



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

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

Project Information

Project Name: Casa-de-la-Misión

HEROS Number: 900000010011524

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

RE Preparer: Eugene Flannery

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Katha Hartley

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Point of Contact:

Consultant (if applicable):

Point of Contact:

Project Location: 3001 24th St, San Francisco, CA 94110

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Direct Comments to: Eugene T. Flannery
MOHCD
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Eugene.flannery@sfgov.org

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

The proposed project, Casa de la Misión, is the mixed-use development of 50 units of low-income housing for seniors and 1,900-2,500 square feet of commercial space. Development of the housing will include site acquisition, demolition of two existing structures and the construction of a six story structure. The 6,000 square foot ground floor will include a lobby, housing management office and non profit or retail space. The second through sixth floors will house 50 studio apartments including a staff unit. The site is located at 3001-3013 24th Street in San Francisco's Mission District.

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

The proposed project will provide affordable housing to homeless and very low income seniors. The 2010 Census counted 154,730 or 19% of San Francisco's population as 60 years or older. San Francisco's elderly population is expected to grow to 205,000 by 2020 and to 360,800 by 2040; this growth is consistent with national trends. The recent Census also estimated that 30% of all San Francisco households have one or more persons over 65 years old. About 33,869 elderly householders, representing about 51% of all households in 2010, lived alone. Senior citizens have different housing needs especially as they develop health problems or experience decreased mobility. The 2010 Census estimated that 40% of persons 65 and over have mobility or self-care limitations. Older and disabled adults who require long-term care have a need for a broad range of on-site and off-site services including central dining, transportation services, limited or complete medical care, recreational and other services. For seniors living independently, there is a need for safe and easily maintained dwelling units. Forty per cent of all elderly and one- to two-person households overpay; generally a larger proportion of lower income households have heavier housing burdens. The City needs to address the housing needs of an aging homeless population. This includes the targeted provision of permanent supportive housing (PSH)--defined broadly as subsidized housing matched with ongoing supportive health and social services--towards particularly high need individuals who may be likely to stay in hospitals for extended periods or require expensive nursing home care in the absence of a PSH placement.

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

San Francisco is one of the highest-cost housing markets in the nation and a large proportion of residents must pay over 30% of their income on rent. Market rents in San Francisco impose a particularly severe cost burden on low-income renters, particularly seniors, low-income families, and persons with disabilities. Ninety-six percent of the households with an extreme rent burden earn less than 50% of the area median income. Recent studies suggests that the single adult homeless population is aging even after accounting for the aging of the overall U.S. population. Amidst great concern about the impact of an aging populace on health care systems and social welfare program, evidence of a separate aging trend in the homeless population merits closer investigation. This is especially true in light of a wealth of evidence showing that poor health and homelessness are closely intertwined; that homeless persons, by virtue of their elevated use of health and behavioral health services, place increased demand on health care systems and providers.

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

<https://www.google.com/maps/place/3001+24th+St,+San+Francisco,+CA>

Determination:

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

Approval Documents:

[MOCD-Color_52870.pdf](#)

7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer on:

7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer on:

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
B-15-MC-06-0016	CPD	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)	\$1,000,000.00
M15-MC0602-13	CPD	HOME Program	\$1,000,000.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$2,000,000.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$50,000,000.00

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project site is 44,567 feet of the nearest airport. It is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.
Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

<p>amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>		
<p>Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>FEMA has not completed a study to determine flood hazard for the selected location; therefore, a flood map has not been published at this time. However, the City and County of San Francisco has prepared Preliminary Flood Plain Maps. The structure or insurable property is not located in either a designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5</p>		
<p>Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The project's county or air quality management district is in non-attainment status for the following: Ozone, Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns. This project does not exceed de minimis emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is the Coastal Zone Management Act, federally designated State coastal management sections 307(c) & (d) agency for the San Francisco segment of the California coastal zone. The project site is 5300 feet from the Coastal Zone Management Area or BCDC's area of jurisdiction, which includes the first 100 feet shoreward from the mean high tide-line around San Francisco Bay; therefore, no formal finding of consistency with BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan is required. This project is not</p>

		located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances were found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property. The adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.
Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project will have No Effect on listed species based on the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service's online critical habitat mapper. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Based on the project description the project has No Potential to Cause Effects. The project is in compliance with Section 106.
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was normally unacceptable: 73.4 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation with mitigation.

Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

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

Impact Codes: An impact code from the following list has been used to make the determination of impact for each factor.

