

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

Project Information

Project Name: Sunnydale Parcel Q 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: 1433-1497 (odd) Sunnydale Avenue, 209-221 (odd) Hahn Street, San Francisco, CA, 94134; APN 6356-61 through APN 6356-68 (eight parcels total)

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

The project includes the rezoning of the project site (Sunnydale Parcel Q) currently zoned NC-1 to RM-2/NC-2 through the Sunnydale HOPE SF Special Use District for the purpose of the development of a multi-family housing structure providing affordable housing. The project comprises up to 70 units (approximately 88,550 square feet for residential units, corridors, and common areas), above an approximately 37-vehicle podium parking facility (approximately 15,950 square feet). Project construction is anticipated to begin in 2017 with completion in mid-2019, taking approximately 14-20 months. The project would be located at the southeastern intersection of Hahn Street and Sunnydale Avenue in the Visitacion Valley neighborhood. The building would consist of a maximum of six floors (five floors of residential over one floor of parking) and would have a maximum height of 65 feet.

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

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and Association of Bay Area Governments 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. The project would provide a portion of identified affordable housing needs for San Francisco in the Visitacion Valley neighborhood.

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

The project site is located on the southeastern corner of the intersection of Hahn Street and Sunnydale Avenue in the Visitacion Valley neighborhood near the southern end of San Francisco, California. The project site is 21,757 square feet or approximately 0.5 acres. The project site is a vacant lot, not previously developed. Within 0.25 miles, the surrounding project area contains primarily residential and recreational uses with limited commercial retail: to the north, across Sunnydale Avenue, is a neighborhood market, church and residential development; to the east and south are row houses and neighborhood parks; to the west, across Hahn Street, is Sunnydale –Velasco, San Francisco’s largest public housing site; to the northwest is Herz Playground and Gleneagles Golf Course. Cow Palace is located just over 0.25 miles south of the project site, and light industrial and commercial offices are located just over 0.25 miles southwest of the project site.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount:

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

Construction Costs:	\$35,000,000
Non-Construction Costs:	\$9,300,000
Total	\$44,300,000

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 <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project would include new construction and operation of an affordable multi-family housing development. The project site is currently a vacant lot consisting of several parcels and thus would not require demolition. The project site is fairly level and the proposed building would be built above grade, so minimal site preparation/excavation would be involved. The project would result in short-term construction emissions

as well as long-term operational emissions primarily from consumer products and vehicle use from the new residents.

Criteria Pollutants

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod 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 1.65 and 0.73 tons per year of ozone precursors [reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), respectively], 0.65 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), and 0.08 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) 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, NO_x, and PM_{2.5} pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the federal Clean Air Act.

Average daily construction-related emissions would be 29.46 pounds per day of ROG, 13.04 pounds per day of NO_x, and 0.89 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀ 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 mitigation measures coincide with San Francisco's Dust Control Ordinance which is further explained below. These average daily construction-related emissions would be below the respective BAAQMD significance thresholds of 54 pounds per day for ROG, NO_x and PM_{2.5} and 82 pounds per day for PM₁₀.

Operational emissions from the project would result primarily from consumer product and vehicle use related to the apartment residents. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual emissions from the operation of the project would be 0.60 tons per year of ROG, 0.40 tons per year of NO_x, 1.71 tons per year of CO, 0.23 tons per year of PM₁₀ and 0.07 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, NO_x, 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 PM₁₀.

Average daily operational emissions from the project would be 3.25 pounds per day of ROG, 1.68 pounds per day of NO_x,

		<p>0.07 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀ and 0.07 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 PM₁₀.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Fugitive Dust</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Asbestos Containing Materials and Lead Based Paint</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 5, 6, 7, 8, Attachment 1</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 9, 10</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances</p> <p>24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is currently a vacant lot, bounded by Hahn Street to the west, Sunnydale Avenue to the north, and residential units to the south and east. A local market and church are located across Sunnydale Avenue, otherwise the site is located within an entirely residential neighborhood comprised of RH (Residential Houses) and RM (Residential Mixed) zoned land.</p> <p>Historical uses and potential hazards for the project site and immediate vicinity were provided by the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for project site prepared by Enviro Assessment PC in December 2014 and review of the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker and EnviroStor databases in April 2016.</p>

