**Environmental Assessment**

**Determinations and Compliance Findings**

**for HUD-assisted Projects**

**24 CFR Part 58**

# Project Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Name:** | 1296-Shotwell-Senior-Housing |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **HEROS Number:**  | 900000010028840 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Responsible Entity (RE):**  | SAN FRANCISCO, 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl Ste 200 San Francisco CA, 94102 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RE Preparer:**  | Eugene Flannery |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State / Local Identifier:**  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Certifying Officer:** | Katha Hartley |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Point of Contact:**  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Consultant (if applicable):** | ICF Jones and Stokes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Point of Contact:**  | Lawrence Truong |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Location:** | 1296 Shotwell St, San Francisco, CA 94110 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Additional Location Information:** |
| N/A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Direct Comments to:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:** |
| The proposed action, located at 1296 Shotwell Street, involves the development of a nine-story building containing 94 dwelling units (93 affordable units plus one unit for the onsite property manager) for seniors age 62 and older. Development of the project includes demolition of the existing one-story industrial building on the project site. The ground-floor level would include a community room; two bicycle storage areas that would contain the Class I bicycle spaces; a meeting room; offices, the manager unit; two one-bedroom units; and an open space area. The second floor would contain a laundry room, eight one-bedroom units, and three studio units. Floors three through seven would each contain approximately nine one-bedroom units and three studio units. Floor eight would contain eight one-bedroom units and three studio units. Floor nine would contain six one-bedroom units, three studio units, and two roof gardens. The project site is approximately 11,700 square feet and is bound by Shotwell Street to the east and Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) uses to the north, west, and south in San Francisco's Mission neighborhood. The proposed building would have a height of 84 feet (96 feet to top of elevator penthouse). The project site is within a 65-X height and bulk district. The proposed project would require the Planning Commission's approval of 100 percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program Project under Section 328 of the Planning Code for up to an additional 30 feet above the height district limit to be consistent with the height limit. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| The proposed project would provide affordable housing to formerly homeless seniors at or below the 30 percent Area Median Income (AMI) and seniors at or below the 50 percent AMI level. The 2015 Census counted 168,993 or 20.1 percent of San Francisco's population as 60 years or older. San Francisco's elderly population is expected to grow to 205,000 by 2020 and to 360,800 by 2040; this growth is consistent with national trends. The recent Census also estimated that 20 percent of all San Francisco households have one or more persons over 65 years old. About 44,867 elderly head of households, representing about 12 percent of all households in 2015, lived alone. Senior citizens have different housing needs especially as they develop health problems or experience decreased mobility. The 2015 Census estimated that 25 percent of persons 65 and over have mobility or self-care limitations. Older and disabled adults who require long-term care have a need for a broad range of on-site and off-site services including central dining, transportation services, limited or complete medical care, recreational and other services. For seniors living independently, there is a need for safe and easily maintained dwelling units. The City needs to address the housing needs of an aging and formerly homeless population. This includes the targeted provision of permanent supportive housing (PSH) - defined broadly as subsidized housing matched with ongoing supportive health and social services towards particularly high-need individuals who may be likely to stay in hospitals for extended periods or require expensive nursing home care in the absence of a PSH placement. In addition, twenty percent of the units would be set aside for formerly homeless individuals. The project site is currently occupied by a one-story industrial building constructed in 1948 that covers the entire parcel. The building houses an automotive repair shop and a storage facility. The project vicinity is characterized by a mix of residential, retail, office, and PDR uses. To the north of the project site (i.e., along 26th Street between South Van Ness Avenue and Shotwell Street) sits a commercial building, to the east and across Shotwell Street are residential complexes, to the west of the site is an auto parts shop and adjacent parking lot, accessed at Cesar Chavez Street. The currently vacant, adjacent property at 1515 South Van Ness Avenue is slated to open summer 2017 as a Navigation Center operated by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. The Navigation Center will help shelter San Francisco's long-term homeless residents who do not use traditional shelters and services and offers case managers that help connect these residents with income, public benefits, health services, shelter, and long-term housing |

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

|  |
| --- |
| San Francisco is one of the highest cost housing markets in the nation and a large proportion of residents must pay over 30 percent of their income on rent. Of the 224,589 households in 2015, approximately 93,686 households (42 percent) paid 30 percent or more of their income on rent. Market rents in San Francisco can impose a particularly severe cost burden on renters, particularly seniors. Of the 34,611 renter-occupied households where the head of household was 65 years and over in 2015, 18,660 households (54 percent) paid 30 percent or more of their income on rent. The median income in 2015 was 81,294 dollars. Of the 72,509 households where the head of household was 65 years and over in 2015, more than 50,927 households (70 percent) earned less than the median income. According to a homeless count conducted in 2015, eight percent of respondents were 61 years or older at the time of the study, which is a five percent increase from 2013 (3 percent). Recent studies suggests that the single adult homeless population is aging even after accounting for the aging of the overall U.S. population. Overall, more than two-thirds of respondents (67 percent) reported one or more health conditions. These conditions included chronic physical illness, physical disabilities, chronic substance abuse and severe mental health conditions. The estimated number of homeless veterans in San Francisco decreased between 2013 (716) and 2015 (598). Amidst great concern about the impact of an aging populace on health care systems and social welfare program, evidence of a separate aging trend in the homeless population merits closer investigation. This is especially true in light of a wealth of evidence showing that poor health and homelessness are closely intertwined; that homeless persons, by virtue of their elevated use of health and behavioral health services, place increased demand on health care systems and providers. The proposed project is located in the Mission District of District 9, which is within the Mission Action Plan 2020 (MAP 2020). The Mission District is becoming a neighborhood with fewer low and moderate income households and more high-income residents. Between 2009 and 2014, the percentage of very-low, low-, and moderate-income residents in the Mission District dropped between one and two percent. Meanwhile, the percentage of higher income residents, whose income falls in the highest bracket ($186,782 or more or 200 percent over AMI) increased from 13 to 17 percent. Of the renters in the Mission District, 42 percent of households pay more than 30 percent and 18 percent pay more than 50 percent of household income towards rent. With approximately eight percent of renters living in overcrowded conditions, the Mission District ranks fourth in overcrowding after Chinatown, the Tenderloin, and SoMa. The housing cost burden has led to a significant increase of evictions in the Mission District. Between 2009 and 2014, Ellis Act evictions increased 1,450 percent (from 2 in 2009 to 31 in 2014), no fault evictions increased 288 percent (16 in 2009 to 62 in 2014), and just cause evictions increased 42 percent (from 104 in 2009 to 148 in 2014). The loss of rent-controlled units and shortage of new affordable housing is worsening pressures on the existing housing stock in the Mission. Between 2010 and 2014, the Mission District lost approximately 63 rent-controlled units per year to Ellis Act evictions or other means. During about the same time period between 2009 and 2014, only a total of 276 100 percent affordable and inclusionary units were constructed in the Mission District. The low rate of affordable housing production in the Mission District has augmented the impact of the displacement of many of the neighborhood's longest-tenured and most vulnerable residents. The proposed project would help provide an increase in affordable housing production. |

**Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:**

[1296+Shotwell+St,+San+Francis.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084587)

**Determination:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.13] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of human environment |
|  | Finding of Significant Impact |

**Approval Documents:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer on:** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer on:** |  |