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

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The site is within the Mission Area of San Francisco and is governed by the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan (Plan). The proposed project is consistent with the Plan in that it meets the objectives of providing affordable housing in a mixed use neighborhood. The site is zoned NCT- 24th-Mission Neighborhood Commercial Transit. The 24th Street Mission Neighborhood	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>Commercial Transit District controls are designed to provide potential for new development consistent with the existing scale and character. Most commercial uses are encouraged at the ground story, while service uses are permitted with some limitations at the second story. Parking is not required, and any new parking required to be set back or below ground. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. The height, architectural design will be harmonious with the existing character of the neighborhood. In accordance with the Plan the increased height is necessary for an area that is expected to see significant new development or should have increased height to support the city's public transit infrastructure</p>	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	<p>The proposed project site is within a built-up urban area and is served by the storm drainage system of the City and County of San Francisco. The project site would be mostly covered by impervious surfaces, so the proposed project would not result in erosion impacts on-site or off-site. The project site is in a seismically active region of California. Earthquakes in the San Francisco Bay Area have the potential to produce strong ground shaking at the site. The</p>	Conduct Soil Survey

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>project would involve the demolition of the existing buildings and construction of 40 affordable housing units. The City and County of San Francisco requires that all new buildings be constructed to the most current building code standards, which would address concerns related to liquefaction. The proposed development would not involve topographic modifications and minimal ground disturbing activity. There is no evidence of substantial erosion problems on the project site and none would result from proposed construction activities, which involves minimal grading and other ground disturbance. Development on the project site would be subject to the permitting requirement of the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations. As part of this permitting process, DBI would review the final building plans and require that they conform to the recommendations in a Geotechnical Survey to be prepared for the proposed project. The report will include design and structural requirements to address geologic hazards and soil suitability per San Francisco current building codes. Therefore, potential damage to</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		structures from soil suitability would be addressed through the permitting requirement and would not represent an adverse effect.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	3	Demolition and construction noise	Mitigation Measure 1. Construction activities of the Proposed Action shall comply with 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. Impact tools, such as jackhammers and impact wrenches, must have both intake and exhaust muffled to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Section 2908 of the Ordinance prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., if noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works.
Energy Consumption/Energy Efficiency	2	The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulation as enforced by the DBI. In addition, San Francisco's Green Building Code places	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>more stringent energy, materials, and construction debris management requirements on new residential buildings than Title 24. New residential buildings are required to achieve at least 75 GreenPoints from the GreenPoints Multi-family New Construction Checklist, or LEED a??Silvera? certification. Other than natural gas and coal fuel used to generate the electricity for the project, the project would not have a substantial effect on the use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource</p>	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	<p>Construction on the project site would provide over 100 full-time construction jobs but is not expected to affect employment in the long term. No impact is anticipated from the project on employment and income within the project area.</p>	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	<p>Demographics: The project would not result in physical barriers or reduced access that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group. Construction would result in temporary, construction job growth at the project site as a result of the project. It is anticipated that construction employees not already living in San Francisco would commute from elsewhere in the Bay Area rather than relocating to the</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>Mission area for a temporary construction assignment. Thus, construction is not anticipated to generate a substantial, unplanned population increase. The project would develop 40 affordable housing units onsite resulting in permanent changes to population in the project area; however, additional affordable housing is needed to keep pace with anticipated demands from growth established in the Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area.</p> <p>Displacement The project would not displace existing and thus there would be no impact with respect to displacement.</p>	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	<p>The project would not displace educational or cultural facilities. Cultural facilities within the City are accessible from the project site within walking distance and via public transportation. The neighborhood has cultural facilities such as the Brava Theater, Galleria de la Raza and Theater Rhinoceros that are within walking distance and other cultural facilities that are available by public transit. Since the project will serve seniors, there will be no increase in student population caused by the proposed development.</p>	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	<p>The project site is within adequate and convenient distance to retail services that</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>provide essential items such as food, medicine, banks and other convenience shopping. Existing retail and commercial services will not be adversely impacted or displaced by the project. The project also provides room for retail space on the first floor which will serve the area.</p>	
<p>Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The proposed project will house senior homeless persons and will not increase the population of the area as the potential residents are present in the neighborhood. By housing currently homeless seniors, the project will improve their health by providing shelter. This will reduce the demand for health care services. There are five public health facilities in the Mission Neighborhood, not including San Francisco General Hospital which is within three blocks. All five health clinics are either within walking distance or a short bus ride. Social services are located both within a convenient and reasonable distance to residents of the proposed project. Furthermore, there is adequate public transportation available from the proposed project to these services.</p>	