		<p>The project site was developed with a structure sometime between 1946 and 1956. Between 1993 and 2000, the original structure was removed and the site has remained vacant since that time. Prior to the development of the original structure, the site existed as vacant agricultural land dating back to the first located aerial photograph from 1938, therefore first use could not be identified. Historical use of the site includes, but is not limited to agricultural land, a television repair shop, and a beauty salon.</p> <p>No Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) have been identified based on the historical use of the project site or review of regulatory database searches for the project site and vicinity. Based on the limited amount of time the site was used as agricultural land, amount of time since it has been agricultural land (60+ years), and amount of tilling and earthwork conducted during the original development and subsequent removal of the former structure on-site, any potential remaining pesticide or fertilizer contamination present from past agricultural activities is considered de-minimis. Database reports were reviewed for any sites which may pose a risk of significant environmental concern to the project site. There are no hazardous materials sites including permitted operational, post-closure, or non-operating sites, as well as Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT), or Spills, Leaks, Investigation, and Cleanups (SLIC) sites within 1,000 feet of the project site. Based on the description of the cases, the type of database listings, the amount of past regulatory oversight, and the relative distance to the subject properties, the sites listed beyond 1,000 feet are not anticipated to impact the project site. Therefore earthwork or ground disturbing activities are not anticipated to disturb contaminated soils or groundwater.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 11, 12, 13</p>
<p>Endangered Species</p> <p>Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is a vacant lot in an urban environment. There are no existing natural habitats or federally protected species within the project site, nor does it provide any listed species' habitat requirements. Listed species may occur in John McLaren Park and San Bruno Mountain area; however, neither of these areas would be affected by the project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 14, 15</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</p> <p>24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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 or immediately adjacent to the project site. The nearest above-ground storage tanks (ASTs) are located at 2600 Geneva Avenue and 501 Tunnel Street.</p>

		<p>The AST at 2600 Geneva Avenue (Cow Palace) contains approximately 1,320 gallons and has an Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) for thermal radiation of 311 feet (if unobstructed). The project site is approximately 1,500 feet north of Cow Palace and thus located at an acceptable distance.</p> <p>The AST at 501 Tunnel Avenue contains 2,500 gallons with an ASD for thermal radiation of 405 feet (if unobstructed). This site is approximately 4,200 feet west of this AST and thus located at an acceptable distance.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 13, Attachment 2</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection</p> <p>Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 17</p>
<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3, 4</p>
<p>Historic Preservation</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project is subject to the Programmatic Agreement By And Among The City And County Of San Francisco, The California State Historic Preservation Officer, And The Advisory Council On Historic Preservation Regarding Historic Properties Affected By Use Of Revenue From The Department Of Housing And Urban Development Part 58 Programs (PA).</p> <p>An Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment was conducted in 2011 for the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF project located across Hahn Street to the west. The Area of Potential Effect and records search included a ¼ mile radius from the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF project site which includes Sunnydale Parcel Q and its immediate vicinity. No previously recorded prehistoric or historic-era sites were identified in this search.</p> <p>The APE for this project consists of the project site, which has no structures but has a similar historical ecological setting and geomorphology to the eastern portion of the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF project site. Both sites have a moderate sensitivity for prehistoric archeological deposits below relatively shallow artificial fill.</p> <p>For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that the parking structure would be at grade and any earthwork or ground</p>

		<p>disturbing activities would be minimized to that necessary for utility and structural support. The project could potentially impact previously undiscovered prehistoric resources. The City of San Francisco Planning Department has determined in their Preliminary Archeological Review for the project that the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF EIS-EIR mitigation measure requiring archaeological testing would be applicable to Sunnydale Parcel Q (Mitigation Measure M-CP-2).</p> <p>This measure has been revised to apply to the project site and included as Mitigation Measure CUL-1. The measure identifies changes from the EIS-EIR measure in underline-strikeout format.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 16, 18</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project would introduce new noise sources to the neighborhood from vehicle use on adjacent and nearby roadways by new residents. The project would also introduce short-term noises during the construction period of the new building.</p> <p><u>HUD Noise Standards</u></p> <p>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 an additional 10 decibels applied 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.</p> <p>The San Francisco city-wide background noise level map, developed by the Department of Public Health, shows traffic noise levels for these adjacent roadways (along Hahn Street and Sunnydale Avenue) to be between 65-70 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Ldn at the roadside. However, the residential structure would set back approximately 32 feet from the center of Hahn Street and from the center of Sunnydale Avenue and so exterior noise levels at the building setback would be less than those estimated in the City's map.</p> <p>ESA modeled noise levels according to the HUD Day/Night Noise Level (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 Hahn Street and Sunnydale Avenue. The other roadway within the assessment range considered for this proposed project was Visitacion Avenue approximately 650 feet to the north. There are no railways within 3,000 feet of the project site. The project site</p>

is located over 4 miles north of the 65 dB CNEL noise contour for San Francisco International Airport and airport noise is not a substantial contributor to the existing noise environment of the project site.

