

Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan Reevaluation

**Attachment A
Impact Re-Evaluation Tables**

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 §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Project Impact Evaluation (Would the project result in new, potentially significant impacts due to changes in laws or regulations or changed conditions?)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6			
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 58.6(d)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As described in Final EIS Section 4.18, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , San Francisco International Airport (SFO) is approximately 8.5 miles south and Oakland International Airport (OAK) is approximately 9.5 miles east of the project site. The project site is not located within the SFO or OAK land use plan or within their maps of height restrictions, in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration Part 77, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace. The project site is, therefore, outside any airport safety or clear zones. In addition, no portion of the project site is within a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77-defined Runway Object Free Area or Runway Safety Area. Finally, there are no private or military airfields in San Francisco County or the nearby vicinity. Source Document(s): 1, 2, 3	The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential impact on Airport Hazards. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982 designated relatively undeveloped coastal barriers along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts as part of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System and made these	The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would

<p>Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>		<p>areas ineligible for most new federal expenditures and financial assistance. As described in Final EIS Chapter 6, <i>Other CEQA/NEPA Considerations</i>, Coastal Barrier Resources exist along the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico coasts; there are no Coastal Barrier Resources in California.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 4</p>	<p>affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential impact on Coastal Barrier Resources. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
<p>Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 [24 CFR 58.6(a)]</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As described in Final EIS Chapter 6, <i>Other CEQA/NEPA Considerations</i>, the project site was not located in a known floodplain nor within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-designated preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City and County of San Francisco on September 21, 2007. The project would not involve either direct or indirect support of development in a floodplain.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 5</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. Although FEMA issued updated (final) Flood Insurance Rate Maps in 2021, the project site remains outside a FEMA-designated floodplain. Therefore, there has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s compliance with the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5</p>			
<p>Clean Air Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As described in Final EIS Section 5.9, <i>Air Quality</i>, the proposed project would result in short-term construction emissions as well as long-term operational emissions primarily from motor vehicle use from the new residents and employees. The Final EIS found that the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (less-than-significant impact) and would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants due to operational emissions (less-than-significant impact).</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s compliance with the Clean Air Act. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

		<p>However, with respect to construction emissions of criteria pollutants, the project would result in a significant, unavoidable effect, despite implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2a, Utilize Efficient Construction Equipment, and M-AQ-2b, Utilize Efficient Construction Equipment after 2016. Additionally, the project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations from construction emissions of toxic air contaminants (primarily diesel particulate matter). However, with implementation of M-AQ-4, Construction Emissions Minimization, this effect would be reduced in severity to less than significant. Effects related to emissions of greenhouse gases would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	
<p>Coastal Zone Management Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 207(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As stated in Final EIS Chapter 6, <i>Other CEQA/NEPA Considerations</i>, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has permit authority over San Francisco Bay and lands located within 100 feet of the Bay shoreline. However, inasmuch as the project site is located more than 100 feet from the Bay shoreline, and therefore is not within BCDC jurisdiction, no formal finding of consistency with the San Francisco Bay Plan is required.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's consistency with the Coastal Zone Management Act. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As detailed in Sections 4.18 and 5.18 of the Final EIS, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, the project site is currently occupied by public housing. Built in two phases in 1941 and 1955, the project site is composed of two of the oldest public housing developments in San Francisco: Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex. The project site was undeveloped prior to the current use.</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of Contamination and Toxic Substances. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

