

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

Project Information

Project Name: 88 Broadway Street and 735 Davis Street

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

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): BRIDGE Housing and John Stewart Company

State/Local Identifier:

Preparer: Eugene T. Flannery

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

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): San Francisco Housing Authority

Consultant (if applicable): Environmental Science Associates

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

Project Location: 88 Broadway Street and 735 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA, 94111; APN 0140-007 and 0140-008

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

The proposed project would demolish the two existing surface parking lots at the site, which provide 180-public parking spaces, and construct two new 65-foot-tall (up to 75 feet with rooftop appurtenances), six-story mixed-use residential buildings containing approximately 178 affordable dwelling units and approximately 6,200 square feet of ground floor commercial space (estimated 5,000 square feet in the family housing building and 1,200 square feet in the senior housing building). An approximately 4,300-square-foot childcare facility for public use would also be included on the ground floor of the family housing building.

Construction of the two buildings would result in an approximately 146,000-square-foot family housing building (fronting Front Street) and an approximately 45,300-square-foot senior housing building (fronting Davis Street). The senior housing building would step down from 65 feet at its western façade to 45 feet at its eastern (Davis Street) façade.

The family housing building would provide 125 affordable dwelling units within approximately 98,900 square feet of residential space, as well as a 4,300-square-foot child care facility, 5,000 square feet of commercial space, 4,800 square feet of multi-purpose/property management offices/lobby space, and 7,900 square feet of residential services (laundry/mechanical/trash rooms). The senior housing building would provide 53 affordable housing units within approximately 28,100 square feet of residential space, as well as 1,200 square feet of commercial space, 2,000 square feet of multi-purpose/property management offices/lobby space, and 3,100 square feet of residential services (laundry/mechanical/trash rooms).

The family housing building would also provide a total of approximately 9,000 square feet of common open space for residents with the following: a 2,000 square-foot open podium courtyard on the second floor; a 1,000 square-foot deck on the fifth floor and 1,200 square-foot deck on the sixth floor; and a 3,200 square-foot terrace and 1,400 square-foot community garden on the roof. The senior housing building would include approximately 3,100 square feet of common open space available to residents with an 800 square-foot open courtyard on the first floor and a 2,300 square-foot roof deck on the fifth floor.

The project would include provisions for bicycle parking only. No off-street vehicular parking spaces would be provided at the project site; however, the project proposes three on-street loading zones that would meet the ADA standards. The proposed project would convert two existing metered parking spaces on Front Street to a loading zone to service the family housing building, two existing metered parking spaces on Davis Street to service the senior housing building, and two existing metered parking spaces on Vallejo Street to service the childcare space. Bicycle parking spaces on the project site would include 122 Class 1 spaces and 20 Class 2 spaces for residential and commercial uses.

The project sponsor proposes a north/south mid-block passage to connect Vallejo Street and Broadway. An east/west mid-block passage would connect the family housing building's residential lobby to Davis Street. A total of 21 street trees would be planted along the four frontages of the project. The proposed project would include excavation of approximately 4,000

cubic yards of material to a maximum depth of four feet below grade to accommodate building foundations and between 70 to 100 feet below grade to accommodate the required piles. The project is anticipated to be constructed applying a deep foundation system with pile and grade beams.

Project demolition and construction would take approximately 19 months beginning in August 2018 with completion by March 2020; both buildings would be constructed concurrently. The construction for the larger, family building would occur over the full 19-month period, and construction of the smaller, senior building would take place over the first 13 months. Construction of the two buildings would include the following: demolition (1 month), shoring and excavation (1 month), foundation (1 to 3 months), building construction (10 to 12 months), and installation of facades (3 to 4 months). During the construction phase of the proposed project, worker parking would occur off-site. As the entire project site would be under construction at the same time, no designated parking for construction workers would be provided on-site, and they would be expected to park on the street or in nearby garages, or to use transit. The proposed project would generate up to 365 tons of asphalt demolition debris and excavation of approximately 4,000 cubic yards of soil export.

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

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

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) identified the total housing need for the San Francisco Bay Area for an eight-year period (in this cycle, from 2014 to 2022) and allocated the need among the various jurisdictions. The Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area estimates that San Francisco will need an additional 6,234 very low income (0-50% of area median income) units and 4,639 low income (51-80% of area median income) units.

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed project provides 178 units which would satisfy a portion of identified affordable housing needs for seniors and families within San Francisco.

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

The approximately 48,620-square-foot, T-shaped project site is located at 88 Broadway (Lot 007) and 735 Davis Street (Lot 008). The project site is located on the block bounded by Broadway to the south, Vallejo Street to the north, Front Street to the west, and Davis Street to the east within San Francisco's North Beach neighborhood, and the Northeast Waterfront Historic District and Waterfront Special Use District No. 3.

The project site's two existing surface parking lots currently provide 180 public parking spaces. There are no physical structures or landscaping on the project site. The public parking lots are operated by SP Plus Parking (88 Broadway) and Aqua Parking (735 Davis Street). The project site shares the block with two other businesses: a two-story office building that is home to the William-Sonoma Incorporated (WSI) corporate office on the northeast corner of the block (fronting Vallejo and Davis street) and a two-story building that is home to Autodesk offices on the southeast corner of the block (fronting Davis Street and Broadway). The surrounding uses in the project site vicinity include television broadcasting offices to the north (KGO, KRON4, and ABC7), a public parking lot to the east (Seawall Lots 323/324 with proposed theater and hotel development), a four-story, mixed-use building to the south, and a public parking structure to the west.

The closest San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Muni Metro station to the project site is the Embarcadero Station approximately 0.5 miles south, which is shared with the regional rail service operated by Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART). The closest BART station entrance to the project site is the Market Street entrance at the Embarcadero Station. The Embarcadero Station is a stop for all six Muni Metro underground lines (Lines N-Judah, L-Taraval, M-Ocean View, K-Owl, T-Owl, and J-Church), and four BART lines (Pittsburg/Bay Point to/from SFO/Millbrae, Dublin/Pleasanton to/from Daly City, Daly City to/from Fremont, and Richmond to/from Daly City/Millbrae). The project is located within 0.25 miles of four local Muni bus lines (Lines 1, 10, 12, and 39); two express Muni bus lines (Lines 3X and 82X); three Muni cable car/trolley lines (Lines E, F, and C); and two regional bus lines (Golden Gate Transit and San Mateo County Transit District). The San Francisco Ferry Terminal is located

approximately 0.5 miles south of the project site and the Caltrain station is located approximately 2 miles south of the project site.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
	PBV	Up to 50 vouchers

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount:

Up to 50 project-based vouchers

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

Total

\$120,000,000.00

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

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6		
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The San Francisco International Airport is over 12 miles south of the project site. The project site is well outside the boundaries of the San Francisco Airport runway protection zones as depicted in Exhibit IV-7, Safety Compatibility Zones. The project site is outside all other defined safety zones, airspace protection zones, and Airport Influence Areas of the airport's Comprehensive Land Use Compatibility Plan. The Oakland International Airport is nearly 11 miles east of the project site. The project site is well outside the boundaries of Oakland Airport runway protection zones, as depicted in Figure 3-4, Safety Compatibility Zones, as well as all other defined safety zones.</p> <p>There are no military airfields in San Francisco County or the nearby vicinity, the nearest air station, the Alameda Naval Air Station having closed; therefore, no military airfield Airport Protection Zone or Clear Zone would affect the project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1, 2, and Attachment 1</p>
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no Coastal Barrier Resource System (CBRS) Units, or CBRS buffer zones, as defined under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982 (PL 97-348), as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (PL 101-591) located within San Francisco Bay. The project site is therefore not located within a CBRS Unit, or CBRS buffer zone.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3 and Attachment 2</p>

<p>Flood Insurance</p> <p>Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>At the time of the preparation of this environmental review, FEMA had not completed a study to determine flood hazard for the project site; therefore, a flood map has not been published at this time and the project site is not considered to be within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SHRA).</p> <p>However, HUD requires an EA utilize the best-available information. This best-available information relies upon the FEMA completed preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) prepared for the City dated November 12, 2015.</p> <p>This preliminary FIRM identifies the project site as located entirely outside of the 100-year floodplain. This preliminary FIRM also shows a portion of the site (eastern part of the parcel at 735 Davis Street) as located within the 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard, which is the 500-year floodplain. Based on the 2015 Preliminary FIRM and 2015 Floodplain Map the project site is not within a SHRA which is defined as "the area that will be inundated by the flood event having a 1-percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year."</p> <p>While the project will include childcare, considered a "critical action" under 24 CFR 55.2(b) (3), the childcare facility would be located outside of the 500-year floodplain. The project therefore, does not require additional analysis described under the 8-Step Process under Executive Order 11988.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 4, 5, and Attachment 3</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5</p>		
<p>Clean Air</p> <p>Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Criteria Pollutants</u></p> <p>Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated by Placeworks using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.1). Model data and assumptions can be found in Attachment 4, 4a, and 4b. The modeled criteria pollutant emissions were compared to the federal <i>de minimis</i> and local Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) construction and operational thresholds to determine if the project would result in a significant impact.</p> <p><i>Comparison to Federal De Minimis Levels</i></p>