Transportation noise for Sunnydale Avenue, Hahn Street, and Visitation Avenue were calculated using the HUD DNL Calculator using best data available based on SFMTA traffic volumes, and bus headway schedules. The combined DNL exterior noise from these sources was calculated to be 72.0 dBA Ldn at the project site.

Taking into account the combined DNL from the Calculator, 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.

Construction Noise

The sensitive receptors nearest to the project site are the residences surrounding the project site, notably two residential buildings adjacent to the southern and eastern boundaries of the proposed project.

Construction of the project would not require demolition as the project site is vacant and only requires minimal site preparation to be 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

		<p>this equipment would be intermittent as work progresses from one level to the next.</p> <p>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. 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. If construction activities using non-impact equipment would exceed these standards, then mitigation measures would be required. To ensure that construction noise impacts remain less than significant, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 has been included which is the same as Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF EIS-EIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a.</p> <p>Source List: 1, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26</p> <p>Attachments 3, 4, 5</p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers</p> <p>Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project is not served by a U.S. EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer.</p> <p>Source Documents: 27</p>
<p>Wetlands Protection</p> <p>Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is not located near, or within, a wetland area. Therefore, the project would not affect wetland or riparian areas.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 28</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 29</p>
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
<p>Environmental Justice</p> <p>Executive Order 12898</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is currently vacant and serves no population. The project site is located in a census block which is made up of 80.7% 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.</p> <p>Source Documents: 30, 31, Attachment 6</p>

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	<p>The project is located within the Visitacion Valley neighborhood near the southern end of San Francisco. The project area contains primarily residential uses with nearby public open spaces and some commercial and industrial uses occurring to the south. In the immediate vicinity, the east side of Hahn Street is dominated by residential row houses. Across Hahn street to the west is the Sunnydale-Velasco public housing development. A neighborhood market and church are located across Sunnydale Ave from the project site.</p> <p>The project site is currently zoned NC-1 Neighborhood Commercial Cluster and allows buildings up to 40 feet in height. However the project site would be rezoned as part of a proposed Special Use District (part of the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project) to RM-2 Residential, Mixed Moderate Density and NC-2 Neighborhood Commercial Small Scale. The rezoning would also raise the allowable height of structures at the project site.</p> <p>The project is consistent with the proposed Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project and zoning of the proposed Special Use District.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 11, 32, 33, 34</p>
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	2	<p><u>Geology and Soils</u></p> <p>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</p>

		<p>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 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. Potential impacts of site development will be mitigated by adherence to the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC).</p> <p>The SFBC derives from the adopted 2013 California Building Code. This code is administered and enforced by the San Francisco 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.</p> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <p>The project site is currently largely pervious grass areas that will be replaced by impervious surfaces. Stormwater runoff from project construction would continue to drain into the combined sewer and stormwater system and be treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. Pursuant to the San Francisco Public Works Code, including the Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance, and the San Francisco Green Building Code, the project sponsor would be required to implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth BMP measures to reduce potential runoff and erosion impacts. The proposed project would construct all improvements according to the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance, which requires treatment of all runoff prior to leaving the site. The proposed stormwater management system for the project would collect, detain and potentially retain some stormwater within the project site such that the rate and amount of stormwater runoff from the site does not negatively impact the City's treatment facilities, and in a manner that is consistent with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's Stormwater Design Guidelines. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality during either construction or operation.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34, 35</p>
<p>Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise</p>	<p>3</p>	<p><u>Hazardous Materials</u></p> <p>As described above in "Contamination and Toxic Substances," historical records and potential hazards for the project site and immediate vicinity were reviewed. No hazardous materials issues were identified and thus the earthwork or ground disturbing activities are not anticipated to disturb contaminated soils or groundwater.</p>