**Funding Information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grant / Project Identification Number** | **HUD Program**  | **Program Name** |
| M17-MC060213 | Community Planning and Development (CPD) | HOME Program |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount:**  | $10,000,000.00 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]:** | $45,000,000.00 |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Compliance Factors**: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6 | Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required? | Compliance determination(See Appendix A for source determinations) |
| **STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6** |
| **Airport Hazards**Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. |
| **Coastal Barrier Resources Act** Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501] | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. |
| **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 structure or insurable property 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. The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements. |
| **STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5** |
| **Air Quality**Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93 | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | The project's air quality management district is in nonattainment status for Ozone and Particulate Matters 2.5 and 10 microns. Criteria Pollutants: CalEEMod (version 2016.3.1) was used to estimate construction-related and operational 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 0.50 and 1.72 tons per year of ozone precursors [reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx), respectively], 1.35 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), and 0.19 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM10) and 0.11 tons per year of fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less (PM2.5). Based on the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin's marginal nonattainment status for ozone precursors, moderate nonattainment status for PM2.5, and maintenance status for CO, these emissions would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG/VOC, NOx, CO, and PM2.5 pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the federal Clean Air Act. Average daily construction-related emissions would be 17.20 pounds per day of ROG, 31.66 pounds per day of NOx, and 1.68 pounds per day of exhaust PM10 and 1.59 pounds per day of exhaust PM2.5. =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 PM2.5, and 82 pounds per day for PM10. Operational emissions would result primarily from vehicle trips related to senior residents at the new residential building. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual emissions from operation would be 0.41 tons per year of ROG, 0.35 tons per year of NOx, 1.53 tons per year of CO, 0.21 tons per year of PM10, and 0.07 tons per year of PM25. These emissions would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG/VOC, NOx, and CO as well as below BAAQMD's maximum annual operational emission thresholds of 10 tons per year of ROG, NOx, and PM2.5, and 15 tons per year of PM10. Average daily operational emissions would be 2.43 pounds per day of ROG, 2.32 pounds per day of NOx, and 0.11 pounds per day of exhaust PM10 and 0.11 pounds per day of exhaust PM2.5. These average daily operational-related emissions would be below the respective BAAQMD significance thresholds of 54 pounds per day for ROG, NOx, and PM2.5, and 82 pounds per day for PM10. 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. Fugitive Dust: 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. There is currently a one-story industrial building on the project site, therefore, project activities could potentially result in a release of asbestos containing materials or lead based paint. However, the project would be required to comply with BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2 (Asbestos Demolition, Renovation and Manufacturing), which controls emissions of asbestos to the atmosphere during demolition activities in accordance with the US Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) asbestos National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) and establishes appropriate waste disposal procedures. |
| **Coastal Zone Management Act**Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d) | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. |
| **Contamination and Toxic Substances**24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)] | 🗹 Yes 🞎 No | Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. The project site is subject to the Maher Ordinance, Article 22 of the San Francisco Health Code. The overarching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. A Limited Subsurface Investigation (LSI) Workplan has been developed to document formal steps for compliance with the Maher Ordinance. The LSI Workplan indicates that a series of groundwater, soil, and soil vapor sampling and testing must be conducted to assess the potential need to prepare a site mitigation plan. As described below in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, if deemed necessary, a site mitigation plan must be implemented in order to comply with the Maher Ordinance. Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires that existing equipment remaining on the project site containing hazardous materials be removed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. |
| **Endangered Species Act**Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402 | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | This project will have No Effect on listed species due to the nature of the activities involved in the project. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.The project site is a previously developed urban property. There are no existing natural habitats or federally protected species within the project site, nor does it provide any endangered species' habitat requirements. |
| **Explosive and Flammable Hazards**Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | The proposed project does not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations. No evidence of underground storage tanks, such as vent pipes, fill ports, or concrete pads not homogeneous with surrounding surfaces, was observed during the Phase I ESA reconnaissance visit. Three double-wall aboveground storage tanks were observed along the northern wall of the unit occupied by existing tenants, but were newly purchased and empty at the time of the visit. None of the regulatory databases or other regulatory agency records searched during the Phase I ESA contained records pertaining to either USTs or ASTs and, other than the three ASTs, persons interviewed at the Site were not aware of the presence of any other tanks. There are no current or known planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. |
| **Farmlands Protection**Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658 | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The project site consists of urban land; therefore the project would not affect farmlands. There are no protected, particularly sections farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco. |
| **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. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. |
| **Historic Preservation**National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800 | 🗹 Yes 🞎 No | Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. Conditions: Other. Upon satisfactory implementation of the conditions, which should be monitored, the project is in compliance with Section 106. |
| **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 | A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was normally unacceptable: 73.5 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation with mitigation. |
| **Sole Source Aquifers**Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149 | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. |
| **Wetlands Protection**Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5 | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | Based on the project description this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. |
| **Wild and Scenic Rivers Act**Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c) | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. |
| **HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS** |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE** |
| **Environmental Justice**Executive Order 12898 | 🞎 Yes 🗹 No | No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898. |

**Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]**

**Impact Codes**: An impact code from the following list has been used 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** | **Mitigation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LAND DEVELOPMENT** |
| Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design | 2 | The site is within the Mission Area of San Francisco and is governed by the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan (Plan) adopted January 2009. The proposed project is consistent with the Plan in that it meets the community-driven goals that were developed specially for the Mission District of providing affordable housing and promoting alternative means of transportation to reduce traffic and auto use. The site is zoned NCT aAAAAAA?AAAAAA? Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit. The NCT District has a mixed pattern of larger and smaller lots and businesses, as well as a sizable number of upper-story residential units and zoning controls designed to permit moderate-scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. Vehicular parking is not required or included as part of the project. The surrounding land uses include NCT to the north and west; Residential, Mixed to the north and east; and Residential to the north and south. The project site was rezoned through the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans to the NCT District. The loss of PDR use at the site was envisioned at the time that the Board of Supervisors adopted the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, and the land use impacts resulting from this rezoning were disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the land uses envisioned for the site under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. Additionally, the project is consistent with the housing/mixed use lot designation for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. The proposed building would have a height of 84 feet (96 feet to top of elevator penthouse). The project site is within a 65-X height and bulk district. The proposed project would require the Planning CommissionaAAAAAA?AAAAAA?s approval of 100 percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program Project under Section 328 of the Planning Code for up to an additional 30 feet above the height district limit to be consistent with the height limit. As a result, the project would conform to locally adopted design legislation. |   |
| Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff | 2 | The project site is developed and served by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) combined sewer system. The project site would be covered by impervious surfaces and would not result in erosion impacts on-site or off-site. The site gently slopes down to the east and south, with grades changing from about 38 feet in the northwest down to about 35 feet in the southeast. The project would not significantly modify the on-site slope and there would be no risk for landslides. The project would comply with San Francisco Public Works Code Article 4.2 - Sewer System Management, which requires stormwater controls to be implemented for development projects that discharge stormwater to either the combined sewer system or a separate stormwater system. Since the project would create 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface, it would be subject to the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the San Francisco Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines. Best Management Practices must be implemented to improve the quality of stormwater before going into the separate stormwater system. For covered projects within SFPUC jurisdiction, the stormwater management approach must manage the 90th percentile, 24-hour storm. As a result, downstream water pollution would be reduced or eliminated by reducing impervious cover, eliminating sources of contaminants, and treating pollutants in stormwater runoff or increasing onsite infiltration. The project site has several potentially continuous layers of liquefiable soil with corrected blow counts of less than 15. The thickest layer is between 11/2 and 51/2 feet thick, which was encountered in multiple borings and CPTs at depths between 22 and 28 feet below the ground surface (bgs). During a major earthquake, lateral spreading could occur at the site. However, adherence to the recommendations in the Geotechnical Report would protect against this risk. The majority of the material encountered above the groundwater table was either clayey or sufficiently dense to resist seismic densification, so the potential for seismic densification at the site is low. The southern portion of project site is underlain by the confluence of two former stream channels associated with a former marsh that was present in the 1850s. The subsurface conditions at the site generally consist of fill, stream channel deposits, and interbedded sands and clays over bedrock. The site is generally blanketed by approximately 10 to 20 feet of fill with thicker fill in the southern portion, likely corresponding to the location of the former stream channels. The fill generally consists of mixtures of clay and sand with variable amounts of gravel, brick, wood, and concrete debris. The fill is generally soft to very stiff clay and the sand is generally loose to medium dense. Groundwater was identified at 4.5 and 7.5 feet bgs and is expected to fluctuate several feet due to seasonal rainfall. Liquefaction and lateral spreading are predicted to occur in the fill and stream channel deposits during a large earthquake. Implementation of ground improvements would reduce the potential liquefaction and resulting settlement and mitigate the lateral spreading hazard at the site. The proposed project would either auger cast piles and use compacted aggregate piers, or use cemented soils and piers. Development would be subject to the permitting requirement of the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations. DBI would review the final building plans and require that they conform to the recommendations in a Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project, which would include design and structural requirements to address geologic hazards and soil suitability per San Francisco current building codes. Therefore, potential damage to structures from soil suitability would be addressed through the permitting requirement and would not represent an adverse effect. |   |
| Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise | 3 | Hazardous Materials As described above in "Contamination and Toxic Substances," there is no indication of a release of petroleum products or hazardous substances or wastes at the project site that would suggest a recognized environmental condition is present. Cases for two off-site leaking underground storage tanks are closed and residual petroleum contaminants remaining in the soil and groundwater are not likely to impact the project site. Compliance with the Maher Ordinance is also discussed above. Noise Construction noise as discussed above "Noise Abatement and Control" would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code). Source Document(s): 3, 7, 8 |   |
| Energy Consumption/Energy Efficiency | 2 | The project would meet, or exceed, current state and local codes and standards 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. |   |
| **SOCIOECONOMIC** |
| Employment and Income Patterns | 2 | The project site currently provides jobs to less than a dozen people, which includes the owners of the businesses. Construction on the project site would provide approximately 158 full-time construction jobs, but is not expected to affect employment in the long term. Operation of the proposed project would result in approximately six on-site staff on the project site. Overall, considering the relocation plan for affected onsite businesses discussed below, the project would not adversely affect employment and income patterns within the project area. Source Document(s): 10, 16 |   |
| Demographic Character Changes / Displacement | 1 | Demographics: The project would not result in physical barriers or reduced access that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group. The Mission area currently is home to over 60,000 residents and provides jobs to 5,000 people. 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 project area for a temporary construction assignment. Thus, construction is not anticipated to generate a substantial, unplanned population increase. The project would develop up to 93 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. The Mission area currently has low income and elderly residents. The project site is located in Census Tract 229.01. In 2012, 101 (7 percent) head of households were 65 years and over. The area median income for head of households 65 years and over was $50,625. Of those 101 households, 55 (55 percent) head of households made less than the median income ($61,875) in 2012. Therefore, the demographic characteristics of the new residents at the project site would not be dramatically different from current residents of the area and, as such, the project would not result in a change to the demographic character of the area. Displacement: The project would displace as many as three tenants: the Smog Shop (Auto Smog), Market (Chu Chu Goods), and a single resident. There are currently no dwelling units at the project site. The one residential occupant is currently inhabiting a portion of Chu Chu Goods, which is not zoned or permitted for residential use. The project is subject to both Federal and California Relocation Assistance Law. The utilization of Federal funds triggers requirements such as 49 CFR Part 24 - Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended "Part 24" - (URA); HUD Handbook 1378 - HUD's agency specific implementing guidelines of the URA; and Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act. The City's participation in the project also requires that the project comply with California Government Code Title 1, Chapter 16, Section 7260-7277 - State of California Relocation Assistance Law (the (CRAL)) and California Code of Regulations Title 25, Division 1, Chapter 6 - State of California Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines. Auto Smog and Chu Chu Good have indicated to the project sponsor the intent to move to a new location and re-establish their businesses. The resident intends to move to a replacement site that would be a services-in-exchange for rent agreement. Adequate funds would be made available to relocate Auto Smog, Chu Chu Good, and the single resident in accordance with the regulations described above. The City, as the Displacing Agency, would delegate the responsibility to pay relocation assistance to the project sponsor. The project sponsor would pay eligible relocation expenses from its project costs. The estimated relocation cost for the project would range from $75,000 to $275,000. Overall, since the project would provide new housing in the area with limited affordable housing options, it would have a beneficial effect related to displacement. |   |
| **COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES** |
| Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity) | 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 San Francisco Organizing Project/Peninsula Interfaith Action, Chez Poulet, and Central American Resource Center that are within walking distance and other cultural facilities that are available by public transit. Therefore, implementation of the project would not require additional or alternative facilities. Since the project will serve seniors, there will be no increase in student population caused by the proposed development. |   |
| Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity) | 2 | The Mission District is a highly urbanized area of the city with a diverse mix of amenities. 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. |   |
| Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity) | 2 | The proposed project will house seniors age 62 and up and formerly homeless seniors and is not anticipated to increase the population of the area as the potential residents are currently present in the city. By housing seniors, the project would improve their health by providing affordable shelter. This would reduce the demand for health care services. There are approximately five public health facilities in the Mission Neighborhood, not including San Francisco General Hospital which is less than a mile northeast. All five health clinics are either within walking distance or a short bus ride. Social services are located both within a convenient and reasonable distance to residents of the proposed project. Furthermore, there is adequate public transportation available from the proposed project to these services. |   |
| Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity) | 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 Recycle Central/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, and 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. The City began disposing its municipal solid waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in January 2016, which 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 proposed 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 proposed 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. |   |
| Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity) | 2 | The project site is within an urban area that is 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 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 collects sewage and stormwater in the same pipe network. The project site is located in the Channel urban watershed. Combined wastewater and stormwater from the project area is transported for treatment to the Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP). Treated wastewater is discharged to San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean. The SEP is responsible for treating nearly 80 percent of the City's flow. The SEP treats on average 60 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater and handles 160 wet tons of biosolids each day. During a rainstorm, it has the capacity to treat up to 250MGD of 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 2013 NPDES Permit No. CA0037664 (Order No. R2-2013-0029) 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 proposed 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. |   |
| Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity) | 2 | The project site is within an urban area that is 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 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 collects sewage and stormwater in the same pipe network. The project site is located in the Channel urban watershed. Combined wastewater and stormwater from the project area is transported for treatment to the Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP). Treated wastewater is discharged to San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean. The SEP is responsible for treating nearly 80 percent of the City's flow. The SEP treats on average 60 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater and handles 160 wet tons of biosolids each day. During a rainstorm, it has the capacity to treat up to 250MGD of 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 2013 NPDES Permit No. CA0037664 (Order No. R2-2013-0029) 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 proposed 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. |   |
| Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical | 2 | The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), headquartered at 1245 3rd Street, provides police protection in the City and County of San Francisco. The project site would be served by the Mission Police Station located at 630 Valencia Street, approximately 1.3 miles northwest of 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 three fire stations near the project site: Fire Station No 7 at 2300 Folsom Street at 19th Street, Fire Station No. 9 at 2245 Jerrold Avenue at Upton Street, and Fire Station No. 11 at 3880 26th Street at Church 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 proposed project could increase the demand for fire protection, emergency medical and police protection services. However, according to the Mission Police Station, the proposed project would not create an adverse impact on police services. Additionally, 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. 11 would help minimize Fire Department and Police Department response times should incidents occur at the project site. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population from Area Plans implementation would not result in a significant impact to public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on public services beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. |   |
| Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity) | 2 | Within a quarter mile of the project site is Precita Park, Garfield Square, and Coso and Precita Mini Park. Precita Park is within 0.14 mile, Garfield Square is within 0.15 mile, and Coso and Precita Mini Park is within 0.22 mile. Precita Park provides a butterfly garden and colorful, gated playground, benches, and grassy field. Garfield Square provides an artificial turf soccer field, playground, clubhouse, pool, basketball court, and picnic and BBQ areas. Coso and Precita Mini Park provides a grassy area. The senior residents are not expected to be regular users of most amenities to overload the existing facilities. The senior residents would have access to the clubhouse at Garfield Square. Residents of the project would utilize existing parks, open space and public recreational facilities. |   |
| Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity) | 2 | The project site is located in an area where existing Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average, the project's residential use would not result in substantial additional VMT, and the proposed project would not result in an adverse impact related to VMT. Furthermore, the project site meets the Proximity to Transit Stations screening criteria, which also indicates that the proposed project's residential, office and retail uses would not cause substantial additional VMT. According to the CEQA analysis completed for the proposed project, the proposed project would generate an estimated 715 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 124 person trips. Transit: The project area is well served by public transit, with several local transit lines including Muni lines 12, 14, 14R, 27, 36, 49, and 67. In addition, the 24th Street-Mission BART station, a major regional transit station, is five blocks northwest of the project site. Development of the site may increase transit demand due to new residents on the project site or increased visitation to the project site, but this additional demand would not reasonably be expected to noticeably affect transit service or result in substantial adverse effects on transit such that service would be adversely affected. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on transit service. Loading: Off-street loading space requirements are based on the proposed onsite use, based on the City Planning code. Loading activity associated with the proposed project would be related to tenant move-ins and move-outs, garbage pickup, and/or deliveries. The proposed project would install a 55-foot-long dropoff/loading zone on Shotwell Street. The sidewalk in the area of the dropoff/loading zone would be 10.5 feet wide. There would be a handicap-accessible blue zone in front of the proposed building entrance and a white loading zone. Parking: No off-street vehicular parking is proposed or required. Two on-street parking spaces would be provided. The proposed project would include 18 Class I bicycle spaces at the ground-floor level and four Class II bicycle spaces on Shotwell Street. Pedestrians: Sidewalks adjacent to the project site are approximately 15 feet wide on Shotwell Street and 10 feet wide on Cesar Chavez Street. Crosswalks are provided at the adjacent intersections off Shotwell Street and Cesar Chavez Street. Overall, the sidewalks and crosswalks in the area operate satisfactorily, with pedestrians moving at normal walking speeds and with freedom to pass other pedestrians. The proposed project would not create unsafe conditions for pedestrians or cause crowding on nearby sidewalks. Implementation of the proposed project would improve pedestrian circulation at the project site by removing the existing concrete "ramp" on Shotwell Street and by providing no off-street vehicle parking spaces. The project-generated 117 pedestrian trips during the weekday p.m. peak hour would be dispersed throughout the project vicinity and would not substantially affect pedestrian conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on pedestrian facilities. Bicycles: The proposed project would include 18 Class I bicycle spaces at the ground-floor level and four Class II bicycle spaces on Shotwell Street. As previously discussed, the proposed project would remove the existing "concrete ramp" on Shotwell Street and would not provide off-street vehicle parking spaces. Implementation of the proposed project would not create unsafe conditions for cyclists. The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on bicycle facilities. |   |
| **NATURAL FEATURES** |
| Unique Natural Features /Water Resources | 2 | Future onsite development would not affect water resources, nor would it use groundwater resources. As noted above, water service at the project site would be provided by the SFPUC. Further, future development on the project site would not discharge effluent into surface water or groundwater. No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site. The Pacific Ocean is approximately five miles from the project site. Wastewater at the project site would be collected and treated by the combined sewage and stormwater system. Stormwater: No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site. The Pacific Ocean is approximately five miles from the project site and could be indirectly affected by stormwater runoff from the proposed project that enters the combined sewer system. As discussed above, future development on the project site would be required to comply with all applicable federal and local water quality and wastewater discharge requirements. Therefore, stormwater effects on surface water resulting from the proposed project would not be significant. The project site is flat and developed with structures. No unique features are on the site, and no active agricultural lands are on or near the site. |   |
| Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.) | 2 | The project site is currently developed with a one-story industrial building, and is surrounded by urban development. There is no landscaping or vegetation within the parcel to be developed. There are no trees used for landscaping in urban areas on the project area's boundaries. Future development of the project site would not require removal of any trees. Approximately 9 new trees (including Western Redbud, Golden Rain Tree, and Princess Flower) would be planted on the ground floor, eighth floor, and ninth floor. In addition, shrubs and perennials would be planted throughout the building and project site. The project site is located within Mission Plan area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and there are no riparian corridors, estuaries, marshes, or wetlands in the plan area that could be affected by the development. Additionally, development envisioned under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would not substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species. Therefore, the project site does not support habitat for any candidate, sensitive or special status species. |   |
| Other Factors | 2 | None |   |