<p>Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Recology, Inc. provides residential and commercial solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services for the City of San Francisco. Recyclable materials are taken</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>to Recology's Pier 96 facility, where they are separated into commodities (e.g., aluminum, glass, and paper) and transported to other users for reprocessing. Compostables (e.g., food waste, plant trimmings, soiled paper) are transferred to a Recology composting facility in Solano County, where they are converted to soil amendment and compost. The remaining material is transported to a landfill. In September 2015, San Francisco approved an Agreement with Recology, Inc., for the transport and disposal of the City's municipal solid waste at the Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. The City began disposing its municipal solid waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in January 2016, and is anticipated to continue for approximately nine years, with an option to renew the Agreement thereafter for an additional six years. The Recology Hay Road Landfill is permitted to accept up to 2,400 tons of waste per day, and, at this maximum rate of acceptance, the landfill has permitted capacity to continue to receive waste approximately through the year 2077. The proposed project would be subject to the City's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires the separation of</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, thereby minimizing solid waste disposal and maximizing recycling and composting. Although the proposed project could incrementally increase total waste generation from the City by increasing the number of residents at the project site, the increasing rate of diversion through recycling and other methods would result in a decreasing share of total waste that requires deposition into the landfill.</p>	
<p>Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	2	<p>The project site is within an urban area that is well served by the combined sewer/stormwater collection, storage and treatment facilities and is in an area where projected population and employment growth has been accounted for by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Wastewater generated at the project site would be treated by the SFPUC, which provides wastewater collection and transfer service in the City. The SFPUC has a combined sewer and wastewater system, which collects sewage and stormwater in the same pipe network. San Francisco comprises two drainage basins: Bayside and Westside drainage basins, which collect wastewater and stormwater from the east and west sides of the City, respectively, which</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>are further divided into five distinct urban watersheds. The project site is located in the Channel urban watershed, which is the largest urban watershed in the Bayside Drainage basin. Combined wastewater and stormwater from the project area is transported for treatment to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. Treated wastewater is discharged to San Francisco Bay through outfalls at Pier 80 (dry and wet weather), and in Islais Creek (wet weather). During dry weather, the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant has a dry weather capacity of 84.5 million gallons per day (mgd). During wet weather, the plant processes up to 250 mgd of combined wastewater. The combined sewer and wastewater system currently operates under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits. The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant is currently operating under the 2008 NPDES Permit No. CA0037664 (Order No. R2-2008-0007) issued and enforced by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, which monitors discharge prohibitions, dry-weather effluent limitations, wet-weather effluent performance criteria, receiving water limitations, sludge management practices, and</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>monitoring and reporting requirements. The permits prohibit overflows from the combined sewer and wastewater system structures during dry weather and require wet-weather overflows to comply with the nine minimum controls specified in the federal combined sewer and wastewater system Control Policy. The proposed project would incrementally increase demand for and use of waste water and sanitary sewer services, but not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in this area.</p>	
<p>Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Water would be provided to the proposed project by the SFPUC. The SFPUC forecasted future water demand using regional growth projections that incorporate existing land use designations and reasonably foreseeable future projects within San Francisco. According to the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco (UWMP) and the updated retail demand forecasts contained in the 2013 Water Availability Study, the SFPUC would be able to meet the future demand in years of average precipitation as well as in a single dry year and a multiple dry year event, for each five-year projection beginning in 2020. Implementation of the proposed project, which</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>consists of the development of 86 dwelling units, would incrementally increase the demand for water in San Francisco. Since proposed project water demand could be accommodated by the existing and planned supply anticipated under SFPUCa??s UWMP, it would not result in a substantial increase in water use on the project site that could not be accommodated by existing water supply entitlements and water resources</p>	
<p>Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), headquartered at 850 Bryant Street, provides police protection in the City and County of San Francisco. The project site would be served by the Mission Police Station located at 1240 Valencia Street, approximately .5 miles from the project site. The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), headquartered at 698 Second Street, provides fire suppression services and unified emergency medical services (EMS) and transport, including basic life support and advanced life support services, in the City and County of San Francisco. The project site would be served by the SFFD through two fire stations near the project site, Fire Station No 1 at 935 Folsom Street, at Fifth Street, and Fire Station No. 8 at 36 Bluxome Street, at Fourth</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>Street. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes. Implementation of the proposed project could increase the demand for fire protection, emergency medical and police protection services. However, the increase would be incremental, funded largely through project-related increases to the City's tax base, and would not be substantial given the overall demand for such services on a citywide basis. Fire protection, emergency medical, and police protection resources are regularly redeployed based on need in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. Moreover, the proximity of the project site to Fire Station No. 7 would help minimize Fire Department and Police Department response times should incidents occur at the project site. Source Document(s): 26, 27</p>	
<p>Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Within four blocks of the project site is the Mission Rec Center. Dolores Park is within .8 of a mile and Cesar Chavez Park is within half a mile. Mission Rec Center provides a full indoor gymnasium, multiple recreational/physical fitness rooms, outdoor basketball and volleyball courts, and a playground. Dolores Park provides soccer</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		fields, tennis courts, green space and outdoor musical events. Residents of the project would utilize existing parks, open space and public recreational facilities	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	The project traffic impact area is encompassed by Harrison Street to the east, Balmy Street to the west, 24th Street to the north, and 25th Street to the south. Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers trip rate of 4.20 average daily trips per unit for high-rise apartments and 42.94 average daily trips per 1,000 sf for retail space, the residential segment of the proposed project (50 residential units) would generate 210 average daily trips (and the non-residential segment of the project (5,000 sf) would generate 214 average daily trips. The incremental increase in vehicle trips to the site that would result from the proposed buildout would incrementally increase traffic and congestion in the vicinity, but would not substantially adversely affect the local circulation system. Most if not all of future residents would be expected to make use of the robust transit opportunities available within four blocks of the site, including a BART station and several bus lines. The commercial uses would be primarily accessed by foot traffic from the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore,	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>proposed buildout of the project site would not result in substantial adverse effects on area roadways or intersection operations. Transit: The project area is well served by public transit, with public bus routes 9, 14, 22, 33, and 49 and BART providing service in the immediate vicinity. The nearest BART stop is the 24th Street Station located at the intersection of 24th Street and Mission Street, approximately 4 blocks from the project site. The proposed project would not increase transit demand. Future development of the site may potentially increase transit demand due to new residents on the project site or increased visitation to the project site, but this additional demand would not reasonably be expected to noticeably affect transit service or result in substantial adverse effects on transit. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on transit service.</p> <p>Pedestrian: Next to the project site, the sidewalks are approximately 10 feet wide on Harrison Street and 24th Street. Crosswalks are provided at the adjacent intersections of Harrison Street and 24th Street. Overall, the sidewalks and crosswalks in the area operate satisfactorily, with pedestrians moving at normal walking speeds and with</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>freedom to pass other pedestrians. The proposed project transfer would not generate new pedestrian trips, and would not create unsafe conditions for pedestrians or cause crowding on nearby sidewalks. Future development of the site may generate new pedestrian trips, but these additional trips would not reasonably be expected to result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians or cause crowding on nearby sidewalks, considering the existing mixed-use, urban setting of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>Bicycles: The proposed project would not generate new bicycle trips, and would not create unsafe conditions for cyclists. The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on bicycle facilities.</p> <p>Loading: Off-street loading spaces are required in different quantities based on the proposed onsite use, based on the City Planning code. Loading activity associated with the proposed project would be related to tenant move-ins and move-outs, garbage pickup, and/or deliveries to retail uses. Future development on the project site would be required to comply with the City Planning Code requirements, and would therefore be</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		reasonably anticipated to include required loading spaces. Additionally, there would be curb space available along 24th Street and Harrison Street, for garbage as well as additional loading and unloading needs. No project impacts are identified. Parking: The housing development on the project site would not include parking spaces.	
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	Future onsite development would not affect water resources, nor would it use groundwater resources. As noted above, water service at the project site would be provided by the SFPUC. Further, future development on the project site would not discharge effluent into surface water or groundwater. No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site. The Pacific Ocean is approximately six miles from the project site. Wastewater at the project site would be collected and treated by the combined sewage and stormwater system. Stormwater: No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site. The Pacific Ocean is approximately six miles from the project site and could be indirectly affected by stormwater runoff from the proposed project that enters	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>the combined sewer system. As discussed above, future development on the project site would be required to comply with all applicable federal and local water quality and wastewater discharge requirements. Therefore, stormwater effects on surface water resulting from the proposed project would not be significant. The project site is flat and developed with structures. No unique features are on the site, and no active agricultural lands are on or near the site.</p>	
<p>Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)</p>	3	<p>The project site is developed with buildings, and is surrounded by urban development. There is no landscaping or vegetation within the parcel to be developed. There are six nonnative trees commonly used for landscaping in urban areas on the project site??s norther and eastern boundaries. Future development of the project site may require removal of these trees. The existing trees could be suitable nesting habitat for a variety of migratory bird species, most likely birds adapted to urban areas, such as pigeon (<i>Columba spp.</i>) and American crow (<i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i>). These species are not listed as endangered or threatened; however, bird species are protected by both federal law (Migratory Bird</p>	<p>Bird Nest Preconstruction Survey: The project sponsor for future onsite development shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction breeding season surveys (approximately March 15 through August 30) of the project site and immediate vicinity during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin, in consultation with the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Fish and Game. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed project, the results of the survey would be valid only for the season during which it is conducted. Bird Nest</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>Treaty Act of 1918) and state regulations (California Department of Fish and Game Code, Sections 3503 and 3513). Tree removal associated with future development on the project site could result in a "take," caused by the direct mortality of adult or young birds, nest destruction, or disturbance of nesting native bird species (including migratory birds and other special status species), resulting in nest abandonment or the loss of reproductive effort. Disruption of nesting birds, resulting in the abandonment of active nests or the loss of active nests through structure removal, could be a substantial adverse effect</p>	<p>Buffer Zone: The project sponsor, in consultation with the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Fish and Game, would delay construction in the vicinity of active bird nests on or next to the project site during the breeding season (approximately March 15 through August 30), while the nest is occupied with adults or young. If active nests are identified, construction would not occur within 500 feet of the nest. A qualified biologist would monitor the active nest until the young have fledged, until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or if it is reasonable that construction is not disturbing nesting behavior. The buffer zone would be delineated by highly visible, temporary construction fencing.</p>
Other Factors	3	<p>Balmy Alley Murals may be impacted by the proposed development. The murals need to be assessed for significance as a cultural resource.</p>	<p>A. As part of review processes mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act or by San Francisco ordinances, the Project Sponsor shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, documentation of the Balmy Avenue Murals for determination of eligibility as a historic resource and</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
			cultural resource in accordance to California and National Register Criteria. B. The work above will be carried out by a qualified art historian with expertise in the field of culturally significant murals. C. The selection of the qualified art historian will be subject to the approval of the San Francisco Planning Department.