		<p><u>Noise</u> Construction noise as discussed above “Noise Abatement and Control” would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 11-13, 19, 20-26</p>
Energy Consumption	2	<p>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.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	2	<p>Construction on the project site would provide a number of 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.</p>
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	<p><u>Demographics</u> The project would not result in physical barriers or reduced access that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group.</p> <p>Construction would result in temporary, construction job growth at the project site as a result of the project but this is a small number that is anticipated to be accommodated by the existing employment pool. The project would develop up to 70 affordable housing units onsite resulting in an increase in population in the project area; however, given the existing residential nature of the vicinity and the planned redevelopment of the adjacent public housing this is consistent with neighborhood character.</p> <p>Furthermore this project would provide additional affordable housing consistent with then needs established in the Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area.</p> <p><u>Displacement</u> The project would not displace existing residents and thus there would be no impact with respect to displacement.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34, 36</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p>The project would not displace educational or cultural facilities. Based on the analysis of school capacity done for the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project, nearby schools have adequate capacity to accommodate any small increase in school age children occupying the completed project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34</p>
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>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.</p>
Health Care and Social Services	2	<p>The project will not impact any health care or social service facilities. The nearest major hospital is 2.5 miles north of the site (St. Luke's Hospital). Several social services including a community center are planned in the redevelopment of the adjacent Sunnydale-Velasco site.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34</p>
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Construction and demolition (C&D) debris in the City must be transported by a registered transporter to a registered facility that can process mixed C&D debris pursuant to the City and County of San Francisco C&D Ordinance. The Ordinance requires that at least 65 percent of C&D debris from a site go to a registered C&D recycling facility. This requirement has been augmented by the Green Building Ordinance, which requires that at least 75 percent of C&D debris be diverted from landfills. Compliance with this regulation would ensure any impact from construction debris is appropriately minimized.</p>

		<p>During operation, 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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34, 37, 38, 39</p>
<p>Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The project site is within an urban area that is well served by the combined sewer/stormwater collection, storage and treatment facilities operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).</p> <p>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 Sunnysdale urban watershed. 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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The project would incrementally increase demand for and use of waste water and sanitary sewer services, but not in excess of existing capacity.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34, 40</p>
<p>Water Supply</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Water would be provided to the project by the SFPUC. The SFPUC forecasted future water demand using regional growth projections that</p>

		<p>incorporate existing land use designations and reasonably foreseeable future projects within San Francisco. According to the <i>2010 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco</i> (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 up to 70 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.</p> <p>Source Information: 34, 41, 42</p>
<p>Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), headquartered at 850 Bryant Street, provides police protection in the City and County of San Francisco. Police service is provided to the project site primarily by the San Francisco Police Department's Ingleside Station, at 1 John V. Young Lane, approximately 2 miles away. In addition, the Ingleside Station maintains a substation within the adjacent Sunnysdale-Velasco public housing site.</p> <p>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. Fire protection to the project site is provided primarily by the San Francisco Fire Department's Station 43, at 720 Moscow Street (approximately 1 mile to the west), Station 44, at 1298 Girard Street (approximately 1.25 miles to the east), and Station 15, at 1000 Ocean Avenue (approximately 2 miles to the northwest). If one or more of the engine or truck companies were to be out of service at the time of an alarm, the next closest available unit would respond. Emergency medical transportation to San Francisco hospitals is provided by a dynamically deployed fleet of both public and private ambulance services. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34, 43, 44</p>

Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	<p>The nearest public open spaces to the project site are Herz Playground and McLaren Park, directly to the north. McLaren Park's varied topography provides expansive views of the City in several directions. The park includes several recreational amenities including; basketball and tennis courts, baseball and soccer fields, a nine hole golf course, an indoor pool, several playground and picnic area as well as approximately seven miles of trails. Several other parks including the Crocker Amazon Playground located to the west of McLaren Park are located within one mile of the project site. The project would not directly impact any of these resources and the small increase in population caused by the project would not substantially increase park use or exceed existing or proposed capacities.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34, 45</p>
Transportation and Accessibility	2	<p>The project site is adequately served by pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and parking facilities. The existing nearby transportation system and impacts caused by the development were extensively modeled as part of the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project EIS-EIR. It concluded that the proposed redevelopment of the existing public housing site and an increase of almost 1,000 dwelling units would not significantly impact traffic, transit or pedestrian/bicycle travel methods. The small additional increase in population from the proposed project beyond what was modeled for the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project would not change the previous conclusions or significantly impact transportation or accessibility.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	<p>No known 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.</p> <p>The project site has a similar geomorphology to the eastern portion of the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF project site and thus the potential to contain subsurface paleontological resources. For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that the parking structure would be at grade and any earthwork or ground disturbing activities would be minimized to that necessary for utility and structural support; however, the project still has the potential to impact previously undiscovered paleontological resources. Mitigation from the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF EIS-EIR requiring a paleontological resources mitigation program would reduce potential impacts associated with Sunnydale Parcel Q (Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through d). These measures has been revised to apply to the project site and included as Mitigation Measure PAL-1. The measure identifies changes from the EIS-EIR measure in underline-strikeout format.</p>