**Supporting documentation**

[Solid Waste Facility Listing\_Details Page.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098839)

[PH\_Fac\_and\_Transit\_Scores.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098837)

[5 hospitals\_The San Francisco Indicator Project.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098836)

[1296 Shotwell 8097-FirstSourceHiringProgram\_AdminCode\_executed 16-1107.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098833)

[Cultural Fac - Google Maps.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098832)

[ACS\_12\_5YR\_B19049.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098831)

[ACS\_12\_5YR\_B19037.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098829)

[ACS\_12\_5YR\_B19013.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098828)

[Retail\_The San Francisco Indicator Project.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098826)

[1296 Shotwell\_Geotechnical Report\_2016-10-24.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098630)

[Eastern Neighborhoods Map \_ Planning Department.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098610)

[Eastern Neighborhoods \_ Planning Department.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098607)

[2321-Mission\_Area\_Plan\_DEC\_08\_FINAL\_ADOPTED.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098606)

[2017-0127\_SHOTWELL ST\_100%DD\_ARCHITECTURAL.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098601)

[2015-018056ENV-1296%20Shotwell%20Infill.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098598)

[1230-Eastern\_Neighborhoods\_Planning\_Areas\_Map.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098597)

**Additional Studies Performed:**

|  |
| --- |
| 1) California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), March 2016. Available: http://caleemod.com/. Accessed June 20, 2017. 2) Essel Environmental Consulting. 2016. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment: Property at 1296/1298 Shotwell Street, San Francisco, California, 94110, Project No. 16120. October 5. 3) Essel Environmental Consulting. 2016. Limited Subsurface Investigation Work Plan 1296/1298 Shotwell Street, San Francisco, California, 94110, Project No. 16120. October 17. 4) United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Results of electronic mapping search. Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species. Available: https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77. Accessed: June 7, 2017. 5) United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017. List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project, Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2017-SLI-2029. May 10. 6) RGD Acoustics. 2016. Environmental Noise Study for: 1296 Shotwell Street Senior Affordable Housing. November 15. 7) U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. DNL Calculator-HUD Exchange. Results of electronic database search. Available: https://www.hudexchange.info/environmentalreview/dnlcalculator/. Accessed: June 21, 2017. 8) 10. San Francisco Planning Department. 2015. Certificate of Determination Infill Project Environmental Review 1296 Shotwell Street. 9) 13. San Francisco Planning Department. 2017. Property Information Map. Results of electronic database search. Available: http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/. Accessed: April 4, 2017. 10) 14. Herman Coliver Locus Architecture. 2017. 1296 Shotwell St. Senior Affordable Housing. January 9. 11) 15. Langan Treadwell Rollo. 2016. Geotechnical Investigation: 1296 Shotwell Street, San Francisco, California. October 24. 12) 20. Overland Pacific & Cutler, Inc. 2017. 1296 Shotwell Project San Francisco CA Relocation Plan. June. 13) 37. Miller Company Landscape Architects. 2016. Landscape Materials Schedule. February 24. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Field Inspection [Optional]:** Date and completed by: |  |
| Eugene Flannery | 6/20/2017 12:00:00 AM |

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

|  |
| --- |
| See Attached.[References.docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010099628) |

**List of Permits Obtained:**

|  |
| --- |
| \* Planning Commission: 100 percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program Project under Section 328 of the Planning Code for up to an additional 30 feet above the height district limit \* San Francisco Planning Department: Large Project Authorization for development of a building greater than 25,000 gross square feet \* Department of Building Inspection: site permit for demolition and new construction. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Since February 2016, the Community Outreach team for 1296 Shotwell Street Affordable Housing for Seniors has conducted various activities to present the details of the project, from garnering feedback regarding the design and services at the site to responding to neighbors' concerns and gaining support for the construction of the project. Community outreach activities in 2016 included: A. Two general community meetings (total engaged = 81 attendees) \* February 13th \* April 30th Pre-Application Community Meeting B. 22 Focus groups with community-based organizations and key stakeholders, and community events in the Mission District (total engaged = 256 attendees) \* June 15th La Colectiva Women's Collective Workers \* June 21st Mission Neighborhood Centers Senior Program \* June 28th Calle 24 Latino Cultural District Council - organizational letter of support included \* July 6th John O'Connell High School MoveUp Resource Fair \* July 7th Jamestown Community Center- staff meeting \* July 15th Mission Neighborhood Resource Center \* July 29th Mission Neighborhood Centers - Health Fair \* July 31st Saint Anthony Church - Sunday mass \* August 4th Abel Gonzales Senior Housing - Resident's meeting \* August 11th ACCE Bernal members meeting \* August 23rd Bernal Neighbors at BHNC \* August 29th Bernal Neighbors at Precita Eyes Art Studio \* September 8th Centro Latino - Senior Program \* September 12th Mission Neighborhood Health Center - Clinic Leaders meeting \* September 14th Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association - Member's meeting \* September 23rd Dolores Street Community Services - SRO Family meeting \* October 1st Mission Movie Night at the Neighborhood Park \* October 5th Inner Mission Residents (Shotwell Street neighbors) \* October 12th Mujeres Unidas y Activas \* October 14th 30th Street Senior Center \* October 20th Parents for Public School \* PhotoVoice Exhibition at !Si se Puede! Event against domestic violence C. The team also made personal visits in the vicinity of the project's site to inform business owners and residents about the proposed development, and to ask for their support. We have received letters of support 24 from business owners, and from 325 residents. In addition, we have received 169 online petition signatures to date in support of the project. D. To address neighbors' concerns, the development team launched a Frequently Asked Questions page. |

**Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:**

|  |
| --- |
| The proposed project is located within the boundary of the Mission Area Plan, which is one of four areas of the Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan. The City and County of San Francisco Planning Department prepared an Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), which was certified in 2008. As the CEQA review was for an area plan which contemplated the inclusion of the proposed project and covers an appropriate time frame of 20 years and a relevant geographic scope, it is being used as the basis of this cumulative impact analysis. The time frame for the review contemplated a twenty year implementation period, which would end in 2026 and the area for the review is shown on the attached map. The EIR analyzed potential environmental effects associated with a range of rezoning options proposed by the San Francisco Planning Department for East SoMa, the Mission, Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods. The EIR identified potential impacts that could not be eliminated or reduced to an insignificant level as those limited to effects on land use, historical resources, transportation and shadow. Land Use Impacts: The project site was rezoned through the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans to the Neighborhood Commercial-Transit (NC-T) District, a primarily residential district that would not permit most PDR uses. Development of the proposed project would result in the net loss of approximately 11,664 square feet of PDR building space and this would contribute considerably to the significant cumulative land use impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. However, the loss of PDR use at the site was envisioned at the time that the Board of Supervisors adopted the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, and the land use impacts resulting from this rezoning were disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The proposed project is consistent with the land uses envisioned for the site under the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR found no feasible project-level mitigation measures to address significant impacts associated with the loss of PDR. |

**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 Mission 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:**

|  |
| --- |
| The project would require implementation of mitigation measures related to construction noise and hazardous building materials. No impacts are potentially significant to the extent that an EIS would be required. The project would increase the inventory of affordable housing and reduce the incidence of homelessness among low-income seniors as well as decreasing their exposure to crime, illness, and social isolation. |

**Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:**

Summarized below areall 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 or Condition** | **Comments on Completed Measures** | **Complete** |
| Historic Preservation | See attached mitigation measure | N/A |   |
| Noise Abatement and Control | 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. Mitigation Measure NOISE-1. The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:tErect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses;tUtilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;tEvaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses;tMonitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements;tPost signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed. | N/A |   |
| Permits, reviews and approvals | \* Planning Commission: 100 percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program Project under Section 328 of the Planning Code for up to an additional 30 feet above the height district limit \* San Francisco Planning Department: Large Project Authorization for development of a building greater than 25,000 gross square feet \* Department of Building Inspection: site permit for demolition and new construction. | N/A |   |
| Contamination and Toxic Substances | Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. The project site is subject to the Maher Ordinance, Article 22 of the San Francisco Health Code. The overarching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. A Limited Subsurface Investigation (LSI) Workplan has been developed to document formal steps for compliance with the Maher Ordinance. The LSI Workplan indicates that a series of groundwater, soil, and soil vapor sampling and testing must be conducted to assess the potential need to prepare a site mitigation plan. As described below in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, if deemed necessary, a site mitigation plan must be implemented in order to comply with the Maher Ordinance. Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires that existing equipment remaining on the project site containing hazardous materials be removed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. | N/A |   |