	<p>As is common for multi-family residential developments, hazardous materials used and/or stored at the project site are limited to cleaning/janitorial supplies and general maintenance supplies, such as paints and thinners, liquid laundry bleach, stain cleaner, fabric softener, and gasoline. No obvious indications of the generation of hazardous wastes were observed during the site reconnaissance in June 2009, and there has been no change in use of the site since that time, meaning that no hazardous waste generation would have occurred in the interim. The project site is not listed on state or local hazardous materials/waste release websites. There are no hazardous materials/waste release sites within one mile of the project site that could affect the redevelopment of the project site.</p> <p>The existing buildings on the project site may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM) in structural materials (e.g., fire-proofing, insulation, roofing, flooring), lead-based paint (LBP), and/or polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and/or mercury in electrical fixtures and equipment, given that the buildings pre-date the 1970s bans on the use of such materials for the construction of structures. Preliminary surveys indicated that ACM and LBP are present in some materials in the structures. It is unknown whether PCBs and/or mercury are present in electrical fixtures and equipment, but their presence is considered likely.</p> <p>Serpentine bedrock is present on existing cut slopes and in sporadic outcrops within and immediately adjacent to the site. Serpentine rock can contain concentrations of naturally occurring asbestos at concentrations less than one percent up to approximately 25 percent. Laboratory analysis indicates that the serpentine bedrock at the project site contains chrysotile, a mineral found in asbestos, as a</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>result of the weathering of serpentine found within the underlying Franciscan bedrock.</p> <p>Both ACM and naturally occurring asbestos must be handled in compliance with procedures and regulations promulgated by the California Air Resources Board, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and the City and County of San Francisco. These measures, along with Final EIS Mitigation Measures M-HZ-2.1, Voluntary Remedial Action Program Applications and Work Plans, and M-HZ-2.2, Site Mitigation Plan, would avoid any significant impacts due to ACM and naturally occurring asbestos, as well as due to other hazardous building materials.</p> <p>The project is not located on an occupied structure on filled land that contains toxic chemicals or radioactive materials at concentrations that would result in exposures above USEPA acceptable risk levels, nor would it locate occupied structures on or near a site which could pose potential environmental hazards, such as dumps, landfills, or industrial locations that might contain hazardous wastes.</p> <p>Construction of the project would involve the use of heavy equipment and construction materials including fuels and oils, paints and thinners, solvents and cleaning solutions, and asphalt and concrete.</p> <p>Contractors would be required to comply with mandatory federal, state, and local workplace hazardous materials regulations, all of which would be specified in the construction contracts. Workplace regulations are effective in reducing potential risks from spills and exposure of workers. In addition, the construction contractor would be required to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which requires an inventory of the products used, storing chemicals in watertight containers or in a</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>storage shed (completely enclosed), with appropriate secondary containment to prevent any spillage or leakage, implementing procedures that effectively address hazardous and nonhazardous spills, developing a spill response and implementation element of the SWPPP prior to commencement of construction activities; good housekeeping for vehicle storage and maintenance to prevent oil, grease, or fuel to leak in to the ground, storm drains, or surface waters.</p> <p>Compliance with mandatory hazardous materials regulations and SWPPP requirements would ensure that potential releases from the transport and use or disposal of hazardous materials during project construction activities would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, the project applicant's contractors would be required to comply with mandatory workplace hazardous materials regulations (Cal/OSHA), all of which would be specified in the construction contracts. This, along with Final EIS Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.3, Dust Control Plan and Worker Health and Safety Plan, and the mitigation measures noted above would ensure that any worker or resident exposure to contamination during ground-disturbing activities would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Finally, implementation of Final EIS Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.4, Underground Storage Tanks, would avoid any potential significant impacts resulting from unanticipated discovery of underground storage tanks.</p> <p>An updated government records was undertaken and identified no potentially contaminated sites of concern that have been identified since publication of the Final EIS.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 6, 7</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>Endangered Species Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As stated in the Final EIS in Sections 5.15 and 5.15, <i>Biological Resources</i>, the project site is highly developed urban land. The proposed project would not affect any plant or wildlife species that is listed or proposed to be listed as threatened or endangered pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA). Due to a lack of natural habitat, past disturbances associated with the construction of the existing housing, increasing competition from invasive nonnative species, and on-going disturbances such as litter and pedestrian traffic, there are likely no candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant or wildlife species that would use the existing habitats within the project site.</p> <p>Several marginal serpentine outcrops are present within disturbed areas that occur on and adjacent to the project site. Many special-status plant species known from the region have a strong serpentine affinity, including four federally-listed species: the white-rayed pentachaeta [<i>Pentachaeta bellidiflora</i>], the Marin western flax [<i>Hesperolinon congestum</i>], the Presidio clarkia [<i>Clarkia franciscana</i>], and the Presidio manzanita [<i>Arctostaphylos hookeri ravenii</i>]). As confirmed during a biological survey in 2011, the serpentine outcrops do not contain the characteristic plant species assemblages, such as purple needlegrass (<i>Stipa pulchra</i>) and foothill needlegrass (<i>Stipa lepida</i>), that would categorize them as serpentine bunchgrass grassland habitat. Additionally, the project site has been developed and the serpentine outcrops and soils are degraded such that they have a very low potential to support special-status plant species. Therefore, effects would be less than significant.</p> <p>Mature gum (eucalyptus) trees, such as those on the project site and nearby, are known to provide</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential impact on Endangered Species. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
--	---	--	--