		Source Document(s): 34
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	The project site is currently a vacant lot with grass vegetation in an urban area. This is not known or likely to support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife species. Source Document(s): 14, 15
Other Factors		

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

1. December 8, 2014; Enviro Assessment P.C.

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 March 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 23, 2016.
3. City and County of San Francisco, Office of the City Administrator, November 12, 2015. Interim Floodplain Map, SE San Francisco. Available: http://sfgsa.org/sites/default/files/Document/SF_SE.pdf. Accessed March 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 March 23, 2016.
5. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), July 2013. Available: <http://caleemod.com/>. Accessed March 9, 2016.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. USEPA, 2016. General Conformity De Minimis Levels, February 2016. Available: <http://www3.epa.gov/airquality/genconform/deminimis.html>. Accessed March 9, 2016.
9. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016. Coastal Zone Management Program. Office for Coastal Management. Available: <https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/mystate/?redirect=301ocm>. Accessed March 23, 2016.
10. City of San Francisco, 2016. City of San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Report for 1477 Sunnydale Avenue. Available: <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/>. Accessed March 23, 2016.
11. California State Water Resources Control Board, 2016. GeoTracker. Available: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=1477+Sunnydale+Avenue%2C+San+Francisco%2C+CA%2C+94134>. Accessed April 4, 2016.
12. California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2016. EnviroStor. Available: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mapfull.asp?global_id=&x=-119&y=37&z=18&ms=640,480&mt=m&findaddress=True&city=1477%20Sunnydale%20Avenue,%20San%20Francisco,%20CA,%2094134&zip=&county=&federal_superfund=true&state_response=true&voluntary_cleanup=true&school_cleanup=true&ca_site=true&tiered_permit=true&evaluation=true&military_eva

[uation=true&school_investigation=true&operating=true&post_closure=true&non_operating=true](#). Accessed April 4, 2016.

13. Enviro Assessment P.C., 2014. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Sunnydale Avenue Properties, 1437 Sunnydale Avenue, San Francisco, CA. December 2014.
14. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016. List of Threatened and Endangered Species that May Occur in the Proposed Project Location, and/or May be Affected by the Proposed Project (Consultation Code: 08ESMF000-2016-SLI-1154, Event Code: 08ESMF00-2016-E- 02526). Accessed on March 30, 2016.
15. 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 30, 2016.
16. Randall Dean, pers. comm., 2016. Personal communication (email) from Randall Dean (City and County of San Francisco Planning Department) to Kansai Uchida (City and County of San Francisco Planning Department) on March 18, 2016.
17. 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 March 23, 2016.
18. Byrd, Brian, and Rebecca Allen, Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment for the Sunnydale-Velasco Hope San Francisco Redevelopment Project, City of San Francisco, California. Prepared for ESA, 2011.
19. 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.
20. San Francisco Department of Public Health, March 2009. Areas Potentially Requiring Noise Insulations. March 2009. Accessed March 14, 2016.
21. 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.
22. 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 14, 2016.
23. SFMTA. Muni Map, March 2014a. Available: <https://www.sfmta.com/maps/muni-system-map>. Accessed March 25, 2016.
24. 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.
25. California Department of Transportation. Technical Noise Supplement, October 1998. Available: [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/Technical Noise Supplement.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/Technical%20Noise%20Supplement.pdf). Accessed March 11, 2016.
26. 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](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.
27. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016. Sole Source Aquifers in Region 9. Available: <http://www3.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html>. Accessed March 23, 2016.
28. 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 March 23, 2016.
29. 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 March 23, 2016.
30. U.S. Census Bureau, 2010. Census Tract Reference Map. Available: http://www2.census.gov/geo/maps/dc10map/tract/st06_ca/c06075_san_francisco/DC10CT_C06075_004.pdf. Accessed March 23, 2016.
31. 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_OTP4&prodType=table. Accessed April 4, 2016.
32. City of San Francisco Planning Department, 2016. Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, Height and Bulk Districts Sheet HT11. Last updated January 2016.