		<p>The modeling results indicate that maximum annual emissions from construction would be approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG); • 2.6 tons per year of nitrogen oxides (NO_x); • 2.4 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO); • 0.3 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀); and • 0.2 tons per year of fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less (PM_{2.5}). <p>Based on the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin's (SFBAAB) marginal nonattainment status for ozone and moderate nonattainment for PM_{2.5}, emissions of ozone precursors and PM_{2.5} would be below the federal <i>de minimis</i> thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{2.5} pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act. Based on the SFBAAB designation as a maintenance area for CO, emissions of CO generated by project construction would be below the Federal <i>de minimis</i> thresholds of 100 tons per year for CO.</p> <p>Operational emissions from the project would result primarily from consumer product, building energy demand (i.e., natural gas), and vehicle use related to the apartment residents. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual emissions from the operation of the project would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2 tons per year of ROG; • 0.7 tons per year of NO_x; • 6.2 tons per year of CO; • 1.3 tons per year of PM₁₀; and • 0.4 tons per year of PM_{2.5}. <p>These emissions would be below the federal <i>de minimis</i> thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG, NO_x, CO and PM_{2.5}.</p> <p><i>Comparison to Bay Area Air Quality Management District Thresholds</i></p> <p>The modeling results indicate that the maximum average daily emissions from construction, excluding fugitive dust, would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32 pounds per day of ROG; • 25 pounds per day of NO_x; • 1 pound per day of exhaust PM₁₀; and
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 pound per day of exhaust PM_{2.5}. <p>The average daily construction emissions would be below the BAAQMD's average daily construction emission thresholds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 54 pounds per day of ROG and NO_x; • 54 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{2.5}; and • 82 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀. <p>It is important to note that the BAAQMD only considers exhaust particulate matter in its thresholds of significance and emphasizes implementation of construction mitigation control measures to ensure that fugitive dust impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Operational emissions from the project would result primarily from consumer product use, building energy demand (i.e., natural gas), and increased vehicle trips by occupants of the project. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual and average daily emissions from the operation of the project would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2 tons per year / 7 pounds per day of ROG; • 0.7 tons per year / 4 pounds per day of NO_x; • 0.03 tons per year / 0.2 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀; and • 0.03 tons per year / 0.1 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{2.5}. <p>These emissions would be below the BAAQMD's maximum annual and average daily operational emission thresholds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 tons per year / 54 pounds per day of ROG and NO_x; • 10 tons per year / 54 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{2.5}; and • 15 tons per year / 82 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀. <p>Consequently, criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation of the project would be less than significant with respect to both federal and local air quality standards.</p> <p><u>Fugitive Dust</u></p> <p>The City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176008, 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 project would</p>
--	--	--

		<p>implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) in compliance with the City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance and BAAQMD fugitive dust control guidelines and these BMPs would be effective in controlling construction-related fugitive dust to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><u>Asbestos Containing Materials and Lead Based Paint</u></p> <p>There is no building currently on the project site, therefore, project activities would not likely result in a release of asbestos containing materials or lead based paint.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and Attachments 4, 4a and 4b</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is not located within Coastal Zone Management Area or San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's (BCDC) area of jurisdiction, which includes the first 100 feet shoreward from the mean high-tide-line around San Francisco Bay; therefore, no formal finding of consistency with BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan is required.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 11 12, and Attachment 5</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances</p> <p>24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site currently contains asphalt parking lots. The project site is located north of the Financial District of San Francisco near the Embarcadero. The area consists of mostly commercial and industrial properties. The two parcels which comprise the project site were originally part of the San Francisco Bay prior to 1853, after which they were filled in with material of unknown origin. The project site was historically used for various industrial uses including as a railyard, cooper shop, and a tank factory. A gasoline service station was operated on the southeast portion of the project site for over four decades until 1999. Most recently, the project site was used as a parking lot.</p> <p>Historical uses and potential hazards for the project site and immediate vicinity were provided by the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker and EnviroStor databases and an EDR database search conducted as part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared for this project.</p>

		<p>The project site is within the expanded Maher Ordinance zone of San Francisco and construction projects within the Maher zone that disturb more than 50 cubic yards of soil require that the project site history (Phase I ESA) and soil quality be assessed (Phase II ESA or ESC) of the material that will be encountered during construction in accordance with Article 22A of the San Francisco Public Health Code. Previous investigations of properties in the vicinity of the project site contained elevated concentrations of lead that exceed California and federal hazardous waste thresholds.</p> <p>While the environmental database search report did not identify any regulated properties within the designated search distances from the project site that may pose an environmental risk in connection with the project site, the Phase I ESA prepared by ENGEO identified several recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with the project site.</p> <p><i>RECS for the 88 Broadway parcel:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property was utilized for industrial processes beginning in the late 1880s that include a railyard, cooper shop, and tank factory. It is possible that polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, petroleum hydrocarbons and metals may remain in the soil and groundwater from this past use. • The property was part of the San Francisco Bay prior to 1853 before being filled with material of unknown origin to achieve the current site grade. The property, underlain by artificial fill is mapped within the limits of the Maher Ordinance program, and thus requires oversight by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). • Between approximately 1956 and 1999, a gasoline service station operated on the southeastern portion of the Property. It is possible that the soil and groundwater were impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons, solvents and metals from the former service station use. • The parcel was used for railcar and/or vehicle parking since at least 1913. Releases of automotive
--	--	---

fluids containing petroleum hydrocarbons and metals from parked vehicles may have affected the near-surface soil.

RECs for 735 Davis Street parcel:

- The western portion of the site was used for industrial processes in the late 1800s that include a rail yard, carriage painting and cooper shops. It is possible that polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, petroleum hydrocarbons and metals may remain in the soil and groundwater from this past use.
- Between about 1956 and 1999, a gasoline service station operated in the southeast portion of the parcel, west of the property. It is possible that the soil and groundwater were impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons and metals from the former service station use.
- The parcel was used for vehicle parking since at least 1956. Releases of automotive fluids containing petroleum hydrocarbons and metals from parked vehicles may have affected the near-surface soil.

Conclusion:

Based on the aforementioned RECs identified during the Phase I investigation, ENGEO proposed Environmental Site Characterization Work Plans to conduct soil, ground water, and soil vapor investigations at both 88 Broadway and 735 Davis Street. Normal grading procedures, including dust control regulations as promulgated by the Department of Building Inspection, routine soil disposal criteria mandated by landfills, and the use of clean approved fill materials on the site, if needed, would adequately mitigate any adverse conditions at the site. Normal construction procedures such as proper work clothing and general health and sanitation procedures such as gloves, and hand washing and smoking prohibitions are required for this site development.

The project site, at 48,620 square feet is approximately 1.1 acres and as such is required to submit a Dust Control Plan.

In addition, because the project is located within the Maher Ordinance zone, it must comply with the Maher Ordinance

		<p>compliance steps (Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code). Disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more would require coordination with SFDPH to determine if additional soil investigation is required. As such, the SFDPH submitted a letter to the project applicant on July 27, 2107 that outlined required remediation and documentation protocol for the proposed Work Plans and for development on the project site. Development of the project with the outlined requirements by the SFDPH would ensure the project would not result in any adverse effects due to hazardous materials. These requirements are included as project mitigation as follows:</p> <p>Mitigation Measures 1 – Site Management Plan (SMP): would require additional site construction guidelines should findings of the Work Plan reports demonstrate adverse hazards, and Mitigation Measure 2 – Health and Safety Plan (HSP): is included to reduce potential health risk to on-site construction workers and the public, and mitigation Measure 3 – Underground Storage Tank Remediation: is included to reduce impacts related to the potential presence of an UST.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and Attachment 6</p>
<p>Endangered Species</p> <p>Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is a disturbed and paved surface parking lot, and does not provide potential habitat for any federally listed species. No federally listed species or proposed for listing or federally designated critical habitats are documented within the project area.</p> <p>No impacts on federally listed species or critical habitat are anticipated as a result of the project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 19, 20, 21, 22 and Attachment 7</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</p> <p>24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>During the Phase I ESA, there was no visual evidence during site reconnaissance of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at or immediately adjacent to the project site. As determined through record searches as part of the Phase I ESA, the nearest above-ground storage tank (AST) is located over 400 feet away.</p> <p>The nearby AST contains approximately 2,000 gallons and has an Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) for thermal</p>

		<p>radiation of 369 feet (if unobstructed). The project site is approximately 429 feet east of the AST, separated by a city block containing several buildings. It is thus located at an acceptable distance.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 13, 14, 76, and Attachment 8</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection</p> <p>Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site consists of urban land; therefore, the project would not affect farmlands (PL 97-98, December 22, 1981). There are no protected farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 23 and Attachment 9</p>
<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As addressed under Flood Insurance above, the project is not located within a 100-year floodplain on a known FEMA floodplain or within the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City dated November 12, 2015.</p> <p>The preliminary/interim flood map shows a portion of the site (eastern part of the parcel at 735 Davis Street) as 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard, which is the 500-year floodplain.</p> <p>While the project will include childcare, considered a "critical action" under 24 CFR 55.2(b) (3), the childcare facility would be located outside of the 500-year floodplain, and therefore does not require additional analysis described under the 8-Step Process under Executive Order 11988.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 4, 5, and Attachment 10</p>
<p>Historic Preservation</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Archeological Resources</u></p> <p>The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for purposes of archaeological resources is limited to the project site. The APE for purposes of historic architectural resources includes adjacent properties. Per Stipulation XI of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) between the City and County of San Francisco and the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), (Consideration And Treatment Of Archeological Resources), MOHCD requested that the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources System at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California, (IC) conduct a records search for the APE.</p>