Supporting documentation

- [SlopeMap.pdf](#)
- [Seismic and Slope Map.pdf](#)
- [Recreation.pdf](#)
- [Proximity to Parks.pdf](#)
- [LegendSFA.pdf](#)
- https://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/styles/472x222_nostyl.pdf
- <http://www.sfindicatorproject.org/indicators/view/114.pdf>
- <http://www.sfindicatorproject.org/indicators/view/8.pdf>
- <http://www.sfhealthnetwork.org/primary-care-3.pdf>
- <http://sfrecpark.org/destination/mission-rec-center.pdf>
- <http://explore.museumca.org/creeks/images/TitleBlockSF.gif.pdf>
- <http://explore.museumca.org/creeks/images/OBSFMapB.pdf>
- <http://explore.museumca.org/creeks/1640-RescMission.html.pdf>
- [Height and Bulk.pdf](#)
- [Gardens.pdf](#)
- [eastern_neighborhoods_map.pdf](#)
- [0-0-0-1440.pdf](#)
- [0-0-0-1332.pdf](#)
- [The project traffic impact area is encompassed by Harrison Street to the east.docx](#)
- [Mission District Service Guide.pdf](#)
- [ArtsNCulture.pdf](#)
- [1975-Station Location Map - w FS51.pdf](#)
- [24th Street 3001 SF Planning Report.pdf](#)

Additional Studies Performed:

Supplemental Information Form, 3001 - 3021 24th Street, San Francisco, CA; Page & Turnbull
September 2008

[eastern_neighborhoods_map\(1\).pdf](#)
[Mission District Service Guide\(1\).pdf](#)
[ArtsNCulture\(1\).pdf](#)
[1975-Station Location Map - w FS51\(1\).pdf](#)
[24th Street 3001 SF Planning Report\(1\).pdf](#)
[301-3021 24h St Page & Turnbull 2008.pdf](#)

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed by:

Rincon Associates

5/13/2016 12:00:00 AM

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

[Source List.pdf](#)

List of Permits Obtained:

San Francisco Planning Department, California Environmental Quality Act Review San Francisco Planning Department, Zoning Administrator, rear yard modification per Planning code 134(e) Department of Building Inspection: Demolition, grading and building permits for the demolition of the existing buildings and construction of the new building San Francisco Public Works: Sidewalk permits for any modifications San Francisco Public Utilities Commission: Approval of any changes to sewer laterals.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

The Combined FONSI and Notice of Intent to Request Release of Funds was published in the San Francisco Examiner, mailed to residences and business within 300 foot radius of the project site and distributed to the interested parties on the attached list.