33. City of San Francisco, 2015 (Last updated: July) Zoning Map Available: <http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9016>. Accessed on March 30, 2016.
34. City and County of San Francisco, 2015. Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project, Final Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement, Volume 1. San Francisco Planning Department and Mayor's Office of Housing, July 9, 2015
35. City of San Francisco, 2015. CatEx Determination Layers Map. Available: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2426>. Accessed March 30, 2016.
36. 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 31, 2016.
37. California Integrated Waste Management Board, 2016. Solid Waste Information System. Available: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/48-AA-0002/Detail/>. Accessed April 4, 2016.
38. 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.
39. 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.
40. 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 April 4, 2016.
41. 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 <http://sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=1055>. Accessed April 4, 2016.
42. 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 April 4, 2016.
43. 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.
44. 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.
45. San Francisco Recreation and Parks. SF Park Finder, Find-A-Destination. Available: <http://sfrecpark.org/parks-open-spaces/find-a-destination/>. Accessed April 4, 2016.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Criteria Pollutant Emission Summary and CalEEMod Output
2. Explosive and Flammable Hazards
3. Noise Assessment Preparation Calculations
4. Noise HUD DNL Calculator Output
5. Noise Abatement and Control Worksheet
6. Environmental Justice Worksheet

List of Permits Obtained:

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]: A notice of availability of the EA and FONSI will be published.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]: Project construction could overlap with redevelopment of the Sunnydale-Velasco Master Plan Project located across Hahn Street to the west. The proposed project would have little to no impact for most resources evaluated with the

exception of construction noise and cultural resources. Mitigation measures have been incorporated which would reduce the project's potential to contribute to cumulative impacts.

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 Visitacion Valley neighborhood. 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 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 residential or neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions: For two environmental issues (cultural resources and noise), the project could potentially result in minor adverse impacts which can be mitigated to a less than significant level. 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.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (based on Sunnydale-Velasco EIS-EIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-2: Archeological Testing Program)

An Archeological Testing Program shall be developed to ascertain whether archeological material may be preserved underneath recent fill within the project ~~EAPE~~. This effort shall entail geoaicheological coring of the ~~eastern-most portion of the project EAPE in project blocks 1 through 8 east of Santos Street~~ and shall take place after detailed project design plans have been developed that show the full extent and depth of project construction activity. Additional pre-field investigations into the cut and fill history of the project ~~EAPE~~ should also be undertaken. With these additional data sets, the precise placement and depth of cores can be determined in order to ensure testing coverage is sufficient to identify any unknown archeological material that would be impacted by construction activities.

Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project area, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried archeological resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant qualified in geoaicheology

from the rotational Department Qualified Archaeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The project sponsor shall contact the Department archaeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archaeological consultants on the QACL. The archaeological consultant shall undertake an archaeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archaeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer or ERO. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource ~~as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (a)(c)~~.

Consultation with Descendant Communities. On discovery of an archeological site (by the term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial) an appropriate representative (an "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission) of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

Archeological Testing Plan. The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program shall be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource ~~under CEQA~~.

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include

additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

- A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or
- B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

Archeological Monitoring Program. If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

Archeological Data Recovery Program. The archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP shall identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- *Field Methods and Procedures.* Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- *Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.* Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- *Discard and Deaccession Policy.* Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- *Interpretive Program.* Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.
- *Security Measures.* Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1)

copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1 (same as Sunnysdale-Velasco EIS-EIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Construction Specifications to Reduce Noise Levels During Construction)