	<p>The IC responded on April 18, 2017 that there is a moderate to high potential for identifying Native American archaeological resources and a high potential for identifying historic-period archaeological resources in the project area. On May 19, 2017 the SHPO concurred with the recommendations of the IC.</p> <p>Due to this high potential for Native American archaeological resource, correspondence was sent to descendants of Native American Tribes as required by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) regarding the project and no response has been received to date. Correspondence was also sent to those persons and organizations listed in the Neighborhood Group List maintained by the San Francisco Planning Department as well as interested persons and organizations outside the Neighborhood Group.</p> <p>In 2003 an Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP) was prepared by Archeo-Tec. The authors reported on the historical and archaeological background of the area and assessed the possibility of encountering subsurface archaeological resources. They reported that "there is a high potential of encountering materials from the Gold Rush (1849-1859) and later 19th century (1860-1906) periods, and a low potential of encountering prehistoric materials (4000 B.C. – A.D. 1776), or materials from the Contact Period or Spanish/Mexican Period (1776-1849)." An Addendum ARDTP was prepared in May 2017 for the project site and confirmed the findings of the original ARDTP.</p> <p><u>Architectural Resources</u></p> <p>In accordance with Stipulation VII of the PA (Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties) MOHCD commissioned a review of age-eligible properties within and adjacent to the project site by Environmental Science Associates (ESA). Each of these properties was assessed for eligibility for listing in the National Register.</p> <p>Within the APE and adjacent to the project site are two properties that are individually eligible for listing in the National Register. They are 915-921 Front Street and 855</p>
--	--

		<p>Front Street. Six properties in the APE are eligible for listing as contributors to the Northeast Waterfront Historic District.</p> <p>The project site is adjacent to the Northeast Waterfront Historic District, which is a compact zone roughly three blocks square between Telegraph Hill and the Embarcadero, south of Levi's Plaza and north of the Golden Gateway redevelopment complex. It is bounded by Union Street on the north, Sansome Street on the west (including all parcels on both sides of the street), Broadway on the south (including all parcels on the north side and none on the south), and Front Street on the east.</p> <p>The San Francisco Planning Department assessed the effect of the proposed Undertaking on eligible properties as well as its effect on the adjacent Northeast Waterfront Historic District. The Planning Department determined that there would be no adverse effect on eligible properties or on the district itself from the project.</p> <p>A Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) was prepared by Knapp Architects in June 2017. The HRE concludes that the proposed undertaking is compatible with the adjacent historic district for purposes of local and State requirements.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Construction activities at the project site have the potential to disturb archeological deposits as ground disturbing activity to a depth of 160 feet is contemplated. The project is compatible with the adjacent Northeast Waterfront Historic District.</p> <p>A project-specific PA was entered into by MOHCD, the SHPO, and project developers in November 2017.</p> <p>The PA includes measures to avoid adverse effects to buried or submerged historical resources. The terms of the PA include preparation of an Archaeological Testing Program. If a significant archaeological resource is present and could be adversely impacted, the PA requires an Archaeological Data Recovery Program. An Archaeological Monitoring Program may be required as determined by a qualified City Staff Archaeologist and should any archeological resource</p>
--	--	---

		<p>be discovered, the project archeologist shall prepare and submit a Draft Final Archeological Resource Report.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, and Attachment 11 and 11a.</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 type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project would introduce new noise sources to the neighborhood from vehicle use on adjacent and nearby roadways by new residents and visitors. The project would also introduce short-term noises during the construction of the new building.</p> <p><u>HUD Noise Standards</u></p> <p>The acceptable exterior noise levels set forth by HUD regulations for new construction of housing are 65 day-night average sound level (DNL) or less. DNL is a 24-hour average noise level with a 10 decibel (dBA) penalty for noise occurring during the nighttime hours, defined as 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM. The regulations consider the range between 65 dBA DNL and 75 dBA DNL to be normally unacceptable, unless appropriate sound attenuation measures are provided. Unacceptable noise levels set by the HUD regulations are 75 dBA DNL and higher.</p> <p>The San Francisco city-wide background noise level map, developed by the Department of Public Health, shows traffic noise levels at the intersection of Broadway Street and Front Street to be between approximately 65 to 70 dBA DNL at the immediate roadside.</p> <p>The HUD DNL Calculator is an assessment tool that calculates the DNL from roadway and railway traffic as well as from aircraft and loud impulse sounds. ESA modeled noise levels according to the HUD DNL Calculator instructions which requires assessing noise impacts from roadways potentially affecting the project site of up to 1,000 feet away and railways potentially affecting the site of up to 3,000 feet away. The roadways closest to the project site and having the most impact with motor vehicle traffic are Battery Street, Sansome Street, Broadway Street and The Embarcadero. There is one streetcar within 3,000 feet of the project site. The Muni Rail Historic Streetcar, which is located approximately 260 feet from the project site</p>

		<p>buildings to the railway centerline, continues northbound and southbound along The Embarcadero.</p> <p>Transportation noise for Battery Street, Sansome Street, Broadway Street and The Embarcadero as well as the Muni Rail Historic Streetcar were calculated using the HUD DNL Calculator using best data available based on San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority (SFMTA) traffic volumes and Caltrain and SFMTA train headway schedules. The combined DNL exterior noise from these sources was calculated to be 71.4 dBA DNL at the project site buildings.</p> <p>Two airports are located within the preliminary screening distance of the project site. SFO is located approximately 12 miles to the south and Oakland International Airport (OAK) is located approximately 10 miles to the southeast of the project site. However, the project site is located several miles outside of the 60 dBA and 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) airport noise contours based on each airport's respective noise contour map. Consequently, the contribution of airport noise from SFO and OAK would not materially contribute to the noise environment at the project site based on each airport's respective noise contour map and are not included in the HUD DNL Calculator assessment.</p> <p>The resulting exterior noise levels at the project site based on the DNL Calculator would fall within HUD's "normally unacceptable" range from 65 to 75 dBA DNL and measures would be required to reduce interior noise exposure.</p> <p>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 dBA. 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.</p> <p><u>Construction Noise</u></p>
--	--	--

		<p>The nearest noise sensitive receptors to the project site are the residences at 75 Broadway approximately 85 feet to the south of the project site and those at 825 Front Street approximately 70 feet to the west of the project site.</p> <p>The project would demolish the two existing surface parking lots at the site, which provide 180-public parking spaces, and construct two new 65-foot-tall, six-story mixed-use residential buildings. Project construction would consist of off-road equipment along with other construction-related noise sources including vehicle trips for deliveries and construction workers and would be expected to generate noise levels that could impact surrounding noise sensitive receptors. Construction equipment would consist of concrete industrial saws, rubber tired dozers, tractors/loaders/backhoes, cranes, forklifts, cement and mortar mixers, pavers, rollers and air compressors. Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the <i>Police Code</i>). The ordinance requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (e.g., jackhammers, hoe rams, impact wrenches) must have manufacturer-recommended and City-approved mufflers for both intake and exhaust. Section 2908 of the Ordinance prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. The project would be required to comply with regulations set forth in the Noise Ordinance.</p> <p>Construction at the project site generally would be limited to daytime hours. According to the Geotechnical Report prepared for the Project, construction would require either driven piles or auger cast piles to construct the foundation. Pile driving and auger equipment would utilize intake and exhaust mufflers recommended by the manufacturers. Impact equipment such as pile drivers are exempt from the noise ordinance limits provided that such equipment is equipped with manufacturer recommended intake and exhaust mufflers.</p> <p>Construction activities of the project shall comply with the above identified San Francisco Noise Ordinance. Therefore, construction noise impacts from the project would be less than significant.</p>
--	--	---

		Source Document(s): 24-31, 62, 63, and Attachment 12, 12a, 12b, and 12c
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project is not served by a U.S. EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer. Source Document(s): 32, Attachment 13
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project site is not located near, or within, a wetland area. The San Francisco Bay is located over 400 feet from the project site, and separated by an existing parking lot and roads. Therefore, the project would not affect wetland or riparian areas. Source Document(s): 33, Attachment 14.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No federally designated Wild and Scenic Rivers are located within the City and County of San Francisco; therefore, the project would not affect any wild and scenic rivers. Source Document(s): 34, Attachment 15.
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	An environmental justice population is considered to be a local community with a higher representation of people either below the poverty line or with a higher representation of ethnic minorities compared to the regional population. The project site is currently a parking lot and currently houses no population. The project site is located in Census Tract 105 of the 2010 U.S. Census. For the purpose of this analysis, the local population is considered to be the project site census tract, Census Tract 105, while the regional population is the represented by the City of San Francisco as a whole. In order to assess the most current status of the project site, the following data is based on 2016 Census information. Within the project Census Tract 105, approximately 45.1 percent of the population is comprised of ethnic minorities and approximately 8.5 percent of the population has an income below the poverty line.