[Resident Mailing List.xlsx](#)
[Mailing list of agencies.xlsx](#)

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The proposed project is located in the Mission Area neighborhood which is one of three areas of the Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan for which the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department prepared a California Environmental Impact Report in 2006. As the CEQA review was for an area plan which contemplated the inclusion of the proposed project and covers an appropriate time frame of 20 years and a relevant geographic scope, it is being used as the basis of this cumulative impact analysis. The time frame for the review contemplated a twenty year implementation period, which would end in 2026 and the area for the review is shown on the attached map. The EIR analyzed potential environmental effects associated with a range of rezoning options proposed by the San Francisco Planning Department for East SoMa, the Mission, Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods. The EIR identified potential impacts that could not be eliminated or reduced to an insignificant level as those limited to effects on land use, historical resources, transportation and shadow. Land Use

Impacts: The 24th Street Corridor, in which the proposed project site is located, has been rezoned as a Neighborhood Commercial-Transit (NC-T) District as a result of the adoption of the Eastern Neighborhood Plan. As an NC-T, this primarily residential district would not permit most Production, Distribution and Retail (PDR) uses. Since the significant impacts related to land use involve PDR only, and the proposed project does not affect existing PDR uses it does not contribute to the cumulative impacts related to land use. Historical Resources: The existing building was determined to be ineligible for listing on the National Register and hence its demolition would not contribute to the cumulative impacts on historic resources contemplated by the EIR prepared for the area plan. Additionally, no archeological resources are located on the site and hence the project would not contribute to the cumulative impacts identified in the Area Plan. Transportation: Transit: Cumulative transit impacts would include significant, unavoidable impacts on seven Muni lines (lines 9, 22, 26, 27, 33, 48 and 49). However, since the project is the development of 50 units of senior housing, the proposed project's incremental contribution is cumulatively small and thus insignificant. The San Francisco MTA has identified mitigation measures to reduce these impacts. They include the identification of new funding source(s), to supplement the City's Transit Impact Development Fee program for non-residential uses, to enable Muni to accommodate projected transit demand within the Eastern Neighborhoods and the remainder of the City, including meeting capital needs such as bus storage. Additionally, further mitigation would include additional and enhanced Muni service, transit priority on certain streets, improvement of transportation demand management, establishment of a coordinated planning process to link land use planning and development in the Eastern Neighborhoods to transit and other alternative transportation mode planning in the eastern portion of the City. However, it is not anticipated that the significant adverse effects on Muni service could be fully mitigated, and therefore the project's contribution to the cumulative effect on Muni service is insignificant. Shadow: the EIR assessed the shadow effects on publicly accessible areas, including public parks, publicly-accessible private open spaces, and sidewalks. The proposed project is not close enough to a public park or to publicly-accessible private open spaces to cause shadowing. The extent and duration of shadow on public sidewalks could increase along 24th Street. However, this new shadow would not be in excess of that which would be expected in a highly urban area. The project would not result in additional cumulative impacts from future related actions.

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

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

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

The no action alternative would mean that the project site is not developed with affordable housing. Due to the lack of available development sites within the City it is likely that the project site would be developed with either residential, commercial, office, or mixed uses.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The project would require implementation of mitigation measures related to Contamination and Toxic Substances, Noise Abatement and Control, Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff, Hazards and Nuisances, Vegetation / Wildlife (Bird Nest Preconstruction Survey) and preservation of murals in Balmy Alley. No impacts are potentially significant to the extent that an EIS would be required. The project does contribute to cumulative impacts related to transportation, specifically to the increase in demand on nine public transit bus routes. The project would increase the inventory of affordable housing and reduce the incidence of homelessness among low-income seniors as well as decreasing their exposure to crime, illness, and social isolation.