		<p>overwintering habitat during migration for the monarch butterfly (<i>Danaus plexippus</i>), which is now a candidate for listing under FESA. As stated in the Final EIS, known winter roost sites are considered sensitive and important to the viability of overwintering and migratory populations, and therefore impacts on a known or potential winter roost site for the monarch butterfly would be considered significant. However, there are no records of the trees that occur on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site (e.g., at the Potrero Hill Recreation Center) as being used for overwintering habitat and roosts by monarchs. Therefore, it is unlikely that monarch butterflies would use the existing gum trees on the project site during migration and for overwintering, and the impact on monarch butterfly would remain less than significant, despite the species being a candidate for FESA listing.</p> <p>Three special-status bat species have been detected within approximately five miles of the project site: Townsend’s big eared bat, western red bat, and hoary bat. However, the high levels of human disturbance and absence of suitable roosting habitat at the project site, makes it unlikely that special-status bat species would occur, and therefore potential impacts to these species would be less than significant.</p> <p>Migratory birds are discussed below, under Vegetation and Wildlife.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>According to Sections 4.18 and 5.18 of the Final EIS, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, the project would not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations. There is no visual evidence or indication of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (ASTs) (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at or immediately adjacent to the project site.</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential impact related to Explosive and Flammable Hazards. The</p>

		<p>There are 11 facilities with listed ASTs within one mile of the project site (ESA 2022). None of the ASTs at the 11 facilities would pose an explosive or flammable AST risk to the proposed project site.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 7</p>	<p>conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site consists of highly urban land; therefore, the project would not affect farmlands. There are no protected farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 8</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential impact related to Farmlands Protection. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
<p>Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As described in Final EIS Chapter 6, <i>Other CEQA/NEPA Considerations</i>, the project site was not located in a known floodplain nor within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-designated preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City and County of San Francisco on September 21, 2007. The project would not involve either direct or indirect support of development in a floodplain.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 5</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. Although FEMA issued updated (final) Flood Insurance Rate Maps in 2021, the project site remains outside a FEMA-designated floodplain. Therefore, there has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's compliance with the Executive Order 11988 regarding Floodplain Management. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
<p>Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Historic Architectural Resources</u> As explained in Sections 4.18 and 5.18 of the Final EIS, <i>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</i>, no historic resources are present within the project site. Two resources eligible for the National Register of</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's effects related to Historic</p>

	<p>Historic Places (NRHP) are located within the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE): 1033 Texas Street has been determined eligible for listing on the basis of distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (Criterion C) and Starr King Elementary School at 1106-1120 Wisconsin Street has been determined eligible for listing for association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history and distinctive characteristic of a type, period, or method of construction (Criteria A and C). These two eligible properties are located in the APE but outside of the project site and the project would neither alter the characteristics of either property nor diminish their integrity. Therefore, project would not have an adverse effect on an historic-era district, site, building, structure, or object listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Proposed Project would have no impact on historical resources.</p> <p><u>Archaeological Resources</u></p> <p>The project site is located in an area determined to have sensitivity for prehistoric archaeological resources. Mitigation Measures M-CP-2a, Archaeological Resource Discovery, and M-CP-2b, Archaeological Monitoring Program, were required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the project on undocumented archaeological resources and sensitive areas. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a required development and implementation of an Archaeological Testing Plan to test for the presence or absence of archaeological resources in sensitive areas. The San Francisco Planning has subsequently approved the Archaeological Testing Plan, although implementation of the testing has not yet been completed. (Mitigation</p>	<p>Preservation, nor has any new information been identified that would support a change in historic resource status within the APE, including due to the passage of time. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Measure M-CP-2b is implemented during construction.)</p> <p><u>Paleontological Resources</u></p> <p>A poorly documented prehistoric site has been reported on the hillside of nearby Bernal Heights, in an environment similar to the southern portion of APE, therefore there is a possibility of a prehistoric deposit in this area of the APE. However, due to the serpentine rock unit underlying the project site and the soils overlying it, fossils would not be found. In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are discovered in the area during construction activities, potential significant impact on paleontological resources could occur. Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a, Discovery of Paleontological Resources, would reduce impacts of the project to paleontological resources because it would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Further, the APE for the project is highly developed and, therefore, any other unique geologic features would have been previously disturbed.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	
<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As explained in Final EIS Section 5.8, <i>Noise</i>, project construction would result in short-term elevated noise levels; however, implementation of Final EIS Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, Submit a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise, and M-NO-1b, Implement a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise, would reduce the severity of this effect to a less-than-significant level. Operation of the project would introduce additional on-site stationary noise sources as well as project-related traffic noise increases; however, the effect would be less than significant because stationary sources would be required to comply with</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential impact related to Noise Abatement and Control. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