		<p>Within the City of San Francisco approximately 51.3 percent of the population is comprised of ethnic minorities and approximately 12.5 percent of the population has an income below the poverty level.</p> <p>Because the project site local community has a lower percentage of ethnic minorities and a lower percentage of the population below the poverty line in comparison to the City of San Francisco as a whole, the project community is not considered to have an environmental justice population. However, because the project would introduce an environmental justice population to the area through the development of affordable housing, this analysis further considers project impacts and their potential to disproportionately affect the project's introduced environmental justice population.</p> <p><u>Project Impacts</u></p> <p>From the consideration of regulatory factors in this EA, a number of environmental topics were identified to generate potential effects requiring mitigation. However, because the local population does not represent a concentration on an environmental justice population, impacts would thus be shared by neighboring, non-environmental justice populations, thus the following impacts with their mitigation summarized below do not represent impacts with the potential to disproportionately effect and environmental justice population.</p> <p><i>Air Quality:</i> While construction and operation of the project would result in criteria pollutant emissions at less-than-significant levels with respect to BAAQMD's thresholds of significance, construction would result in fugitive dust. However, through implementation of the City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176008, effective July 30, 2008, San Francisco Health Code Article 22B, and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.3.2.6), measures to control fugitive dust would be implemented to ensure that construction projects do not result in visible dust. The project would implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) in compliance with the City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance and BAAQMD fugitive dust control guidelines and these BMPs would be effective in controlling</p>
--	--	--

		<p>construction-related fugitive dust to below a threshold level.</p> <p><i>Construction Noise:</i> The project would introduce new noise sources to the neighborhood from vehicle use on adjacent and nearby roadways by new residents and visitors. The project would also introduce short-term noises during the construction of the new building. The nearest noise sensitive receptors to the project site are the residences at 75 Broadway approximately 85 feet to the south of the project site and those at 825 Front Street approximately 70 feet to the west of the project site. However, because construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code), which requires: 1) that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source, 2) that impact tools (e.g., jackhammers, hoe rams, impact wrenches) have manufacturer-recommended and City-approved mufflers for both intake and exhaust, and 3) prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., the project would reduce impacts related to construction noise. Therefore, construction noise impacts from the project would be below the City's threshold criteria.</p> <p><i>Operational Noise:</i> HUD DNL Calculator estimates that exterior noise levels at the project site would be within HUD's "normally unacceptable" range, thus indicating low-income residents housed within the new building could be exposed to excess noise. However, since the project will need to comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations which establishes noise insulation standards, interior noises levels would meet interior noise goals of HUD and the State of California. As such, there is no potential for excess exterior noise to impact an environmental justice population.</p> <p><i>Hazardous Materials:</i> There is a potential for construction work to disturb contaminated soils. However, compliance with San Francisco Health Code Article 22A will require actions for safe handling and treatment of hazardous materials. Since no environmental justice populations were identified to be present in the vicinity of the project site, no disproportionate impacts to environmental justice</p>
--	--	--

		<p>populations as a result of disturbance of contaminated soils and groundwater during construction would occur.</p> <p><i>Geology and Soils:</i> The project site is in a seismically active region; the San Andreas, San Gregorio, and Hayward Faults are the closest major faults, but none of them are located within five miles of the project site. The site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, but the San Francisco Planning Department's CatEx Determination Layers Map shows that the project site is within a designated liquefaction hazard zone. Because development of the site would be required to adhere to the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC), this would reduce any potential impacts of liquefaction and landslides as a result of seismic activities. The SFBC derives from the adopted 2013 California Building Code. This code is administered and enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI), and compliance with all provisions is mandatory for all new development and redevelopment in the City. Throughout the permitting, design, and construction phases of a building project, Planning Department staff, DBI engineers, and DBI building inspectors confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <p>Overall, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts which would create permanent adverse effects in the project area existing populations, or to an introduced environmental justice population.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 35, 36, 37, 38 and Attachment 16.</p>
--	--	---

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

page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

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

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

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	<p>The project site is located within the North Beach neighborhood within the northeastern portion of the City of San Francisco. The project area is located one block west of Pier 7, Pier 9, and the Embarcadero. Land uses in the area include commercial, office, mixed-use, and residential uses. The project site occurs on a block that contains two office building.</p> <p>The project site is currently zoned as C-2: <i>Community Business</i> by the City of San Francisco. Based on this zoning designation, this district is meant to serve several functions, including providing convenience goods and services to residential areas and providing comparison shopping goods and services. While this district includes an off-street parking ration requirement, the project does not include parking and as such will obtain a Planning Unit Development (PUD) modification as part of its City Planning Department project review process to exempt this requirement.</p> <p>The project occurs within the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan of the San Francisco General Plan. The Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan seeks to re-integrate the waterfront area with the rest of the City of San Francisco and to connect community centers, residential areas, and employment centers. By providing mixed use services including commercial, childcare, and residential units, the project would not substantially conflict with any goals or policies of the overall General Plan or those within the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan.</p> <p>The project site is within the boundaries of the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Land Use Plan and the City of San Francisco's Northeast Embarcadero Study area. The Waterfront Land Use Plan was adopted in 1997 to guide development, leases, management, and maintenance of the San Francisco Waterfront area. The project, with its planned residential, commercial, and retail spaces, is consistent with the Waterfront Land Use</p>

		<p>Plan approved land uses. The Northeast Embarcadero Study was approved in 2010 and seeks to guide development of areas along the west side of the Embarcadero and make sure that new development is compatible with the context of historic buildings. The project is compatible with the heights and context of the surrounding neighborhood as evaluated in the HRE.</p> <p>Overall, the project is consistent with relevant land use/zoning plans.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 39, 40, 41, and 42</p>
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	2	<p><u>Geology and Soils</u></p> <p>The project site is located in the Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province which extends along the California coast south to the Transverse Ranges and north to the Oregon border. The site is located between the San Andreas fault zone and the western margin of the San Francisco Bay. The site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.</p> <p>The San Francisco Planning Department's CatEx Determination Layers Map shows that the project site is within a designated liquefaction hazard zone. Previous studies at the site indicate that liquefaction-induced settlements and ground deformation may be up to approximately 10 inches at the site.</p> <p>However, development of the site will be required to adhere to the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC), thereby mitigating potential impacts. The SFBC derives from the adopted 2013 California Building Code. This code is administered and enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI), and compliance with all provisions is mandatory for all new development and redevelopment in the City. Throughout the permitting, design, and construction phases of a building project, Planning Department staff, DBI engineers, and DBI building inspectors confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations.</p> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <p>The project site is currently entirely paved, serving as a parking area. This area will be replaced by residential structures, and will remain similarly impervious. Stormwater runoff from project construction would continue to drain into the combined sewer and stormwater system and be treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. Pursuant to the San Francisco Public Works Code, including the Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance and the San Francisco Green Building Code, the project sponsor would be required to implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth BMPs to reduce</p>

		<p>potential runoff and erosion impacts. The project would construct all improvements according to the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance, which requires treatment of all runoff prior to leaving the site. The proposed stormwater management system for the project would collect, detain and potentially retain some stormwater within the project site such that the rate and amount of stormwater runoff from the site does not negatively impact the City's treatment facilities, and in a manner that is consistent with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) Stormwater Design Guidelines. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that the project would not substantially degrade water quality during either construction or operation.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 45, 46, and 47</p>
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise	2	<p><u>Hazardous Materials</u></p> <p>As described above in "Contamination and Toxic Substances," historical records and potential hazards for the project site and immediate vicinity were reviewed. Compliance with the outlined procedures from the July 27, 2017 letter from the San Francisco Department of Public Health under Article 22A, as described in Mitigation Measures 1, 2, and 3, would ensure all potential impacts related to hazardous materials are reduced such that the project would neither result in impacts to the environment nor generate risks for future residents.</p> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Construction noise as discussed above in "Noise Abatement and Control" would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24-31, 62, 63, and Attachment 6, and 12, 12a, 12b, and 12c</p>
Energy Consumption	2	<p>The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulation as enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building. 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.</p> <p>New residential buildings are required to achieve at least 75 GreenPoints from the GreenPoints Multi-family New Construction Checklist, or Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) "Silver" certification. Since the project would be required to meet renewable energy criteria of the Green Building Code, it would further reduce consumption on non-renewable fuel sources. As such the project would not have a substantial effect on the use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	1	<p>The project site is currently a surface parking lot and removal would not displace a substantial number of jobs. Construction of the project site would result in temporary, construction job growth at the project site. It is estimated that the project would generate an estimated 55 new employees, based on the expected creation of 6,800 square feet of multi-purpose/property management offices/lobby space (4,800 square feet in family housing building and 2,000 square feet in the senior housing building), 4,300-square-foot childcare facility, and 6,200 square feet of commercial space [based on average of 350 square feet of space per employee for retail, childcare, and commercial space and 276 square feet per employee in office space].</p> <p>It is expected that construction work and retail/childcare/office work would be accommodated by the existing employment pool. No adverse impacts are anticipated from the project on employment and income within the project area.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 48</p>
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	1	<p><u>Demographics</u></p> <p>The project would provide a multi-family affordable housing structure on the project site. Furthermore, this project would provide affordable housing consistent with the needs established in the Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area. As the project is consistent with the planned use of the site, no adverse demographic changes are anticipated.</p> <p><u>Displacement</u></p> <p>The project involves the construction of a multi-family residential structure on a parking lot which would create an estimated 55 job and provide housing for an estimated 402 residents. The project would not displace existing residents, rather provide for more. In addition, while the project would remove the existing jobs provided by the parking lot attendance service, by generating an estimate 55 jobs the removal of existing employees would be offset by the creation of new jobs. Thus the project would result in no adverse effects to displacement but rather, provide a net benefit to new residents and jobs.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 44</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p>The project would not displace educational or cultural facilities. The project will be served by the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). The public schools that serve the project site include Chin Elementary at 350 Broadway, Francisco Middle School at 2190 Powell Street, and Galileo High School at 1150 Francisco Street.</p> <p>Based on the 2015 SFUSD Demographic Analyses, affordable housing units generate approximately 0.31 students per unit. Since the project's family housing building would have 125 affordable dwelling units, the project would result in an estimated increase in enrollment in the SFUSD of 39 students (it is assumed that the senior housing building with 53 affordable housing units would not generate additional students). This minor increase in enrollment would not exceed the projected student capacities that are expected and provided for by the SFUSD.</p> <p>Cultural facilities within the City of San Francisco are accessible from the project site within walking distance and via public transportation. The nearby area to the project site has cultural facilities such as Eureka Theater, the San Francisco Playhouse, and the Beat Museum which are within walking distance; other cultural facilities are available by public transit.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 58 and 59</p>
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>The North Beach Neighborhood around the project site consists of various land uses, including mixed-use, commercial, and residential uses. The surrounding uses include television broadcasting offices to the north, a public parking lot to the east, a four-story, mixed-use building to the south, and a public parking structure to the west.</p> <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. For example, there is a "Safeway" grocery store located two blocks south of the project site and a "Walgreens" pharmacy retailer located 0.4 miles south. The project residents would contribute to the ongoing vitality of these types of commercial facilities.</p> <p>The project will create space designated for office and commercial uses, including a childcare facility available for public use. Since the project site is currently vacant, there is no onsite existing retail and commercial services to be adversely affected or displaced by the project.</p>