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

Summarized below 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.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
Contamination and Toxic Substances	Phase II Environmental Site Assessment to be conducted and recommendations followed.	N/A	
Noise Abatement and Control	Mitigation Measure 1. Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations establishes uniform noise insulation standards for residential projects. Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or DNL) of at least 45 dB. The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall and floor/ceiling assemblies meet state standards regarding sound transmission. Compliance with this requirement would ensure that interior noise levels of the project residential units would meet the interior noise goal of HUD and the State of California.	N/A	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water	Conduct Soil Survey	N/A	

Runoff			
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	<p>Mitigation Measure 1. Construction activities of the Proposed Action shall comply with 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. Impact tools, such as jackhammers and impact wrenches, must have both intake and exhaust muffled to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Section 2908 of the Ordinance prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., if noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works.</p>	N/A	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	<p>Bird Nest Preconstruction Survey: The project sponsor for future onsite development shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction breeding season surveys (approximately March 15 through August 30) of the project site and immediate vicinity during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin, in consultation with the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Fish and Game. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed project, the results of the survey would be valid only for the season during which it is conducted. Bird Nest Buffer Zone: The project sponsor, in consultation with the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Fish and Game, would delay construction in the vicinity of active bird nests on or next to the project site during the breeding season (approximately March 15 through August 30), while the nest is occupied with adults or young. If active nests are identified, construction would not occur within 500</p>	N/A	

	<p>feet of the nest. A qualified biologist would monitor the active nest until the young have fledged, until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or if it is reasonable that construction is not disturbing nesting behavior. The buffer zone would be delineated by highly visible, temporary construction fencing.</p>		
<p>Other Factors</p>	<p>A. As part of review processes mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act or by San Francisco ordinances, the Project Sponsor shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, documentation of the Balmy Avenue Murals for determination of eligibility as a historic resource and cultural resource in accordance to California and National Register Criteria. B. The work above will be carried out by a qualified art historian with expertise in the field of culturally significant murals. C. The selection of the qualified art historian will be subject to the approval of the San Francisco Planning Department.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Permits, reviews and approvals</p>	<p>San Francisco Planning Department, California Environmental Quality Act Review San Francisco Planning Department, Zoning Administrator, rear yard modification per Planning code 134(e) Department of Building Inspection: Demolition, grading and building permits for the demolition of the existing buildings and construction of the new building San Francisco Public Works: Sidewalk permits for any modifications San Francisco Public Utilities Commission: Approval of any changes to sewer laterals.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

Mitigation Plan

See attached mitigation plan.

[Casa de la Mision Mitigation Monitoring Plan.docx](#)

Supporting documentation on completed measures

APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

Airport Hazards

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

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

No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project site is 44,567 feet of the nearest airport. It is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.

Supporting documentation

[SFO to 3001 24th Street.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Coastal Barrier Resources

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

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

Compliance Determination

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Flood Insurance

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

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

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

Yes

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

[SF_NE PFIRM.pdf](#)

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

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

No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

FEMA has not completed a study to determine flood hazard for the selected location; therefore, a flood map has not been published at this time. However, the City and County of San Francisco

has prepared Preliminary Flood Plain Maps. The structure or insurable property is not located in either a designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.

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

Yes

 No

Air Quality

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

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

Yes

No

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

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

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

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

Carbon Monoxide

Lead

Nitrogen dioxide

Sulfur dioxide

Ozone

- ✓ Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns
- Particulate Matter, <10 microns

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

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

Provide your source used to determine levels here:

<https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/ancl.html>
<https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/genconform/deminimis.html>

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

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

Enter the estimate emission levels:

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

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project's county or air quality management district is in non-attainment status for the following: Ozone, Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns. This project does not exceed *de minimis* emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

Supporting documentation

[AIR Attachment 1 CALEEMOD input.xls](#)

[AIR Attachment 4 TPY.pdf](#)

[AIR Attachment 3 PPD.pdf](#)

[AIR Attachment 2 Emissions worksheet.xlsx](#)

[Air-Quality-Worksheet_jxw_tr.docx](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Zone Management Act

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

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

Yes

No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is the Coastal Zone Management Act, federally designated State coastal management sections 307(c) & (d) agency for the San Francisco segment of the California coastal zone. The project site is 5300 feet from the Coastal Zone Management Area or BCDC's area of jurisdiction, which includes the first 100 feet shoreward from the mean hightide- line around San Francisco Bay; therefore, no formal finding of consistency with BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan is required. This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Supporting documentation

[3001 24th Street to CZ.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Contamination and Toxic Substances

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

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

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

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

No

- Yes

3. Mitigation

Document and upload the mitigation needed according to the requirements of the appropriate federal, state, tribal, or local oversight agency. If the adverse environmental effects cannot be mitigated, then HUD assistance may not be used for the project at this site.