		<p>the San Francisco noise ordinance and traffic volumes would not increase to such an extent that traffic noise levels would increase substantially.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	
<p>Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Local groundwater is not currently used at the project site and is not proposed as a water supply source for the project site. Existing SFPUC supplies would be used to meet Project water demand. The project is not served by a US EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer.</p> <p>The anticipated depth of excavation is 42.5 feet, although excavation may be deeper, depending on the locations of subdrains and other utilities. Excavation at this depth will likely require groundwater dewatering. If construction dewatering is required during excavation, it would be temporary and limited in volume. Additionally, any groundwater encountered during construction would be subject to the Batch Wastewater Discharge Permit issued by the SFPUC before the beginning of dewatering to the combined sewer system.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential impact related to Sole Source Aquifers. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
<p>Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is not located near, or within, a wetland area, waters of the United States, or of the State. Therefore, the project would not affect wetland or riparian areas.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential impact related to Wetlands Protection. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p>	<p>Yes No</p>	<p>No federally designated Wild and Scenic Rivers are located within the City and County of San Francisco;</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been</p>

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>therefore the project would not affect any wild and scenic rivers.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential impact related to Wild and Scenic Rivers. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE			
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site would provide new housing for current residents and add new housing for a variety of income levels. The project site is located in a census block which the Final EIS found comprised approximately 76 percent ethnic minority groups and 64 percent of families are below poverty levels. The project would not result in disproportionately adverse environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. Construction of affordable housing would provide result in a beneficial impact by providing housing for low-income populations.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential impact related to Environmental Justice. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan Reevaluation