Health Care and Social Services	2	<p>The project will not impact any health care or social service facilities. The nearest hospitals and medical centers include the Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, located 3.6 miles south of the project site, the California Pacific Medical Center – Pacific Campus, approximately 2 miles west of the project site, and the Saint Francis Memorial Hospital, approximately 1.7 miles southwest.</p> <p>Social services are located both within a convenient and reasonable distance to residents of the project. Furthermore, there is adequate public transportation available from the project to these services.</p>
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	<p>Recology, Inc. provides residential and commercial solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services for the City of San Francisco. Recyclable materials are taken to Recology's Pier 96 facility, where they are separated into commodities (e.g., aluminum, glass, and paper) and transported to other users for reprocessing. Compostables (e.g., food waste, plant trimmings, soiled paper) are transferred to a Recology composting facility in Solano County, where they are converted to soil amendment and compost. The remaining material is transported to a landfill.</p> <p>In September 2015, San Francisco approved an Agreement with Recology, Inc., for the transport and disposal of the City's municipal solid waste at the Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. The City began disposing its municipal solid waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in January 2016, and is anticipated to continue for approximately nine years, with an option to renew the Agreement thereafter for an additional six years. The Recology Hay Road Landfill is permitted to accept up to 2,400 tons of waste per day, and, at this maximum rate of acceptance, the landfill has permitted capacity to continue to receive waste approximately through the year 2034.</p> <p>Construction and demolition (C&D) debris in the City must be transported by a registered transporter to a registered facility that can process mixed C&D debris pursuant to the City and County of San Francisco C&D Ordinance. The Ordinance requires that at least 65 percent of C&D debris from a site go to a registered C&D recycling facility. This requirement is augmented by the Green Building Ordinance, which requires that at least 75 percent of C&D debris be diverted from landfills. Compliance with this regulation would ensure any impact from construction debris is appropriately minimized.</p> <p>During operation, the project would be subject to the City's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires the separation of refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, thereby minimizing solid waste disposal and maximizing recycling and composting. Although the project could incrementally increase total waste generation from the City by</p>

		<p>increasing the number of residents at the project site, the increasing rate of diversion through recycling and other methods would result in a decreasing share of total waste that requires deposition into the landfill.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 50, 51, and 52</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 operated by SFPUC. Wastewater generated at the project site would be treated by SFPUC, which provides wastewater collection and transfer service in the City. SFPUC has a combined sewer and wastewater system, which collects sewage and stormwater in the same pipe network. San Francisco comprises two drainage basins, Bayside and Westside, which collect wastewater and stormwater from the east and west sides of the City, respectively, which are further divided into five distinct urban watersheds.</p> <p>Combined wastewater and stormwater from the project area is transported for treatment to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. Treated wastewater is discharged to San Francisco Bay through outfalls at Pier 80 (dry and wet weather), and in Islais Creek (wet weather). The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant has a dry weather capacity of 85.4 million gallons per day (mgd); during wet weather, the plant processes up to 250 mgd of combined wastewater.</p> <p>The combined sewer and wastewater system currently operates under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits. The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant is currently operating under the 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 permits prohibit overflows from the combined sewer and wastewater system structures during dry weather and require wet-weather overflows to comply with the nine minimum controls specified in the federal combined sewer and wastewater system Control Policy.</p> <p>Implementation of the project, which consists of development of up to 178 dwelling units and a total of approximately 17,500-square-feet of commercial/retail, office, and community space, would incrementally increase the demand for wastewater treatment services (excludes 11,000 square feet of residential services e.g. laundry, mechanical, trash rooms, etc.). Based on the U.S. Census 2010, average household size in the City and County of San Francisco is 2.26 persons per household. The development of 178 new housing units would increase the citywide</p>

		<p>population by an estimated 402 persons. Based on the <i>2015 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco</i> (UWMP) estimate of average water consumption for residents of 44 gallons per day per capita and 37 gallons per day per capita for employees in San Francisco (and assuming all this water enters sewer/stormwater drains), the project would increase wastewater flows by approximately 19,720 gallons per day. This increase in wastewater flow would signify only an increase of 0.03 percent of the current average daily wastewater flows of 60 million gallons per day to the Southwest Water Pollution Control Plant, or 0.02 percent of the total dry weather flow capacity of this wastewater treatment plant. The project would incrementally increase demand for and use of waste water and sanitary sewer services, but not in excess of existing capacity.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 43, 49, 53, 54, and 56</p>
Water Supply	2	<p>Water would be provided to the project by SFPUC. SFPUC forecasted future water demand using regional growth projections that incorporate existing land use designations and reasonably foreseeable future projects within San Francisco. According to the 2015 UWMP and the updated retail demand forecasts contained in the 2013 Water Availability Study, the SFPUC would be able to meet the future demand in years of average precipitation as well as during a single dry year. In a multiple dry year event, SFPUC could experience shortages (1.2% of total demand) in 2040 during years 2 and 3 without development of additional supply concepts.</p> <p>Based on the 2015 UWMP estimate of average water consumption for residents of 44 gallons per day per capita and 37 gallons per day per capita for employees in San Francisco, the project would increase water usage by approximately 19,720 gallons per day. In the Water Availability Study for the City and County of San Francisco, SFPUC estimates an additional 500,000 gallons of water per day is needed to keep up with future demand; the project represents 3.9% of this additional demand estimate. Since additional water is already planned to be developed for San Francisco to match expected future growth and the project is infill development consistent with the planned use of the site, the water demand from the project is expected to be accommodated by existing and planned supply.</p> <p>Source Information: 43, 55 and 56</p>
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	<p>The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provides police protection in the City and County of San Francisco. Police service is provided to the project site primarily by the San Francisco Police Department's Central Station, at 766 Vallejo Street (approximately 0.7 miles away).</p>

		<p>The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) provides fire suppression services and unified emergency medical services (EMS) and transport, including basic life support and advanced life support services, in the City and County of San Francisco. Fire protection to the project site is provided primarily by the San Francisco Fire Department's Station 13, at 530 Sansome Street (at Washington Street, approximately 0.27 miles southwest), Station 2, at 1340 Powell Street (at Broadway, approximately 0.59 miles to the west), and Station 28, at 1814 Stockton Street (at Greenwich Street, approximately 0.56 miles to the northwest). If one or more of the engine or truck companies were to be out of service at the time of an alarm, the next closest available unit would respond.</p> <p>Emergency medical transportation to San Francisco hospitals is provided by a dynamically deployed fleet of both public and private ambulance services. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes.</p> <p>Implementation of the project could increase the demand for fire protection, emergency medical and police protection services. However, the increase would be incremental, funded largely through project-related increases to the City's tax base, and would not be substantial given the overall demand for such services on a citywide basis. Fire protection, emergency medical, and police protection resources are regularly redeployed based on need in order to maintain acceptable service ratios.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 60, 61a, 61b</p>
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	<p>Sydney G. Walton Square is a public park located approximately 500 feet south of the project site. The 5.3-acre Sue Bierman Park, formerly called Ferry Park, is located 0.3 miles southeast of the project site. Piers 7 and 9 and the Embarcadero are located one block east of the project site; these areas are commonly used for recreational purposes. The Betty Ong Recreational Center is located 0.9 miles west of the project site and features basketball courts, a playground, and a recreation center/gym. The project would also provide over 12,000 square feet of open space available to residents through courtyards and rooftop gardens. Residents of the project would utilize project provided open space in addition to existing parks, open space, and public recreational facilities.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 57</p>
Transportation and Accessibility	2	<p>The project site is infill development that is adequately served by existing pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and parking facilities. San Francisco utilizes vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a screening criteria for determining if a</p>