**Mitigation Plan**

|  |
| --- |
| Project sponsor is responsible for carrying out mitigation measures. Noise abatement will be implemented during construction; Contamination and Toxic Substances will be carried out before demolition and prior to construction; Archaeological will be implemented prior to start of construction and during excavation. |

[Shotwell Archeological Mitigation Measure(1).docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010109002)

[Mitigation Monitoring Plan (1).docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010109001)

**Supporting documentation on completed measures**

**APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities**

 **Airport Hazards**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General policy | Legislation | Regulation |
| It is HUD’s policy to apply standards to prevent incompatible development around civil airports and military airfields.  |  | 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D |

**1. To ensure compatible land use development, you must determine your site’s proximity to civil and military airports. Is your project within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | **No** |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload the map showing that the site is not within the applicable distances to a military or civilian airport below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. |

**Supporting documentation**

[Distance to SFO.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084597)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Coastal Barrier Resources**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| HUD financial assistance may not be used for most activities in units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS). See 16 USC 3504 for limitations on federal expenditures affecting the CBRS.  | Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) of 1982, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 USC 3501)  |  |

**This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRA units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. |

**Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Flood Insurance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| Certain types of federal financial assistance may not be used in floodplains unless the community participates in National Flood Insurance Program and flood insurance is both obtained and maintained. | Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 as amended (42 USC 4001-4128) | 24 CFR 50.4(b)(1) and 24 CFR 58.6(a) and (b); 24 CFR 55.1(b). |

**1. Does this project involve financial assistance for construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of a mobile home, building, or insurable personal property?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No. This project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Yes |

**2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:**

|  |
| --- |
| [PFIRM for SF(1).jpg](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010095005)[Distance to SFO(1).pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084602) |

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The [FEMA Map Service Center](http://www.msc.fema.gov) provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use the best available information to determine floodplain information.  Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site. Provide FEMA/FIRM floodplain zone designation, panel number, and date within your documentation.

**Is the structure, part of the structure, or insurable property located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No |

 Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| The structure or insurable property 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. The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements. |

**Supporting documentation**

[PFIRM for SF.jpg](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010094946)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Air Quality**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| The Clean Air Act is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which sets national standards on ambient pollutants. In addition, the Clean Air Act is administered by States, which must develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to regulate their state air quality. Projects funded by HUD must demonstrate that they conform to the appropriate SIP.  | Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.) as amended particularly Section 176(c) and (d) (42 USC 7506(c) and (d)) | 40 CFR Parts 6, 51 and 93 |

**1. Does your project include new construction or conversion of land use facilitating the development of public, commercial, or industrial facilities OR five or more dwelling units?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Yes |
|  | No |

**Air Quality Attainment Status of Project’s County or Air Quality Management District**

**2. Is your project’s air quality management district or county in non-attainment or maintenance status for any criteria pollutants?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No, project’s county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Yes, project’s management district or county is in non-attainment or maintenance status for the following criteria pollutants (check all that apply):  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Carbon Monoxide  |
|  | Lead |
|  | Nitrogen dioxide |
|  | Sulfur dioxide |
| ✓ | Ozone |
| ✓ | Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns |
|  | Particulate Matter, <10 microns |

**3. What are the *de minimis* emissions levels (40 CFR 93.153) or screening levels for the non-attainment or maintenance level pollutants indicated above**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Ozone |   | ppb (parts per million) |
| Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns |   | µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide your source used to determine levels here:**  |
| Based on the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin's (SFBAAB) marginal nonattainment status for ozone precursors, moderate nonattainment status for PM2.5, and maintenance status for CO, these emissions would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG/VOC, NOx, CO, and PM2.5 pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the federal Clean Air Act. |

4. **Determine the estimated emissions levels of your project. Will your project exceed any of the de minimis or threshold emissions levels of non-attainment and maintenance level pollutants or exceed the screening levels established by the state or air quality management district?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No, the project will not exceed *de minimis* or threshold emissions levels or screening levels.  |

**Enter the estimate emission levels:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Ozone |   | ppb (parts per million) |
| Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns |   | µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air) |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes, the project exceeds *de minimis* emissions levels or screening levels. |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| The project's air quality management district is in nonattainment status for Ozone and Particulate Matters 2.5 and 10 microns. Criteria Pollutants: CalEEMod (version 2016.3.1) was used to estimate construction-related and operational 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 0.50 and 1.72 tons per year of ozone precursors [reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx), respectively], 1.35 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), and 0.19 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM10) and 0.11 tons per year of fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less (PM2.5). Based on the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin's marginal nonattainment status for ozone precursors, moderate nonattainment status for PM2.5, and maintenance status for CO, these emissions would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG/VOC, NOx, CO, and PM2.5 pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the federal Clean Air Act. Average daily construction-related emissions would be 17.20 pounds per day of ROG, 31.66 pounds per day of NOx, and 1.68 pounds per day of exhaust PM10 and 1.59 pounds per day of exhaust PM2.5. =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 PM2.5, and 82 pounds per day for PM10. Operational emissions would result primarily from vehicle trips related to senior residents at the new residential building. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual emissions from operation would be 0.41 tons per year of ROG, 0.35 tons per year of NOx, 1.53 tons per year of CO, 0.21 tons per year of PM10, and 0.07 tons per year of PM25. These emissions would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG/VOC, NOx, and CO as well as below BAAQMD's maximum annual operational emission thresholds of 10 tons per year of ROG, NOx, and PM2.5, and 15 tons per year of PM10. Average daily operational emissions would be 2.43 pounds per day of ROG, 2.32 pounds per day of NOx, and 0.11 pounds per day of exhaust PM10 and 0.11 pounds per day of exhaust PM2.5. These average daily operational-related emissions would be below the respective BAAQMD significance thresholds of 54 pounds per day for ROG, NOx, and PM2.5, and 82 pounds per day for PM10. 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. Fugitive Dust: 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. There is currently a one-story industrial building on the project site, therefore, project activities could potentially result in a release of asbestos containing materials or lead based paint. However, the project would be required to comply with BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2 (Asbestos Demolition, Renovation and Manufacturing), which controls emissions of asbestos to the atmosphere during demolition activities in accordance with the US Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) asbestos National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) and establishes appropriate waste disposal procedures. |

**Supporting documentation**

[1296 Shotwell EA\_02\_Air\_Quality.docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098264)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Coastal Zone Management Act**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| Federal assistance to applicant agencies for activities affecting any coastal use or resource is granted only when such activities are consistent with federally approved State Coastal Zone Management Act Plans.  | Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC 1451-1464), particularly section 307(c) and (d) (16 USC 1456(c) and (d)) | 15 CFR Part 930 |

**1. Is the project located in, or does it affect, a Coastal Zone as defined in your state Coastal Management Plan?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. |

**Supporting documentation**

[San Francisco Property Information Map - Print Version.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084799)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Contamination and Toxic Substances**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulations |
| It is HUD policy that all properties that are being proposed for use in HUD programs be free of hazardous materials, contamination, toxic chemicals and gases, and radioactive substances, where a hazard could affect the health and safety of the occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property. |  | 24 CFR 58.5(i)(2)24 CFR 50.3(i) |

**1. How was site contamination evaluated? Select all that apply. Document and upload documentation and reports and evaluation explanation of site contamination below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) |
|  | ASTM Phase II ESA |
|  | Remediation or clean-up plan |
|  | ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening |
|  | None of the Above |