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

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	<p>The project is located on the south slope of Potrero Hill. The project area contains residential, commercial, recreational, and industrial uses in a highly urban environment. The site is bordered on the northwest by the Potrero Hill Recreation Center. There are multi-family residences, single-family residences, and Starr King Elementary School to the west, industrial uses to the south, and multi-family residential, single-family residential, and industrial uses to the east.</p> <p>The project site remains in an RM-2 (Residential, Mixed-Use – Moderate Density) Use District, as was the case for all but a small portion of the site at the time of the Final EIS; this area, formerly in a P (Public) District, is now in an RM-2 District. The project site had height limits of between 40 feet and 65 feet at the time of the Final EIS; it is now largely within a 40/65-X Height and Bulk District, with a small portion (where new construction has already occurred) in a 50-X Height and Bulk District.</p> <p>The project site is within the San Francisco General Plan’s Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan, which identifies the site as an area that will be redeveloped under the HOPE SF program.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 9</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential impact related to Conformance with Plans, Compatible Land Use and Zoning, and Scale and Urban Design. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Soil Suitability, Slopes/Erosion/ Drainage/Storm Water Runoff	3	<p><u>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</u></p> <p>The project site is located on the western side of Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province. The Coast Ranges are a complex series of linear mountain ranges that lie more or less parallel to the coast and to the San Andreas Fault System. The Coast Ranges are composed primarily of Jurassic- and Cretaceous-age (206 to 65 million years ago) rocks that accumulated on the sea floor. These older rocks include a tectonic mix of sandstone, chert, altered basalt referred to as greenstone, and serpentinite, collectively referred to as the Franciscan Complex. While Franciscan bedrock is exposed in the hills and cliffs of San Francisco, the flanks of the hills are blanketed with thin to thick layers of colluvium and alluvium (weathered material</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential impact related to Soil Suitability, Slopes, Erosion, Drainage, and Storm Water Runoff. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
		<p>washed downslope from the bedrock exposures). Valleys are filled with water-laid stream deposits. Soils consist of slope debris and ravine fill consisting of colluvium ranging from 6 to 11 feet in thickness. The results also indicate that previous grading activities at the project site resulted in the placement of fill in areas of the site. Fill was also placed on portions of the slope east of the northern limits of Texas Street and east of the Missouri Street and Texas Street intersection. In general, fill at the Project site consists of silty clay and sand and clayey silt and sand ranging in thickness from 1 to 8 feet.</p> <p>The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest known active faults to the project site are the San Andreas Fault, located about 6 miles to the southwest, the San Gregorio fault located about 10 miles to the west, and the Hayward fault located about 11 miles to the east. The San Andreas, San Gregorio, and Hayward faults have estimated maximum earthquake magnitudes (M) of 7.9, 7.2, and 7.1, respectively. Thus, the project site could be subjected to seismic shaking in the event of an earthquake. The Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities estimates there is a 21 percent probability that a M 6.7 or greater earthquake will occur on the northern portion of the San Andreas Fault, while it estimates a 31 percent probability of the same magnitude event occurring on the Hayward/Rogers Creek Fault over the next 30 years. The project site would be subject to strong shaking intensity during a characteristic earthquake M 7.9 on the San Andreas fault. During a characteristic earthquake of M 7.1 on the Rodgers Creek and Northern segments Hayward fault, the project site would be subject to moderate shaking.</p> <p>The project site is not located in a Seismic Hazard Zone designated as vulnerable to liquefaction or lateral spreading. The northwest/southeast-trending slope between Connecticut Street and Dakota Street is indicated as an area that may be susceptible to seismic-induced landsliding. The areas mapped as having the potential for seismic-induced landsliding appear to consist of steeper existing slopes. Potential impacts of site development would be mitigated by adherence to the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC) and implementation of Final EIS Mitigation Measure M-GE-1, Landslide Hazard Mitigation.</p> <p>The SFBC derives from the adopted 2019 California Building Code. This code is administered and enforced by DBI, and compliance with all provisions is mandatory for all new development and redevelopment in the City. Throughout the permitting,</p>	

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
		<p>design, and construction phases of a building project, Planning Department staff, DBI engineers, and DBI building inspectors confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations. Compliance with Chapter 16 of the SFBC (Structural Design), which sets forth the requirements governing seismically resistant construction, and Chapter 18 (Soils and Foundations), which requires foundation and soils investigations that would minimize the exposure to risks from seismic shaking, seismic-induced ground failures (e.g., liquefaction, landslides) and unstable soils and geologic units (e.g., expansive soils). Structure designs would be constructed to the highest feasible seismic safety standards, consistent with the requirements of the SFBC, as deemed appropriate by the project engineer and verified by DBI. Compliance with the SFBC, which requires design-level studies and associated recommendations for building construction that are reviewed and approved by DBI during the permitting process, along with implementation of Final EIS Mitigation Measure M-GE-4, Expansive Soils, would mitigate potential hazards and would ensure that impacts from groundshaking and unstable soil and geologic units remain less than significant.</p> <p><u>Erosion</u></p> <p>The project site is characterized by steep topography and uneven slopes. As described above under Contamination and Toxic Substances, the construction contractor would be required to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP, in conjunction with implementation of Final EIS Mitigation Measures M-GE-2a, Preventative Erosion Control Measures, M-GE-2b, Cut Slopes and Engineered Fill, and M-GE-2c, Erosion Control Measures in Response to Heavy Rains, would ensure that potential effects related to erosion would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <p>The project site is developed with a mix of impervious surfaces (i.e., buildings and hardscape) and landscaping. The project site is characterized by steep slopes and hilly topography with grades in some locations exceeding 30 percent. There are no natural drainage features on or adjacent to the Project site. Stormwater runoff from the project site, along with wastewater, is conveyed through the combined sewer and wastewater system to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant and, after secondary treatment. As the project would replace the previous impervious surfaces</p>	