	<p>project would have a significant effect on the transportation environment. The existing residential VMT per capita for the project site traffic analysis zone (TAZ) is 2.6, with a forecast of 2.2 in 2040. The regional residential VMT per capita minus 15% is currently 14.6 with a forecast of 13.7 in 2040. The residential VMT for the project area is projected to be substantially lower than the region and thus the project is not anticipated to significantly affect area traffic.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 39a, 39b</p>
--	---

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	<p>No known unique natural, or water features are present onsite. Implementation of the project would not affect water resources, nor would it increase demands on groundwater resources. As noted above, water service would be provided by SFPUC. No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 33</p>
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	<p>The project site is currently a parking lot and does not support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife species.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 19, 20, 21, 22</p>
Other Factors	2	<p><u>Greenhouse Gas</u></p> <p>In August 2016, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued its Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews. The CEQ's Final Guidance directs that analysis include the impact of the project on climate and the impact of climate change on the project. Pursuant to Executive Order 13783, "Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth," of March 28, 2017, the guidance was withdrawn for further consideration. As explained in the Notice of Availability, the withdrawn guidance was not a regulation. In lieu of any other federal guidance for assessing GHG impacts, this analysis applies the methodology of the local Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).</p> <p>The quantitative threshold of 4.6 metric tons of CO₂e (MTCO₂e) per service population per year proposed by BAAQMD in its 2009</p>

	<p>Justification Report and published in its 2017 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Guidelines is applied in this analysis. The BAAQMD threshold excludes GHG emissions associated with construction. Nonetheless, the BAAQMD encourages lead agencies to evaluate and assess the significance of construction GHG emissions. Other air districts in California have recommended methodologies for evaluating construction GHG emissions. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County states that "lead agencies may decide to amortize the level of short-term construction emissions over the expected (long-term) operational life of a project." Consistent with SMAQMD guidance, GHG emissions from construction, which are temporary, have been amortized over an assumed 30-year lifetime of the project and included in the project's operational GHG emissions. Amortizing construction GHG emissions and including them in a project's operational GHG emissions is consistent with current CEQA practices for evaluating temporary construction-related GHG emissions.</p> <p>CaleEMod (version 2016.3.1) was used to estimate construction and operational-related greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the project to determine if it would exceed the BAAQMD quantitative threshold of 4.6 MTCO₂e per service population per year. Model results indicate that total GHG emissions from construction would be approximately 481 MTCO₂e. When amortized over 30 years, construction would contribute approximately 16 MTCO₂e to the project's annual operational GHG emissions over a 30-year lifetime. The estimated annual operational emission from project operations would be approximately 1,696 MTCO₂e. The combined amortized construction and annual operational GHG emissions would be approximately 1,712 MTCO₂e per year. Dividing these total emissions by the estimated project service population of 55 employees and 402 residents' results in GHG emissions of 3.7 MTCO₂e per year per service population, which would be below the local significance threshold of 4.6 MTCO₂e per year per service population. The number of residents was estimated based on the U.S. Census 2010, average household size in the City and County of San Francisco of 2.26 persons. Thus, the project would not substantially impact climate change by way of generated greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Source(s): 6, 7, 10, and 77</p>
--	---

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

1. April 19, 2017; Environmental Science Associates (ESA). Historic Buildings Primary Records for the Department of Parks and Recreation.
2. October 10, 2016; ENGEO Incorporated. Phase I Investigation.
3. May 19, and May 20, 2017; ENGEO Incorporated. Geotechnical Investigation for Family and Senior Housing at 88 Broadway and 735 Davis Street.

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

1. City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2012 (November). Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport. Available: ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Consolidated_CCAG_ALUCP_November-20121.pdf. Prepared by Ricondo & Associates, Inc., Jacobs Consultancy, and Clarion. Accessed April 19, 2017.
2. Alameda County, 2012 (December). Oakland International Airport Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Prepared by ESA. Available at: www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/OAK_ALUCP_122010_FULL.pdf. Accessed April 18, 2017.
3. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2017. Results of Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper electronic database search for San Francisco, California. Available: www.fws.gov/cbra/Maps/Mapper.html. Accessed April 19, 2017.
4. City and County of San Francisco, Office of the City Administrator, November 12, 2015. Interim Floodplain Map, SE San Francisco. Available: sfgsa.org/sites/default/files/Document/SF_SE.pdf. Accessed April 18, 2017.
5. U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2015. Flood Map Service Center, San Francisco County. Available: msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor. Accessed April 18, 2017.
6. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), July 2016. Available at: caleemod.com/. Accessed June 21, 2017.
7. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2017. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017. Available at: www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines. Accessed June 21, 2017.
8. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 2017. 2008 Ground-level Ozone Nonattainment Areas (2008 Standard). Available: www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/map8hr_2008.html. Accessed September 27, 2017.
9. USEPA, 2016. General Conformity De Minimis Levels, August 4, 2017. Available: www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables. Accessed August 23, 2017.
10. BAAQMD, 2009. Revised Draft Options and Justification Report California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance.
11. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2017. Coastal Zone Management Program. Office for Coastal Management. Available: coast.noaa.gov/czm/mystate/. Accessed April 19, 2017.
12. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. San Francisco Bay Plan. Adopted in 1968. Reprinted in March 2012. Available at: www.bcdc.ca.gov/plans/sfbay_plan. Accessed April 17, 2017.
13. ENGEO, 2017. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 88 Broadway, San Francisco, California, APN 0140-007. February 13, 2017.
14. ENGEO, 2017. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 735 Davis Property, San Francisco, California, APN 0140-008. February 13, 2017.
15. City of San Francisco, 2015. Expanded Maher Area, March 2015. Available: www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/library_of_cartography/Maher%20Map.pdf. Accessed April 18, 2017.
16. California State Water Resources Control Board, 2016. GeoTracker. Available: geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=88+Broadway%2C+San+Francisco. Accessed April 18, 2017.
17. California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2016. EnviroStor. Available: www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mapfull.asp?global_id=&x=-119&y=37&z=18&ms=640,480&mt=m&findaddress=True&city=88%20broadway,%20san%20francisco&zip

- =&county=&federal_superfund=true&state_response=true&voluntary_cleanup=true&school_cleanup=true&ca_site=true&tiered_permit=true&evaluation=true&military_evaluation=true&school_investigation=true&operating=true&post_closure=true&non_operating=true Accessed April 18, 2017.
18. City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health, 2017. SFHC Article 22A Compliance Letter/ 88 Broadway and 735 Davis Street Development/ 88 BROADWAY AND 735 DAVIS STREETS, SAN FRANCISCO, CA. EHB-SAM NO.: SMED 1580. Sent from Mamdouh Awwad, REHS, Senior Environmental Health Inspector on July 27, 2015 July 27, 2017.
 19. U.S. 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-1815, Event Code: 08ESMF00-2017-E-04600). Accessed on April 18, 2017. Updated on November 1, 2017 Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2018-SLI-0306, Event Code: 08ESMF00-2018-E-00819
 20. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2017. USFWS ArcGIS Online: Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species. Available at: fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77. Accessed April 19, 2017.
 21. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017. California Natural Diversity Database, Results of electronic records search for wildlife. Sacramento, California: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat Data Analysis Branch. [USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles San Francisco North, Point Bonita, San Rafael, San Quentin, Richmond, Oakland West, Hunters Point, San Francisco South]. Accessed April 19, 2017. Results reviewed and updated November 1, 2017
 22. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017. California Natural Diversity Database, Results of electronic records search for plants and fungi. Sacramento, California: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat Data Analysis Branch. [USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles San Francisco North, Point Bonita, San Rafael, San Quentin, Richmond, Oakland West, Hunters Point, San Francisco South]. Accessed April 19, 2017. Results reviewed and updated November 1, 2017
 23. Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2017. Custom Soil Resource Report for San Mateo County Eastern Part, and San Francisco County, California. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available: websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed April 18, 2017.
 24. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Noise Guidebook, March 2009. Available: www.hudexchange.info/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/. Accessed August 23, 2017
 25. San Francisco Department of Public Health, March 2009. Areas Potentially Requiring Noise Insulations. March 2009. Accessed August 23, 2017.
 26. Federal Highway Administration, January 2006. Construction Noise Model User's Guide. Available: www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2017.
 27. San Francisco Metropolitan Transit Agency (SFMTA). Traffic Count Data 1995 – 2015, March 2014. Available: www.sfmta.com/about-sfmta/reports/sfmta-traffic-count-data-1995-2015. Accessed August 23, 2017.
 28. SFMTA. Muni Map, Revised May 2016. Prepared by David Wiggins and Jay Primus. Available: www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/maps/2016/16-13070_GF_C1_16-13070_GF_SFMTA-Metro-May2016_web-150-jhi.pdf. Accessed August 18, 2017.
 29. Oakland International Airport Master Plan, March 2006. Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) Contours 2004 and 2010 (Figure 6.17).
 30. Final 14 Code of Federal Regulations Part 150, August 13, 2015. Study Update Noise Exposure Map Report for San Francisco International Airport- 2019 Noise Exposure Map.
 31. San Francisco Planning Department, 2010. Draft EIR/EIS Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan EIR- SCH No. 2010112029, Appendix 4.8A, 2014.
 32. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017. Sole Source Aquifers in Region 9. Available: www3.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html. Accessed April 18, 2017.
 33. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2017. National Wetlands Inventory, Results of electronic mapping search. Available: www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html. Accessed April 18, 2017.
 34. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 2017. Electronic Database Search for National Wild and Scenic Rivers in California. Available: www.rivers.gov/index.php. Accessed on April 18, 2017.
 35. United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census), 2010. 2010 CENSUS - CENSUS TRACT REFERENCE MAP: San Francisco County (075). Available at: www2.census.gov/geo/maps/dc10map/tract/st06_ca/c06075_san_francisco/DC10CT_C06075_004.pdf.