- Provide enclosures and mufflers for stationary equipment, shrouding or shielding for impact tools, and barriers around particularly noisy operations, such as grading or use of concrete saws within 50 feet of an occupied sensitive land use.
- Use construction equipment with lower (less than 70 dB) noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly air compressors and generators.
- Do not use equipment on which sound-control devices provided by the manufacturer have been altered to reduce noise control.
- Locate stationary equipment, material stockpiles, and vehicle staging areas as far as practicable from sensitive receptors.
- Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.
- Require applicable construction-related vehicles and equipment to use designated truck routes to access the project site. Construction traffic should be routed along Geneva Avenue, Brookdale Avenue and Santos Street and should be managed to avoid peak periods.
- Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible (i.e., such that they do not impede efficient operation of equipment or dramatically slow production rates), which may include, but are not limited to, noise barriers or noise blankets. The placement of such attenuation measures shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Public Works prior to issuance of development permit for construction activities.
- Designate a Noise Disturbance Coordinator who shall be responsible for responding to complaints about noise during construction. The telephone number of the Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site and shall be provided to the City. Copies of the construction schedule shall also be posted at nearby noise-sensitive areas.

Mitigation Measure PAL-1 (based on Sunnysdale-Velasco EIS-EIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a: Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program, Mitigation Measure M-CP-3b: Paleontological resources training; Mitigation Measure M-CP-3c: Assessment and salvage of potential fossil finds; Mitigation Measure M-CP-3d: Monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during ground disturbing activities)

Prior to ground disturbance, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified paleontologist (is a practicing scientist who is recognized in the paleontologic community and is proficient in vertebrate paleontology) or a California Professional Geologist with appropriate paleontological expertise to carry out all mitigation measures related to paleontological

resources. The qualified paleontologist or geologist shall be available “on-call” to project sponsor throughout the duration of ground-disturbing activities.

Paleontological Resources Training

All construction forepersons and field supervisors conducting or overseeing subsurface excavations shall be trained by a qualified paleontologist in the recognition of potential fossil materials prior to ground disturbing activities. A one hour pre-construction training on paleontological resources shall also be provided to all other construction workers, but may include videotape of the initial training and/or the use of written materials rather than in person training by the qualified paleontologist. In addition to fossil recognition, the training shall convey procedures to follow in the event of a potential fossil discovery.

Assessment and Salvage of Potential Fossil Finds

If potential fossils are discovered during construction, all earthwork or other types of ground disturbance in the immediate vicinity of the find shall stop until the qualified paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the fossil. If salvage is required, recommendations shall be consistent with current professional standards outlined in the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines. If required, treatment for fossil remains may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection.

Monitoring by a Qualified Paleontologist During Ground Disturbing Activities

If fossils are discovered during construction, a qualified paleontologist shall determine whether monitoring shall be required during remaining ground disturbing activities. If required, a qualified paleontologist, a California Professional Geologist with appropriate paleontological expertise, or paleontological monitor working under the supervision of a qualified paleontologist shall monitor ground-disturbing activities. This monitoring shall consist of periodically inspecting disturbed, graded, and excavated surfaces, as well as soil stockpiles and disposal sites. The frequency of monitoring would be determined by the qualified paleontologist. If the monitor encounters a paleontological resource, he or she shall assess the fossil, and record or salvage it as described above in M-CP-3e.

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.

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations	Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or DNL) of 45 dB.
San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code)	The ordinance established acceptable noise levels for construction activities unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works.
San Francisco Building Code	The San Francisco Building Code derives from the adopted 2013 California Building Code. This code is 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.
San Francisco Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance (Article 4.2 of the Public Works Code)	Under the ordinance, any construction project that disturbs 5,000 square feet or more of land must apply to the SFPUC for a Construction Site Runoff Control Permit prior to the start of work and submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth best management practices (BMPs) intended to control erosion control and sediment.

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: _____ Date: _____

Name/Title/Organization: _____

Certifying Officer Signature:  _____ Date: 4-19-16

Name/Title: KATHA HARTLEY DEP. DIRECTOR

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations	Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or DNL) of 45 dB.
San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code)	The ordinance established acceptable noise levels for construction activities unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works.
San Francisco Building Code	The San Francisco Building Code derives from the adopted 2013 California Building Code. This code is 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.
San Francisco Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance (Article 4.2 of the Public Works Code)	Under the ordinance, any construction project that disturbs 5,000 square feet or more of land must apply to the SFPUC for a Construction Site Runoff Control Permit prior to the start of work and submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth best management practices (BMPs) intended to control erosion control and sediment.

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: 4/19/2016
Name/Title/Organization: Environmental Science Associates (ESA)

Certifying Officer Signature: _____ Date: _____
Name/Title: _____

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).

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).