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
		and would continue to be served by the combined sewer and wastewater system, impacts to the stormwater system would be less than significant. Source Document(s): 1	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise	3	<p><u>Hazardous Materials</u></p> <p>As described above in “Contamination and Toxic Substances,” the project is not located on an occupied structure on filled land that contains toxic chemicals or radioactive materials at concentrations that would result in exposures above USEPA acceptable risk levels. However, construction activities could result in releases of hazardous materials into the environment specifically in regards to lead from lead-based paint which would require mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts and hazards risk. (See Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1, M-HZ-2.2, M-HZ-2.3, and M-HZ-2.4 as discussed in the aforementioned section and presented in Section 5.18).</p> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Construction noise as discussed above “Noise Abatement and Control” would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with the City’s noise ordinance. The project would increase traffic volumes beyond background growth over the next 20 years. Source Document(s): 1</p>	The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential impact related to Hazards and Nuisances, including Site Safety and Noise. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.
Energy Consumption	2	The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulation as enforced by the Department of Building Inspection (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. High-rise residential projects and large commercial projects (greater than 25,000 sf or a high-rise) are required to achieve LEED Silver certification, and achieve a 50 percent reduction in the use of potable water for landscaping and 30 percent reduction in water use. Effective January 1, 2012, large commercial projects must achieve LEED Gold certification and comply with LEED requirements for provision of on-site renewable energy. The project would be built to LEED-ND standards. Source Document(s): 1	The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential impact related to Energy Consumption. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	<p>Construction on the project site would provide approximately 75 new jobs during operation, jobs during construction, and would not displace the existing on-site jobs. The project would provide approximately 33 new jobs at buildout (in addition to the temporary construction-related jobs). No impact is anticipated from the project on employment and income within the project area.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential effects related to Employment and Income Patterns. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	<p>As explained in Final EIS Section 5.4, <i>Socioeconomics and Community/Population and Housing</i>, the project would not result permanent displacement of project site residents, nor would it induce a substantial amount of unplanned growth. Additionally, the project would not introduce physical barriers or result in reduced access that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group. Construction-period displacement of residents could occur, but would be temporary. Accordingly, effects related to demographic character changes and displacement would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential effects related to Demographic Character Changes and Displacement. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential effects related to Community Facilities. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>The project site is within adequate and convenient distance to retail services that provide essential items such as food, medicine, banks and other convenience shopping. Existing retail and commercial services would not be adversely impacted or displaced by the project. The project would also provide 15,000 square feet of retail/flex space that would serve the area.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential effects related to Community Facilities. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
Health Care and Social Services	2	<p>There are several Urgent Care Clinics located within approximately 2 miles pf the project site, which are accessible via public transportation. In addition, the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay and the UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital are 1.1 miles from the project site and also accessible via public transportation. In addition, the proposed project would replace existing childcare facilities within the project site.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential effects related to Health Care and Social Services The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Solid Waste Disposal/ Recycling	2	<p>Recology, Inc. provides residential and commercial solid waste collection, as was the case when the Final EIS was published; there has been no change in these services, although Recology is now disposing of solid waste that is not composted or recycled at the Hay Road Landfill in Solano County, rather than the Altamont Landfill in Alameda County.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential effects related to Solid Waste Disposal or Recycling. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	<p>The project site is within an urban area that is well served by the combined sewer/stormwater collection, storage and treatment facilities and is in an area where projected population and employment growth has been accounted for by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Wastewater generated at the project site would be treated by the SFPUC, which provides wastewater collection and transfer service in the City. The 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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential effects related to Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Water Supply	2	<p>The analysis of water supply impacts is a cumulative analysis by its nature because it considers the capacity of the city’s water supply system and its ability to serve the additional demand associated with future growth consistent with the proposed project in combination with existing water demand in San Francisco.</p> <p>April 2022 Water would be provided to the project by the SFPUC. The SFPUC forecasted future water demand using regional growth projections that incorporate</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential effects related to Water Supply.</p>