36. United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census), "Poverty Thresholds for 2015 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years," available at: www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html. Accessed May 5, 2017.
37. United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census), "Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months," American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 2012–2016, Available at: factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_16_5YR_S1701&prodType=table. Accessed December 18, 2017.
38. United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census), "ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates," American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 2012–2016, Available at: factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_16_5YR_DP05&prodType=table. Accessed December 18, 2017.
39. San Francisco Planning Department, 2016. San Francisco Transportation Information Map. Available at: sftransportationmap.org/. Accessed May 5, 2017.
40. City of San Francisco Planning Department, 2013. NorthEastern Waterfront Plan Area. Available at: generalplan.sfplanning.org/NE_Waterfront.htm. Accessed May 8, 2017.
41. San Francisco Planning Department, 2010. Northeast Embarcadero Study. Available at: 208.121.200.84/ftp/files/Citywide/NES/Northeast_Embarcadero_Study_Report_June2010.pdf. Accessed May 8, 2017.
42. Port of San Francisco, 1997. Waterfront Land Use Plan – The Northeast Waterfront. Available at: sfport.com/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/8521-ch4NEWf.pdf. Accessed May 8, 2017.
43. Metropolitan Transportation Commission – Association of Bay Area Governments (MTC-ABAG). Available at: www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/counties/SanFranciscoCounty.htm. Accessed May 8, 2017.
44. Association of Bay Area Governments. Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area 2014–2022. Available: abag.ca.gov/files/ABAG_Final_RHNA_Publication.pdf. Accessed May 5, 2017.
45. San Francisco Planning Department, March 17, 2015. CatEx Determination Layers. Available at: sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/catexposter.pdf. Accessed May 8, 2017.
46. ENGEO, 2016. Geotechnical Feasibility Study, San Francisco, CA. Prepared for BRIDGE Housing, San Francisco, CA. October, 13, 2016.
47. California Department of Conservation (DOC), 2000. Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the City and County of San Francisco, California. Available at: gmw.consrv.ca.gov/SHP/EZRIM/Reports/SHZR/SHZR_043_City_And_County_of_San_Francisco.pdf. Accessed May 8, 2017.
48. City and County of San Francisco, 2002. Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review. Available at: sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/6753-Transportation_Impact_Analysis_Guidelines.pdf. Accessed May 8, 2017.
49. SFPUC, 2014. San Francisco's Wastewater Treatment Facilities. Available at: sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=5801. Accessed May 8, 2017.
50. California Integrated Waste Management Board, 2016. Solid Waste Information System. Available: www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/48-AA-0002/Detail/. Accessed May 8, 2017.
51. City and County of San Francisco, 2015. Notice of Availability of and Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for the Agreement for Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. Available: www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1828. Accessed May 8, 2017.
52. San Francisco Planning Department, Agreement for the Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste and Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County, Case No. 2014.0653E, Final Negative Declaration, July 21, 2015. Available: sfmea.sfplanning.org/2014.0653E_Revised_FND.pdf. Accessed May 8, 2017.
53. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, ORDER NO. R2-2013-0029, NPDES NO. CA0037664. Available: www.gsweventcenter.com/Appeal_Response_References/2013_0819_RWQCB.pdf. Accessed May 5, 2017.
54. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2015. SSIP On the Bayside. Available at: sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=785. Accessed May 8, 2017.
55. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), 2013 *Water Availability Study for the City and County of San Francisco*, May 2013. Available online at www.sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3589. Accessed May 8, 2017.
56. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), 2015 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco, June 2016. Available online at www.sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9300. Accessed May 8, 2017.

57. San Francisco Recreation and Parks, 2017. Parks and Open Space. Available at: sfrecpark.org/parks-open-spaces/. Accessed May 8, 2017.
58. Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc, Demographic Analyses and Enrollment Forecasts for the San Francisco Unified School District, November 23, 2015. Available: www.sfusd.edu/en/assets/sfusd-staff/about-SFUSD/files/demographic-analyses-enrollment-forecast.pdf. Accessed May 5, 2017
59. San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) Capital Plan FY 2010-2019. Available at: www.sfusd.edu/en/assets/sfusd-staff/about-SFUSD/files/capital-plan-final-2010-2019.pdf. Accessed May 5, 2017.
60. San Francisco Police, 2015. City and County of San Francisco Streets and Police Districts. Available at: sanfranciscopolice.org/sites/default/files/Citywide_District_Map.pdf. Accessed May 8, 2017.
61. San Francisco Fire Department, 2017. City and County of San Francisco Fire Department Fire Station Locations. Available at: sf-fire.org/fire-station-locations. Accessed May 8, 2017.
62. San Francisco Planning Department, 2015. Event Center and Mixed-Use Development at Mission Bay Blocks 29-32 EIR, SCH No. 2014112045, Appendix NO.
63. American Legal Publishing Corporation, 2015. Article 29: Regulation of Noise. Available: [library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/police/policecode?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\\$sync=1](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/police/policecode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sync=1). Accessed September 27, 2017.
64. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), 2017a. Primary Record for APN 0136-003. Prepared by ESA June 5, 2017.
65. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), 2017b. Primary Record for APN 0137-001. Prepared by ESA June 5, 2017.
66. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), 2017c. Primary Record for APN 0140-001. Prepared by ESA June 5, 2017.
67. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), 2017d. Primary Record for APN 0140-005. Prepared by ESA June 5, 2017.
68. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), 2017e. Primary Record for APN 0141-005. Prepared by ESA June 5, 2017.
69. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), 2017f. Primary Record for APN 0141-003B. Prepared by ESA June 5, 2017.
70. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), 2017g. Primary Record for APN 0141-013. Prepared by ESA June 5, 2017.
71. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), 2017h. Primary Record for APN 0166-001. Prepared by ESA June 5, 2017
72. Knapp Architects, Historic Resource Evaluation: 88 Broadway & 735 Davis Street, Draft, January 2017, and Final June 2017.
73. Northwest Information Center, 2017. Record Search Results for the Proposed 88 Broadway/735 Davis Street Project. File No: 16-1552, prepared April 18, 2017.
74. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 2017. Letter to Eugene Flannery Ref: Proposed 88 Broadway and 735 Davis Street Projects/ City and County of San Francisco, CA. Sent on August 9, 2017.
75. WSA, 2017. Final Addendum Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan for 88 Broadway/ 735 Davis Street San Francisco. Prepared May 2017.
76. HUD Exchange, 2017. HUD Acceptable Separation Distance Electronic Assessment Tool. Available at: www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/asd-calculator/. Accessed April 19, 2017.
77. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, December 2008, updated September 2016. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County.

Attachments:

1. Airport Hazards Worksheet
2. Coastal Barrier Resource
3. Flood Insurance Worksheet
4. Air Quality Worksheet
 - a. Criteria Pollutant Emission Summary and CalEEMod Output
 - b. Construction Emissions 2016
5. Coastal Zone Management Worksheet

6. Site Contamination (Multi-Family) Worksheet
7. Endangered Species Act Worksheet
8. Explosive and Flammable Facilities Worksheet
9. Farmlands Protection Worksheet
10. Floodplain Management Worksheet
11. Historic Preservation Worksheet
 - a. Project-Specific Programmatic Agreement
12. Noise Abatement and Control Worksheet
 - a. Noise Assessment Preparation Calculations
 - b. HUD DNEL Calculator
 - c. SFMTA Route KT 2016 data
13. Sole Source Aquifers Worksheet
14. Wetland Protection Worksheet
15. Wild and Scenic Rivers Worksheet
16. Environmental Justice Worksheet

List of Permits Obtained:

Due to City of San Francisco Planning procedures, the project would require the following permits:

Planning Commission:

- Approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) for new construction within the Article 10 Northeast Waterfront Historic District (Waterfront Special Use District No. 3).
- Approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) per Planning Code Section 304. Implementation of the proposed project would require modification of the following Planning Code requirements through the approval of a PUD. PUD modifications for the rear yard configuration per Sections 130/134, dwelling unit exposure for 14 family housing units and three senior housing units located on the mid-block passage per Section 140, bay window requirements per Section 136(c)(2), active use depth setback per Section 145.1, the childcare parking requirement per Section 151, and on-street loading per Section 152.
- Approval of an Affordable Housing Project Authorization per Planning Code Section 315.