Can adverse environmental impacts be mitigated?

Adverse environmental impacts cannot feasibly be mitigated.

- ✓ Yes, adverse environmental impacts can be eliminated through mitigation. Document and upload all mitigation requirements below.

4. Describe how compliance was achieved in the text box below. Include any of the following that apply: State Voluntary Clean-up Program, a No Further Action letter, use of engineering controls, or use of institutional controls.

Phase II Environmental Site Assessment to be conducted and recommendations followed.

If a remediation plan or clean-up program was necessary, which standard does it follow?

Complete removal

- ✓ Risk-based corrective action (RBCA)

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances were found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property. The adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Topographical Maps.pdf](#)

[Sanborne Maps.pdf](#)

[Phase One.pdf](#)

[Directory Abstract.pdf](#)

[Appendix One.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances Worksheet.docx](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

- ✓ Yes

No

Endangered Species

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

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

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

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

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project will have No Effect on listed species based on the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service's online critical habitat mapper. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

Supporting documentation

http://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap_viewer.html?webmap=9d8de.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Explosive and Flammable Hazards

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

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

No

Yes

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

No

Yes

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

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

No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Farmlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) discourages federal activities that would convert farmland to nonagricultural purposes.	Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.)	7 CFR Part 658

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

Yes

✓ No

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

The project site consists of urban land; therefore the project would not affect farmlands (PL 97-Farmland Protection Policy Act 98, December 22, 1981). There are no protected of 1981, particularly sections farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

Supporting documentation

<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx.pdf>

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Floodplain Management

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

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

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

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

[SF_NE PFIRM.pdf](#)

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

Does your project occur in a floodplain?

- No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Historic Preservation

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

Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)

- ✓ No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].

Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

Threshold (b). Document and upload the memo or explanation/justification of the other determination below:

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on the project description the project has No Potential to Cause Effects. The project is in compliance with Section 106.

Supporting documentation

[SHPO Response.pdf](#)

[3001 and 3013 24th Street Form A and B.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Noise Abatement and Control

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

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

- New construction for residential use

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

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

A research demonstration project which does not result in new construction or reconstruction

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster

None of the above

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

Indicate the findings of the Preliminary Screening below:

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

- ✓ Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.

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

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

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

Is your project in a largely undeveloped area?

- ✓ No

Indicate noise level here: 73.4

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

Yes

Unacceptable: (Above 75 decibels)

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

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

Indicate noise level here: 73.4

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

6. HUD strongly encourages mitigation be used to eliminate adverse noise impacts. Explain in detail the exact measures that must be implemented to mitigate for the impact or

effect, including the timeline for implementation. This information will be automatically included in the Mitigation summary for the environmental review.

✓ Mitigation as follows will be implemented:

Mitigation Measure 1. Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations establishes uniform noise insulation standards for residential projects. Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or DNL) of at least 45 dB. The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall and floor/ceiling assemblies meet state standards regarding sound transmission. Compliance with this requirement would ensure that interior noise levels of the project residential units would meet the interior noise goal of HUD and the State of California.

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

No mitigation is necessary.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was normally unacceptable: 73.4 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation with mitigation.

Supporting documentation

[Noise Attachment 1 - DNL Calculator - HUD Exchange.pdf](#)

[Noise-Abatement-and-Control-EA-Worksheet_JXW.docx](#)

[Noise Attachment 2 - Noise Prep Calcs.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

✓ Yes

No

Sole Source Aquifers

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

1. Is the project located on a sole source aquifer (SSA)?

A sole source aquifer is defined as an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. This includes streamflow source areas, which are upstream areas of losing streams that flow into the recharge area.

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload documentation used to make your determination, such as a map of your project (or jurisdiction, if appropriate) in relation to the nearest SSA and its source area, below.

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

[ssafact.pdf](#)

[MOU HUD EPA Region 9.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wetlands Protection

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

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

No

✓ Yes

2. Will the new construction or other ground disturbance impact an on- or off-site wetland? The term "wetlands" means those areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances does or would support, a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas such as sloughs, potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds.

"Wetlands under E.O. 11990 include isolated and non-jurisdictional wetlands."

✓ No, a wetland will not be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990’s definition of new construction.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload a map or any other relevant documentation below which explains your determination

Yes, there is a wetland that be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990’s definition of new construction.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive

Order 11990.

Supporting documentation

<http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data Mapper.html.pdf>

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

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

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

No

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

<http://www.rivers.gov/california.pdf>

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Environmental Justice

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

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No