deputy Director, MOHCD

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environmental Review Record (ERR) for the activity/project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).