**2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property? (Were any recognized environmental conditions or RECs identified in a Phase I ESA and confirmed in a Phase II ESA?)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No |

**Explain:**

|  |
| --- |
| None of the databases searched as part of the Phase I ESA indicate a release of petroleum products or hazardous substances or wastes at the project site that would suggest a recognized environmental condition is present. Cases for two off-site leaking underground storage tanks are closed and residual petroleum contaminants remaining in the soil and groundwater are not likely to impact the project site. The project site is subject to the Maher Ordinance, Article 22 of the San Francisco Health Code. The overarching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. A Limited Subsurface Investigation (LSI) Workplan has been developed to document formal steps for compliance with the Maher Ordinance. The LSI Workplan indicates that a series of groundwater, soil, and soil vapor sampling and testing must be conducted to assess the potential need to prepare a site mitigation plan. As described below in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, if deemed necessary, a site mitigation plan must be implemented in order to comply with the Maher Ordinance. Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires that existing equipment remaining on the project site containing hazardous materials be removed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. The project site is subject to the Maher Ordinance, Article 22 of the San Francisco Health Code. The overarching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. A Limited Subsurface Investigation (LSI) Workplan has been developed to document formal steps for compliance with the Maher Ordinance. The LSI Workplan indicates that a series of groundwater, soil, and soil vapor sampling and testing must be conducted to assess the potential need to prepare a site mitigation plan. As described below in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, if deemed necessary, a site mitigation plan must be implemented in order to comply with the Maher Ordinance. Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires that existing equipment remaining on the project site containing hazardous materials be removed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. |

**Supporting documentation**

[Limited Subsurface Investigation.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098217)

[16120 PH I ESA 1296-1298 Shotwell Street, San Francisco 100516.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010088741)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Yes |
|  | No |

**Endangered Species**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | ESA Legislation | Regulations |
| Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates that federal agencies ensure that actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out shall not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed plants and animals or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat. Where their actions may affect resources protected by the ESA, agencies must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (“FWS” and “NMFS” or “the Services”).  | The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq*.); particularly section 7 (16 USC 1536). | 50 CFR Part 402 |

**1. Does the project involve any activities that have the potential to affect specifies or habitats?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No, the project will have No Effect due to the nature of the activities involved in the project.  |

This selection is only appropriate if none of the activities involved in the project have potential to affect species or habitats. Examples of actions without potential to affect listed species may include: purchasing existing buildings, completing interior renovations to existing buildings, and replacing exterior paint or siding on existing buildings.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No, the project will have No Effect based on a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes, the activities involved in the project have the potential to affect species and/or habitats. |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| This project will have No Effect on listed species due to the nature of the activities involved in the project. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.The project site is a previously developed urban property. There are no existing natural habitats or federally protected species within the project site, nor does it provide any endangered species' habitat requirements. |

**Supporting documentation**

[Endangered Species List.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084822)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Explosive and Flammable Hazards**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| HUD-assisted projects must meet Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) requirements to protect them from explosive and flammable hazards. | N/A | 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C |

**1. Is the proposed HUD-assisted project a hazardous facility (a facility that mainly stores, handles or processes flammable or combustible chemicals), i.e. bulk fuel storage facilities, refineries, etc.?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No |
|  | Yes |

**2. Does this project include any of the following activities: development, construction, rehabilitation that will increase residential densities, or conversion?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Yes |

**3. Within 1 mile of the project site, are there any current *or planned* stationary aboveground storage containers:**

* **Of more than 100 gallon capacity, containing common liquid industrial fuels OR**
* **Of any capacity, containing hazardous liquids or gases that are not common liquid industrial fuels?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| The proposed project does not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations. No evidence of underground storage tanks, such as vent pipes, fill ports, or concrete pads not homogeneous with surrounding surfaces, was observed during the Phase I ESA reconnaissance visit. Three double-wall aboveground storage tanks were observed along the northern wall of the unit occupied by existing tenants, but were newly purchased and empty at the time of the visit. None of the regulatory databases or other regulatory agency records searched during the Phase I ESA contained records pertaining to either USTs or ASTs and, other than the three ASTs, persons interviewed at the Site were not aware of the presence of any other tanks. There are no current or known planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. |

**Supporting documentation**

[1296 Shotwell EA\_05\_Explosives\_Flammable.docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098272)

[APS Facilities.xls](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084831)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Farmlands Protection**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) discourages federal activities that would convert farmland to nonagricultural purposes. | Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.) | [7 CFR Part 658](http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_11/7cfr658_11.html) |

**1. Does your project include any activities, including new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, that could convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

If your project includes new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, explain how you determined that agricultural land would not be converted:

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The project site consists of urban land; therefore the project would not affect farmlands. There are no protected, particularly sections farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco. |

**Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Floodplain Management**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General Requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, requires federal activities to avoid impacts to floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development to the extent practicable. | Executive Order 11988 | 24 CFR 55 |

**1. Do any of the following exemptions apply? Select the applicable citation? [only one selection possible]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | 55.12(c)(3) |
|  | 55.12(c)(4)  |
|  | 55.12(c)(5)  |
|  | 55.12(c)(6)  |
|  | 55.12(c)(7)  |
|  | 55.12(c)(8)  |
|  | 55.12(c)(9)  |
|  | 55.12(c)(10)  |
|  | 55.12(c)(11)  |
| ✓ | None of the above  |

**2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:**

[PFIRM for SF(1).jpg](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010095005)

[Distance to SFO(1).pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084602)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The FEMA Map Service Center provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use **the best available information** to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site.

**Does your project occur in a floodplain?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| 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. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. |

**Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Historic Preservation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| Regulations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) require a consultative process to identify historic properties, assess project impacts on them, and avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects  | Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f) | 36 CFR 800 “Protection of Historic Properties” <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_10/36cfr800_10.html> |

***Threshold***

**Is Section 106 review required for your project?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA ). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.) |
|  | No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)]. |
| ✓ | Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect). |

***Step 1 – Initiate Consultation***

**Select all consulting parties below (check all that apply):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) | Not Required |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ✓ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation | Not Required |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Other Consulting Parties |

**Describe the process of selecting consulting parties and initiating consultation here:**

|  |
| --- |
| In accordance with the Programmatic Agreement among MOHCD, the CA SHPO and the ACHP, MOHCD requested a records search from the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University (IC). The IC informed MOHCD that there is a low potential for Native American archaeological resources and a moderate potential for historic-period archaeological resources to be located within the project area and a 1/4-mile radius of the project area. The IC advised MOHCD that their usual recommendation of conducting archival research and a field examination was not feasible because the proposed project area has been highly developed and is presently covered with asphalt, buildings, or fill that obscures the visibility of original surface soils, which negates the feasibility of an adequate surface inspection. The IC recommended that prior to ground disturbance, archival research be conducted to determine the appropriate locations for archaeological monitoring during removal of asphalt or concrete, fill, vegetation, or structures. Following the exposure of the original soils, it is recommended that a field inspection be conducted and a report containing |

Document and upload all correspondence, notices and notes (including comments and objections received below).

***Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties***

1. **Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE), either by entering the address(es) or uploading a map depicting the APE below:**

|  |
| --- |
| The Area of Potential Effects (APE) is the area bounded by 26th Street on the north, Shotwell Street on the east, Cesar Chavez Street on the south and South Van Ness Avenue on the west. |

**In the chart below, list historic properties identified and evaluated in the APE. Every historic property that may be affected by the project should be included in the chart.**

Upload the documentation (survey forms, Register nominations, concurrence(s) and/or objection(s), notes, and photos) that justify your National Register Status determination below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Address / Location / District** | **National Register Status** | **SHPO Concurrence** | **Sensitive Information** |
| 1294 Shotwell Street | Not Eligible | Yes | ✓ Not Sensitive |
| 1515 South Van Ness Avenue | Not Eligible | Yes | ✓ Not Sensitive |

**Additional Notes:**

|  |
| --- |
| Per Stipulation IV of the PA, for properties determined to by ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, SHPO concurrence is presumed. |

1. **Was a survey of historic buildings and/or archeological sites done as part of the project?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

***Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties***

Only properties that are listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places receive further consideration under Section 106. Assess the effect(s) of the project by applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect. (36 CFR 800.5)] Consider direct and indirect effects as applicable as per guidance on direct and indirect effects.

**Choose one of the findings below - No Historic Properties Affected, No Adverse Effect, or Adverse Effect; and seek concurrence from consulting parties.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No Historic Properties Affected |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No Adverse Effect |

 Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

 **Document reason for finding:**

|  |
| --- |
| In the event that buried historic resources are encountered a mitigation measure has been developed that will reduce the potential effect. |

 **Does the No Adverse Effect finding contain conditions?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Yes (check all that apply) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Avoidance |
|  | Modification of project |
| ✓ | Other |

 Describe conditions here:

|  |
| --- |
| See attached mitigation measure |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Adverse Effect |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. Conditions: Other. Upon satisfactory implementation of the conditions, which should be monitored, the project is in compliance with Section 106. |

**Supporting documentation**

[SanFrancisco+1913-Dec.1950vol.6,1914-Dec.1950,+Sheet+627.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105468)

[San+Francisco+1913-1915+vol.+6,+1914,+Sheet+627.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105467)

[San+Francisco+1899-1900+vol.+5,+1900,+Sheet+578.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105466)

[San+Francisco+1886-1893+vol.+5,1886,+Sheet+141\_b.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105465)

[2015-018056ENV-1296%20Shotwell%20Infill(1).pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105416)

[PA05(final).pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105410)

[Shotwell Archeological Mitigation Measure.docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105408)

[NWIC Letter.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105407)

[Form A Shotwell 1515.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105406)

[Form A Shotwell 1294.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010105405)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Yes |
|  | No |

**Noise Abatement and Control**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| HUD’s noise regulations protect residential properties from excessive noise exposure. HUD encourages mitigation as appropriate. | Noise Control Act of 1972General Services Administration Federal Management Circular 75-2: “Compatible Land Uses at Federal Airfields” | Title 24 CFR 51 Subpart B |

**1. What activities does your project involve? Check all that apply:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | New construction for residential use |

NOTE: HUD assistance to new construction projects is generally prohibited if they are located in an Unacceptable zone, and HUD discourages assistance for new construction projects in Normally Unacceptable zones. See 24 CFR 51.101(a)(3) for further details.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Rehabilitation of an existing residential property |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | A research demonstration project which does not result in new construction or reconstruction |
|  | An interstate land sales registration |
|  | Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster |
|  | None of the above |

4**. Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the vicinity (1000’ from a major road, 3000’ from a railroad, or 15 miles from an airport).**

**Indicate the findings of the Preliminary Screening below:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | There are no noise generators found within the threshold distances above.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.  |

5**. Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Acceptable: (65 decibels or less; the ceiling may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Normally Unacceptable: (Above 65 decibels but not exceeding 75 decibels; the floor may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a)) |

**Is your project in a largely undeveloped area?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicate noise level here:  | 73.5 |

Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Unacceptable: (Above 75 decibels) |

HUD strongly encourages conversion of noise-exposed sites to land uses compatible with high noise levels.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Check here to affirm that you have considered converting this property to a non-residential use compatible with high noise levels.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicate noise level here:  | 73.5 |

Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

6**. HUD strongly encourages mitigation be used to eliminate adverse noise impacts. Explain in detail the exact measures that must be implemented to mitigate for the impact or effect, including the timeline for implementation. This information will be automatically included in the Mitigation summary for the environmental review.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | Mitigation as follows will be implemented:  |

|  |
| --- |
| 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. Mitigation Measure NOISE-1. The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible: Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses; Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site; Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses; Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed. |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload drawings, specifications, and other materials as needed to describe the project’s noise mitigation measures below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No mitigation is necessary.  |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was normally unacceptable: 73.5 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation with mitigation. |

**Supporting documentation**

[7\_Noise Study\_1296 Shotwell\_111516.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010108965)

[memorandum 170802.docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010108962)

[EA Discussion of Noise\_ ESA Clean.docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010108961)

[dnl-calculator 170727.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010108960)

[Cesar Chavez Traffic Counts.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010108959)

[bpm-calculator.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010108958)

[1296 Shotwell EA\_06\_Noise ESA Clean.docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010108956)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Sole Source Aquifers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 protects drinking water systems which are the sole or principal drinking water source for an area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health. | Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 201, 300f et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349) | 40 CFR Part 149 |

**1. Does the project consist solely of acquisition, leasing, or rehabilitation of an existing building(s)?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. |

**Supporting documentation**

[ssafact.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084846)

[MOU HUD EPA Region 9.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010084843)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Wetlands Protection**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| Executive Order 11990 discourages direct or indirect support of new construction impacting wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service’s National Wetlands Inventory can be used as a primary screening tool, but observed or known wetlands not indicated on NWI maps must also be processed Off-site impacts that result in draining, impounding, or destroying wetlands must also be processed.  | Executive Order 11990 | 24 CFR 55.20 can be used for general guidance regarding the 8 Step Process. |

**1. Does this project involve new construction as defined in Executive Order 11990, expansion of a building’s footprint, or ground disturbance? The term "new construction" shall include draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities and any structures or facilities begun or authorized after the effective date of the Order**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| Based on the project description this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. |

**Supporting documentation**

[Wetlands-Protection.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010085901)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Wild and Scenic Rivers Act**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides federal protection for certain free-flowing, wild, scenic and recreational rivers designated as components or potential components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) from the effects of construction or development.  | The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287), particularly section 7(b) and (c) (16 U.S.C. 1278(b) and (c)) | 36 CFR Part 297  |

**1. Is your project within proximity of a NWSRS river?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ✓ | No |
|  | Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River. |
|  | Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River. |

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. |

**Supporting documentation**

[Wild\_Scenic\_Rivers.pdf](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010085903)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

**Environmental Justice**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| Determine if the project creates adverse environmental impacts upon a low-income or minority community. If it does, engage the community in meaningful participation about mitigating the impacts or move the project.  | Executive Order 12898 |  |

**HUD strongly encourages starting the Environmental Justice analysis only after all other laws and authorities, including Environmental Assessment factors if necessary, have been completed.**

**1. Were any adverse environmental impacts identified in any other compliance review portion of this project’s total environmental review?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

|  |
| --- |
| No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898. |

**Supporting documentation**

[1296 Shotwell EA\_07\_Environmental\_Justice.docx](https://heros.hud.gov/heros/faces/downloadFile.xhtml?erUploadId=900000010098281)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
| ✓ | No |