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
		<p>existing land use designations and reasonably foreseeable future projects within San Francisco, relying on the City’s 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Since publication of the Final EIS, the UWMP has been updated twice: the current version is dated 2020. Also, since publication of the Final EIS, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), in 2018, adopted amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Bay-Delta Plan Amendments). The SFPUC has determined that, if the Bay-Delta Plan Amendments are fully implemented, the SFPUC would be able to meet the projected demand in normal years but would experience supply shortages in single dry years and multiple dry years with respect to both in-City water demand and demand for water supplied by SFPUC to other Bay Area jurisdictions. However, implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan Amendments is uncertain because of pending legal challenges and outstanding regulatory actions. Regardless, water supplies would meet the demand of projected growth under the current water supply scenario through 2050, with varying levels of rationing during normal years, both with and without implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan Amendments. If the Bay-Delta Plan Amendments are fully implemented, high levels of rationing would be required in single dry years and multiple dry years. Although dry-year shortfalls resulting from the Bay-Delta Plan Amendments would occur with or without the proposed project, the project’s relatively minor increase in potable water demand, in the context of overall system demand, would not result in a considerable contribution to the shortfalls and the related need to develop new or expanded water supply facilities, and therefore the effect would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 10</p>	<p>The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	<p>The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provides police protection in San Francisco. The project site is located within the SFPD’s Bayview District. The SFPD would continue to serve the project site with implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p>The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) provides fire suppression and emergency medical services (EMS) and transport in San Francisco. The project site is located within the SFFD’s Division 3, which includes the South of Market area, extending through the southwestern boundaries and up to the southern border of the city. The nearest fire station to the project site is Station 37, which is a single engine company located at 798 Wisconsin Street (approximately 0.2 miles to the north).</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential effects related to Police, Fire, and Emergency Medical Services. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
		<p>The SFFD would continue to serve the project site with implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p>Implementation of the project could incrementally increase the demand for fire protection, emergency medical and police protection services but would not be substantial given the overall demand for such services on a citywide basis. Police, fire, and emergency medical resources are regularly redeployed based on need in order to maintain acceptable service ratios.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	<p>Within the Potrero Hill area are numerous San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRDP) facilities, including five children’s play areas, two dog play areas, three community gardens, a recreation center, and open space. Adjacent to the project site is the Potrero Hill Recreation Center. There are two community gardens, the Arkansas Friendship Garden and the Connecticut Friendship Garden, managed by SFRPD located adjacent to the Potrero Hill Recreation Center. Residents of the project would utilize existing parks, open space and public recreational facilities.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential effects related to Parks, Open Space, and Recreation. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Transportation and Accessibility	3	<p>Transportation and circulation impacts evaluated in the Final EIS include effects on intersection, freeway mainline, and freeway ramp levels of service (LOS), transit capacity and operations, pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities, freight and passenger loading, emergency access, parking, and site access/circulation design. In addition, the certified FEIS includes an evaluation of impacts to transportation and circulation that would result from project construction activities.</p> <p>The majority of the impact analysis in the certified FEIS was based on project trip generation/distribution/assignment, and the majority of the impacts identified were related to intersection LOS. The Final EIS identified significant cumulative LOS impacts at four intersections: Pennsylvania Avenue/SB I-280 Off-Ramp; 25th Street/Indiana Street/NB I-280 On-Ramp; Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street; and Cesar Chavez Street/US 101 Off-Ramp. Mitigation Measures including geometric and/or traffic control upgrades were identified to address these LOS impacts; however, uncertainty about the feasibility of implementation resulted in a NEPA impact determination of significant and unavoidable with mitigation.</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project’s potential effects related to Transportation and Accessibility. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
		<p>Since completion of the Final EIS in 2016, the measure of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has replaced the measures of vehicle delay/LOS in the evaluation of transportation impacts in San Francisco, consistent with state environmental review laws and regulations. For this reason, the project impacts (TR-1 through TR-3 [less than significant], C-TR-1 through C-TR-3 [less than significant in some instances and significant and unavoidable in other instances, as noted above]) and mitigation measures (C-M-TR-1a, C-M-TR-1b, C-M-TR-1c, C-M-TR-1d) associated with vehicle delay/LOS are no longer applicable to the project. Instead, a VMT analysis was conducted following guidance provided in most recent version of the San Francisco Planning Department guidelines (SF Guidelines).</p> <p>The project’s relatively modest increase in trip generation and the likelihood that a number of project visitors would travel by non-automobile modes means that the project would not substantially increase VMT. According to the City’s Transportation Information Map, the existing average daily VMT per capita for the transportation analysis zone (TAZ) in which the project site is located (TAZ 519), is 8.47 for residential uses, which is below the existing regional VMT per capita minus 15 percent of 14.6. The project is located within an area of the City where the existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the regional VMT thresholds; therefore, the project would not generate a substantial increase in VMT and is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts related to VMT. Therefore, traffic impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>The Final EIS identified a significant cumulative transit capacity impact on the two Muni bus lines: 10 Townsend and 48 Quintara/24th Street, and Mitigation Measure M-TR-4, which included a fair-share contribution to increase transit capacity on these lines, was identified to reduce this effect to a less-than-significant level. This conclusion would remain valid.</p> <p>The Final EIS found that effects related to construction circulation would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-14, Construction Traffic Control Plan, while effects on site access and on-site circulation would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-16, Design of Bulb-Outs and Driveways. These impact conclusions and mitigation measures would remain valid.</p>	