Approval Action:

The approval of the Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission pursuant to Planning Code Section 304 constitutes the Approval Action for the proposed project, pursuant to Section 31.04(h)(3) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determination pursuant to Section 31.6(d) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Actions by Other City Departments (approving bodies noted in parentheses):

- Approval of a site permit (Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection).
- Approval of demolition, grading, and building permits (Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection).
- Approval of permits for streetscape improvements in the public right-of-way, including a curb cut on Front Street (San Francisco Public Works).

- Approval of a waiver for providing nine fewer trees than required under Public Works Code Section 806 (San Francisco Public Works).
- Approval of a request for curb cut, color curb, and on-street parking changes on Front Street, Vallejo Street, and Davis Street (SFMTA).
- Approval of project compliance with the Stormwater Design Guidelines (San Francisco Public Utilities Commission).
- Approval of a Stormwater Control Plan (San Francisco Public Utilities Commission).
- Issuance of a certification of registration for a diesel backup generator (San Francisco Department of Public Health).
- Approval of a Site Mitigation Plan, Soil Mitigation Plan, and Dust Control Plan prior to commencement of excavation work pursuant to the Maher Ordinance (Department of Public Health).

Actions by Other Government Agencies

- Approval of permit for installation, operation, and testing of diesel backup generator (Bay Area Air Quality Management District).

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]:

On March 15, 2017 the design for proposed new construction of two buildings within the Northeast Waterfront Landmark District was brought to the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the San Francisco Historic Preservation Committee.

A notice of availability of the EA and FONSI will also be published.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

A cumulative impact is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. Projects within the vicinity of the project which would contribute to the reasonably foreseeable cumulative environment. These include five projects located within a 1/4-mile radius of the project that are currently under construction or the subject of an Environmental Evaluation Application on file with the San Francisco Planning Department. They include Teatro ZinZanni, a retail and hotel project at 439 Washington Street; a housing, retail, and hotel project at 447 Battery Street; an office project at 300 Clay Street; and a retail, office, and museum project at 940 Battery Street. This analysis focuses on whether the project's contribution to potential cumulative impacts would be significant. The project would have no adverse impacts with respect to the following issues and thus would not contribute meaningfully to any potential cumulative impacts for these issues: issues are not discussed further: Airport Hazards, Coastal Resources/Coastal Zone, Flood Insurance/Floodplain, Endangered Species, Explosive and Flammable Hazards, Farmlands, Sole Source Aquifers, Wetland, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Environmental Justice, Land Use Planning, Socioeconomics and Natural Features. These issues are not discussed further.

With respect to *Contamination and Toxic Substances, Site Hazards and Soils*, impacts related to these issues are limited to the project site itself and thus are not considered cumulative in nature.

Measures identified to reduce potential adverse effects related to hazards are included in this EA and are described under *Mitigation Measures and Conditions*, below.

With respect to *Historic Preservation*, the HRE has taken into consideration the development of the project in the context of the built neighborhood and determined it to be consistent. New development within or adjacent to the Northeast Waterfront Historic District will be required to complete similar design review to ensure consistency with the Historic District.

As identified above under *Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations Listed at 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5- Clean Air Act*, the project would not exceed the federal *de minimis* thresholds pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act or local BAAQMD for construction or operation. These thresholds are designed with development of the entire air basin in mind and thus are cumulative in nature. As the project is below these thresholds, the project's contribution to potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Within the reasonably foreseeable cumulative environment, building construction would result in temporary increases to noise levels. The project would be required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the *Police Code*). The ordinance requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source, and the project would result in less than significant impacts to noise. Similarly, construction of nearby projects would be regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. With implementation of noise reducing measures during construction, the project's contribution to potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

With regard to *Community Facilities and Services and Energy Consumption*, the project has been considered in the context of development within the City of San Francisco. As the development is consistent with the allowable land use of the site, the development has been property accounted for in growth planning for public services and utilities.

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 North Beach neighborhood area and is consistent with development planned at the project site. A larger development could have greater impacts on the human environment although they may be mitigated depending on the size of the development. A smaller development would not maximize the potential use of the property for affordable housing and would not serve to avoid any impacts.

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

Summary of Findings and Conclusions: For Hazards and Hazardous Materials the project would result in minor adverse but mitigable impacts. No impacts are potentially significant to the extent that an Environmental Impact Statement would be required. The project would result

primarily in less than significant impacts to the environment with beneficial socioeconomic impacts.

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

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

Mitigation Measure 1 – Site Mitigation Plan:

Contingent upon the findings of the submitted 88 Broadway and 735 Davis Street Environmental Site Characterization Work Plan reports that characterize soil and groundwater in accordance with the requirements of San Francisco Health Code Article 22A, if the site investigation indicates the presence of a hazardous materials release, a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) shall be prepared. The SMP shall specify the actions that will be implemented to mitigate the significant environmental or health and safety risks caused or likely to be caused by the presence of the identified release of hazardous materials including soil vapor intrusion. The SMP shall identify, as appropriate, such measures as excavation, containment, or treatment of the hazardous materials, monitoring and follow-up testing, and procedures for safe handling and transportation of the excavated materials, or for protecting the integrity of the cover or for addressing emissions from remedial activities, consistent with the requirements set forth in Article 22A.

Mitigation Measure 2 - Health and Safety Plan (HASP):

The project applicant shall develop and implement a comprehensive HASP, which will be prepared by a certified industrial hygienist (CIH) on behalf of the contractor and submitted to the San Francisco Environmental Health Branch-Site Assessment and Mitigation (EHB-SAM) per the requirements of the San Francisco Department of Public Health. The purpose of the HASP is to provide field personnel with an understanding of the potential chemical and physical hazards, protection of any off-site receptors, procedures for entering the project site, health and safety procedures, and emergency response to hazards should they occur. All project personnel shall read and adhere to the procedures established in this HASP. A copy of this plan will be kept on site during field activities and will be reviewed and updated as necessary. The HASP plan will describe the training requirements, i.e. trained in accordance with 29 CFR Section 1910.120 (HAZWOPER training), specific personal hygiene, and monitoring equipment that will be used during construction to protect construction workers and the general public from exposure to constituents in the soil.

Mitigation Measure 3 – Underground Storage Tank (UST) Remediation:

Should an UST be encountered, work will be suspended and the owner notified. The site owner or their representative shall notify the San Francisco Department of Public Health of the situation and of the proposed response actions. The UST shall be removed under permit with the San Francisco Department of Public Health-Hazardous Materials and Waste Program (HMWP) and the San Francisco Fire Department. DPH SAM should be sent a copy of permits and tank closure reports prepared for HMWP or the Fire Department. Should contamination be found at the site in

areas that were not tested (elevator pit final depth), appropriate characterization and disposal to a licensed landfill is required.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance (San Francisco Health Code Article 22B, and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.3.2.6)	All site preparation work, demolition, or other construction in San Francisco that could create dust or expose or disturb more than 10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of soil, must comply with specified dust control measures.
24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	It is a HUD goal that the interior auditory environment shall not exceed a day-night average sound level of 45 decibels.
Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations	Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or DNL) of at least 45 decibels.
San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code)	The ordinance established acceptable noise levels for construction activities unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works.
San Francisco Building Code	The San Francisco Building Code derives from the adopted 2013 California Building Code. This code is administered and enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI), and compliance with all provisions is mandatory for all new development and redevelopment in the City. Throughout the permitting, design, and construction phases of a building project, Planning Department staff, DBI engineers, and DBI building inspectors confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations.
Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code (Maher Ordinance)	Disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more of soil within a designated Article 22A area would require coordination with San Francisco Department of Public Health to determine if additional soil investigation is required, including that the project site history (Phase I ESA) and soil quality be assessed (Phase II ESA or ESC). As such, the SFDPH submitted a letter to the project applicant on July 27, 2017 that outlined required remediation and documentation protocol for the proposed Work Plans and for development on the project site. Development of the project with the outlined requirements by the SFDPH and as included as Project-specific mitigation measures 1, 2 and 3, above would ensure the project would not result in any adverse effects due to hazardous materials.

Project-Specific Programmatic Agreement (PA; Attachment 11a)

The PA includes measures to avoid adverse effects to buried or submerged historical resources. The terms of the PA include preparation of an Archaeological Testing Program. If a significant archaeological resource is present and could be adversely impacted, the PA requires an Archaeological Data Recovery Program. An Archaeological Monitoring Program may be required as determined by a qualified City Staff Archaeologist and should any archeological resource be discovered, the project archeologist shall prepare and submit a Draft Final Archeological Resource Report.

Determination:

☒ **Finding of No Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]

The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

☐ **Finding of Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]

The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Preparer Signature: Jennifer Wade Date: January 2, 2018

Name/Title/Organization: Jennifer Wade Robertson / Program Manager / ESA

Certifying Officer Signature: [Signature] Date: 1-2-18

Name/Title: Katha Hartley, Director, MOHCD

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