¹ Impact Codes: (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 ¹	Original Project Impact Evaluation	Revised Project Impact Evaluation (Would the Revised Project result in new, potentially significant impacts?)
		<p>The Final EIS identified less-than-significant effects on pedestrian and bicycle circulation; passenger and freight loading; and parking. These conclusions would likewise remain valid.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 11</p>	
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	<p>No unique natural, or water features are present onsite. Implementation of the project would not affect water resources, nor would it increase demands on groundwater resources. As noted above, water service would be provided by SFPUC. No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential impact on Unique Natural Resources and Water Resources. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>
Vegetation, Wildlife	3	<p>As described above under Endangered Species, proposed project would not affect any plant or wildlife species that is listed or proposed to be listed as threatened or endangered pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA).</p> <p>The trees on and adjacent to the project site could provide suitable habitat for common nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Implementation of Final EIS Mitigation Measure M-BI-4a, Bird Nest Pre-Construction Survey, would ensure that potential effects on nesting birds would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>	<p>The project remains unchanged from that described in the Final EIS. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements or the environmental setting that would affect the analysis of the proposed project's potential impact on Vegetation and Wildlife. The conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid and the project would result in no new significant impacts.</p>

¹ Impact Codes: (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.

Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan Reevaluation

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

1. San Francisco Planning Department and San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, 2015, *Potrero Hope SF Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report/Final Environmental Impact Statement*. December. Available at: <https://sfplanning.org/potrero-hope-sf#documents>. Accessed June 19, 2022.
2. City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2012, *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport*, November. Available at: https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Consolidated_CCAG_ALUCP_November-20121.pdf. Accessed June 19, 2022.
3. Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission, 2010, *Oakland International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*, December. Available at: https://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/OAK_ALUCP_122010_FULL.pdf. Accessed June 19, 2022.
4. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, undated, Coastal Barrier Resources Act webpage and Official Coastal Barrier Resources System Maps webpage. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/program/coastal-barrier-resources-act/maps-and-data> and <https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/official-coastal-barrier-resources-system-maps>. Accessed June 19, 2022.
5. Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2021, *Flood Insurance Rate Map, City and County of San Francisco, California, Map Panel 060298*, March 23. Available at: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/downloadProduct?productTypeID=FINAL_PRODUCT&productSubTypeID=FIRM_PANEL&productID=0602980119A. Accessed June 19, 2022.
6. Environmental Science Associates, 2022, Memorandum, "Results for Government Records Search and HUD Acceptable Separation Distance," June 10.
7. EnviroSite Corporation, 2022, *Government Records Report, Potrero HOPE, 1801-1849 23rd Street, San Francisco, CA , 94107*, June 9.
8. California Department of Conservation, Important Farmland Finder webpage, undated. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed June 19, 2022.
9. San Francisco Zoning Maps. Available at: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_zoningmaps/0-0-0-339. Accessed June 20, 2022.
10. San Francisco Planning Department, 2022, *San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update Draft Environmental Impact Report*, April 20. Available at: https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents?title=Housing%20Element%202022&field_environmental_review_target_id=All&items_per_page=10. Accessed June 20, 2022.
11. San Francisco Planning Department, 2019, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review*, October. Available at: <https://citypln-m-extnl.sfgov.org/REST/sharedlinks/%7ba4a7dadc-b0dc-4322-bd29-f6f07103c6e0%7d/79b86615648b30738b5be29ce1d6be428adebe8ad75a7e1d3cc064a715634ec5/content>. Accessed June 8, 2022.