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

Project Information

Project Name: Mission Bay Block 6 West

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

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): Mercy Housing LLC.

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):

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: Mission Bay South Block 6 West, San Francisco, CA, 94158; APN 8711-020

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
The project would develop a 152-unit affordable housing structure with roughly a quarter of the units as one-bedroom, a half percent as two-bedroom, a quarter as three-bedroom, and additional units in the form of studios and 4- and 5-bedroom family units. The project ground floor would provide amenities including: building services (community room, multipurpose room, bike and car parking), offices (social services and building management), a space dedicated to commercial use, a childcare facility, and various utilities, storage and maintenance rooms. The project would include parking for up to 28 cars, 2 car share spaces, and up to 110 Class 1 bicycle spaces. The project would also provide a variety of open spaces, including residential ground floor entries and stoops, a central ground-level courtyard, a podium courtyard, and balconies.

The building would consist of a maximum of seven floors in various stepped increments (from four to seven stories), with a maximum height not to exceed 74 feet (including stair penthouse roofs. The four-story section would involve wood frame Type V construction, the six-story wing would consist of five stories of wood frame Type III over a Type I concrete podium, and the seven-story wing would consist of Type I concrete. Any earthwork or ground disturbing activities would occur on the project site, an area within the Mission Bay basin that overlays Bay Mud and fill, and would therefore require pile driving to reach bedrock. Project construction would take approximately 24 months to complete.

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 distributed 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 percent of area median income) units and 4,639 low-income (51-80 percent of area median income) units.

City policies call for increased development of affordable housing in the City. The City's General Plan Housing Element states, "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 our 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, did not meet its fair 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 South Mission Bay neighborhood consistent with the larger Mission Bay project. 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 152 units, which would satisfy a portion of identified affordable housing needs for San Francisco.

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

The project site, located at South Mission Bay, Block 6 West (block 8711, lot 020), is bounded by China Basin Street to the north, Merrimac Street to the west, Mission Bay Boulevard North to the south, and an under-construction mixed use housing structure to the east, within the Mission Bay neighborhood of San Francisco, California. The project site previously served as a paved parking area and is now primarily a vacant lot used for construction staging and stockpiling for the adjacent Block 6E site. The project site is a generally flat, rectangular lot, with approximately 275 feet of frontage along Merrimac Street to the west and along the eastern property boundary and approximately 180 feet along China Basin Street and along Mission Bay Boulevard to the south, with a usable area of approximately 49,500 square feet or 1.1 acres. The project site is surrounded by recent development constructed under the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan. To the west is now housing, to the north and south are newly constructed open spaces and parks and to the east and northeast are new housing projects both recently completed and under construction. The project vicinity contains residential, commercial and public land uses in a medium-density urban environment. The project site is located one block west of the MUNI T-line and inland of Pier 50 and Pier 54.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
	Section 8 Project Based Vouchers	38

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: **38 Vouchers**

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

Construction Costs:	$91,556,299
Non-Construction Costs:	$25,730,004
Total	$117,286,303

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 ☒	San Francisco International Airport is nearly 10 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. Oakland International Airport is nearly 8.5 miles southeast of the project site. The project site is well outside the boundaries of Oakland Airport runway protection zones and all other defined safety zones. There are no military airfields in San Francisco County or the nearby vicinity; therefore, no military airfield Airport Protection Zone or Clear Zone would affect the proposed project. Source Document(s): 1 and 2
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes ☐ No ☒	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 a CBRS buffer zone. Source Document(s): 3
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National	Yes ☐ No ☒	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

Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]		Special Flood Hazard Area (SHRA). 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. The preliminary FIRM and site elevation maps identify the project site as located partially within the 100-year floodplain (with a lowest current elevation of 9.7 feet at less than an eighth of an acre in its northeastern-most corner near China Basin Street). This preliminary FIRM also shows a portion of the site (eastern part of the parcel) as located within the 0.2 percent Annual Chance Flood Hazard, which is the 500-year floodplain. Based on the 2015 Preliminary FIRM and 2015 Floodplain Map, the project site is 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." The project involves the construction of childcare facility uses, considered a "critical action;" however, this facility would not be located within the 100-year floodplain identified in the preliminary FIRM. Because the project contains features located within the 100-year floodplain, it requires analysis under Executive Order 11988 by the eight-step process. This is discussed further under "Floodplain Management." To avoid inconsistency with Flood Insurance due to the existing elevation, the project should implement **Mitigation Measure 1: Construction above the BFE, and Mitigation Measure 2: FEMA Map Revision**. Mitigation Measure 1 would require the project site be graded to a minimum elevation of 10 feet NAVD 88, and for all structures to be built with a lowest finished floor of 1 foot above BFE. Mitigation Measure 2 contingent upon the adoption of the Preliminary FIRM, would require the submittal of a Conditional Letter of Map Revision Based on Fill (CLOMR-F) application to FEMA prior to the construction of the project should the FIRM be final, and then a subsequent Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) application upon completion of project. Under the CLOMR-F the additional grading and fill would bring the project out of the SFHA to a minimum elevation of elevation of 10 feet NAVD 88. With the approved CLOMR-F and LOMR-F by FEMA, the Proposed Action would not involve development in a SFHA and flood insurance would not be required. However, should either the CLOMR-F or LOMR-F or both be rejected by FEMA, the project would be required to acquire Flood Insurance consistent with the Flood Disaster

		Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. Source Document(s): 4, 5, and Attachment 1
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5		
Clean Air Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	Yes ☐ No ☒	<u>Criteria Pollutants</u> Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2016.3.2. The modeled criteria pollutant emissions were compared to the federal General Conformity *de minimis* levels and local Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) construction and operational thresholds to determine if the project would result in a significant air quality impact. *<u>Comparison to Federal General Conformity De Minimis Levels</u>* Construction emissions from the project would result primarily from off-road equipment, vehicle use, and fugitive dust. The modeling results indicate that maximum annual emissions from construction would be approximately: • 2.5 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG); • 2.2 tons per year of nitrogen oxides (NO_X); • 2.2 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO); and • 0.2 tons per year of fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less ($PM_{2.5}$). Based on the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin's designation status as marginal nonattainment for ozone, moderate nonattainment for $PM_{2.5}$, and maintenance for CO, federal *de minimis* levels would be 100 tons per year each these pollutants or their precursors (ROG, NO_X, $PM_{2.5}$, and CO). A conformity determination would be required for each criteria or precursor exceeding the federal General Conformity *de minimis* level. Emissions of ROG, NO_X, $PM_{2.5}$, and CO from construction would be below the federal General Conformity *de minimis* levels pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act. Operational emissions from the project would result primarily from use of consumer products (e.g., paints, solvents), building energy demand (i.e., natural gas use), and vehicle use. Results

		from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual emissions from the operation of the project would be approximately: • 0.9 tons per year of ROG; • 1.1 tons per year of NO_X; • 3.4 tons per year of CO; and • 0.2 tons per year of $PM_{2.5}$. Operational emissions would also be below the federal *de minimis* level of 100 tons per year for ROG, NO_X, $PM_{2.5}$, and CO. Therefore, the proposed action is exempt from General Conformity regulations. *Comparison to Bay Area Air Quality Management District Thresholds* The modeling results indicate that the average daily emissions from construction, excluding fugitive dust, would be: • 11 pounds per day of ROG; • 17 pounds per day of NO_X; • 1 pound per day of exhaust PM_{10}; and • 1 pound per day of exhaust $PM_{2.5}$. The average daily construction emissions would be below the BAAQMD's average daily construction emission thresholds of: • 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 PM_{10}. It is important to note that the BAAQMD only considers exhaust particulate matter in its thresholds of significance and emphasizes implementation of its basic and enhanced construction mitigation control measures to ensure that fugitive dust impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual and average daily emissions from the operation of the project would be: • 0.9 ton per year / 5.1 pounds per day of ROG; • 1.1 ton per year / 6.1 pounds per day of NO_X; • 0.6 tons per year / 3.3 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{10}; and • 0.2 tons per year / 1.1 pounds per day of exhaust $PM_{2.5}$. These emissions would be below the BAAQMD's maximum annual and average daily operational emission thresholds of:

		• 10 tons per year / 54 pounds per day of ROG and NO_X (each); • 10 tons per year / 54 pounds per day of exhaust $PM_{2.5}$; and • 15 tons per year / 82 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{10}. Consequently, criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation of the project would be less than significant with respect to BAAQMD's thresholds of significance. <u>Fugitive Dust</u> The City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) requires a number of measures to control fugitive dust to ensure that construction projects do not result in visible dust. The project would implement Best Management Practices in compliance with the City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance and BAAQMD recommended control measures for controlling fugitive dust and these Best Management Practices would be effective in controlling construction-related fugitive dust emissions to a less-than-significant level. <u>Asbestos Containing Materials and Lead Based Paint</u> There are no buildings currently on the project site, therefore, project activities would not likely result in a release of asbestos containing materials or lead based paint. While the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment identified levels of asbestos as non-detect within the initial surveys, it recommends a subsequent subsurface investigation (Phase II Environmental Site Assessment). In addition, because the project is located within the Maher Ordinance zone, it must comply with the Maher Ordinance compliance steps (Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code). To address this outstanding analysis, **Mitigation Measure 3 – Phase II Environmental Site Assessment**, would require a Phase II analysis. Should this analysis indicate the presence of a hazardous materials release then **Mitigation Measure 4 – Site Management Plan (SMP)**, shall be required and would require additional site construction guidelines and, should findings of the Work Plan reports demonstrate adverse hazards then **Mitigation Measure 5 – Health and Safety Plan (HSP)** shall be required and would reduce potential health risk to on-site construction workers and the public. The project site, with 49,500 square feet of usable area, is approximately 1.1 acres and as such is required to submit a Dust Control Plan. Standard dust control measures required by the San

		Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance as well as compliance with the Maher Ordinance, and implementation of Mitigation Measures 3 through 6 would reduce the potential for exposure to asbestos containing material. Source Document(s): 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and Attachment 2
Coastal Zone Management Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is not located within Coastal Zone Management Area or San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission'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 commission's San Francisco Bay Plan is required. Source Document(s):11 and 12
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)	Yes ☒ No ☐	The project site is currently unpaved and is used as a staging area for construction on the adjacent lot. The project site is located in the Mission Bay area of San Francisco, which is currently comprised of residential, commercial, and industrial properties. The project site was originally part of the San Francisco Bay and was filled between approximately 1884 to 1892 with fill material of unknown origin (fill ranges from 15-30 feet thick). The project site has been occupied by the San Francisco Lumber Company, serving as a storage area for piles of lumber; by the Southern Pacific Railroad and Freight Company, containing railroad track siding, and storage of trucks and trailers; and most recently used as a parking lot, the stockpiling of soil, or as open land. 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, an EDR database search, and interviews conducted as part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by AEW Engineering Inc., for this project. The project site is also 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 Environmental Site Assessment) and soil quality be assessed (Phase II Environmental Site Assessment or ESC) of the material that will be encountered during construction in accordance with Article 22A of the San Francisco Public Health Code.

		Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Findings 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 Environmental Site Assessment identified the following two recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with the project site, including: • Semi-volatile organic compounds constituents, arsenic, lead, and cyanide were reported in soil samples above the respective Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Region's Environmental Screening Levels in previous environmental investigations; and • Methane was reported at elevated levels in subsurface soils at the neighboring property. Conclusion Based on the identified RECs, AEW recommended a subsequent subsurface investigation (Phase II Environmental Site Assessment), which would include soil, soil vapor and groundwater sampling to assess current subsurface conditions. In addition, because the project is located within the Maher Ordinance zone, it must comply with the Maher Ordinance compliance steps (Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code). Disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more would require coordination with the San Francisco Department of Public Health to determine if additional soil investigation is required. Article 22A requires preparation of a work plan for subsurface sampling and analysis and submission of a subsurface investigation report to the San Francisco Department of Public Health. Sites with contamination require a site mitigation plan. Mitigation Measure 3 – Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, would require a Phase II analysis. Contingent on findings of this Phase II analysis, that is, should it indicate the presence of a hazardous materials release, Mitigation Measure 4 – Site Management Plan (SMP), would require additional site construction guidelines, and should findings of the Work Plan reports demonstrate adverse hazards, Mitigation Measure 5 – Health and Safety Plan (HSP) would reduce potential health risk to on-site construction workers and the public.

		The project site, with 49,500 square feet of usable area, is approximately 1.1 acres and as such is required to submit a Dust Control Plan. Source Document(s): 13 and 14
Endangered Species Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is a disturbed site, having previously served as a paved parking area and currently serving as a construction staging area. It 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 proposed project area. Listed species may occur in Corona Heights Park and the San Miguel Hills areas; however, neither of these areas would be affected by the project. No impacts on federally listed species or critical habitat are anticipated from the project. Source Document(s): 15, 16, 17, and 35
Explosive and Flammable Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project does not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations. There is no visual evidence or indication of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at or immediately adjacent to the project site. The nearest above-ground storage tank (AST) is over 1,700 feet from the project, with a voluyme of approximately 6,400 gallons. Based on the tank's contents and size, this AST has an Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) for thermal radiation of 600 feet (if unobstructed). Because the project site is approximately 1,700 feet south of this AST, and is separated by Mission Creek and several buildings, it is located at an acceptable distance, and no explosive hazard to the project site would occur. Source Document(s): Attachment 3
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	Yes ☐ No ☒	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. Source Document(s): 18
Floodplain Management	Yes ☒ No ☐	As addressed under Flood Insurance above, FEMA prepares FIRMs, which identify areas subject to flood inundation, most often from a flood having a one percent chance of occurrence in

Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55		a given year (also known as a base flood or 100-year flood). FEMA refers to the portion of the floodplain or coastal area that is at risk from floods of this magnitude as a SFHA. 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 SHRA. 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. This preliminary FIRM and site elevation maps identifies the project site as located partially within the 100-year floodplain (with a lowest current elevation of 9.7 feet at less than an eighth of an acre in its northeastern-most corner near China Basin Street). This preliminary FIRM also shows a portion of the site (eastern part of the parcel) 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 within a SHRA. The project involves the construction of a childcare facility, considered a "critical action," while this facility would not be located within the 100-year floodplain, it would be located within the 500-year floodplain. Because the project would support development in a proposed floodplain, this triggers the need to comply with the Floodplain Management Act 8–Step Process (Executive Order 11988). The Floodplain Management Act 8-Step Process was initiated with an earlypublic notification on December 12, 2017. Under this process, alternatives were considered that identified impacts to development within a floodplain, considered project alternatives, and identified a preferred action that raises the site out of the SFHA. The 8-Step Process will be completed on with the Final Notification provided with the EA. As concluded by the 8-Step Process Documentation (provided in Attachment 1), the project would be required to be developed following the addition of fill which would elevate the project site above the BFE. The additional grading and fill would bring the project out of the SFHA to a minimum elevation of elevation of 10 feet NAVD 88 Datum. In order to ensure the project adheres to this requirement, **Mitigation Measure 1: Construction above the BFE** and **Mitigation Measure 2: FEMA Map Revision** should be implemented. Mitigation Measure 1 would require the project site

		be graded to a minimum elevation of 10 feet NAVD 88, and for all structures to be built with a lowest finished floor of 1 foot above BFE. Mitigation Measure 2, contingent upon the adoption of the Preliminary FIRM, would require the submittal of a Conditional Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (CLOMR-F) application to FEMA prior to the construction of the project and subsequent Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) application upon completion construction. Under this CLOMR-F the additional grading and fill would bring the project out of the SFHA to a minimum elevation of elevation of no less than 10 feet NAVD 88. With the approved CLOMR-F and LOMR-F by FEMA the project would not involve development in a SFHA and flood insurance would not be required. However, should either the CLOMR-F or LOMR-F or both be rejected by FEMA, the project would be required to acquire Floodplain Insurance consistent with Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. With Mitigation Measure 1, the development of the project under the project would not involve development in a SFHA. Lastly, the project has complied with applicable floodplain management regulations through completion of the 8-Step Process, included in Attachment 1 to this EA. No additional compliance is required. Source Document(s): 4, 5, and Attachment 1
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	Yes ☒ No ☐	A project-specific sensitivity assessment and records search conducted by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC File No.: 16-1689) indicated a moderate potential for both Native American and historic-period archaeological resources to be within the project area. A project-specific Programmatic Agreement (PA) was entered into by MOHCD, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and project developers in June 2018. 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 Plan/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.

		Source Document(s): 64, 65, and Attachment 4
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	Yes ☒ No ☐	The project would introduce new noise sources to the neighborhood from vehicles used on adjacent and nearby roadways by new residents and visitors. The project would also generate short-term noise during the construction of the new building. <u>HUD Noise Standards</u> 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 p.m. to 7 a.m. 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 L_{dn} and higher. The San Francisco city-wide background noise level map, developed by the Department of Public Health, shows traffic noise levels at the intersection of China Basin Street and 4th Street to between approximately 55 to 60 dBA DNL at the immediate roadside. Therefore, according to the San Francisco city-wide background noise level map, the exterior noise levels at the building facing China Street would be between approximately 55 to 60 dBA DNL. 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 using the HUD DNL Calculator, 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 greatest contribution to ambient traffic noise are China Basin Street, 4th Street, Long Bridge Street and 3rd Street. The Caltrain rail line is within 1,500 feet of the project site. The Muni Metro Rail T-Owl and KT routes are located approximately 685 feet east of the project site. Transportation noise for China Basin Street, 4th Street, Long Bridge Street and 3rd Street as well as the Muni Metro Rail T and Caltrain were calculated using the HUD DNL Calculator using data available on the San Francisco County Transportation

		Authority website, SFMTA train headway schedules and Caltrain Time Table. The combined DNL exterior noise from all of these sources was calculated to be 58 dBA DNL at the project site. Two airports are located within the preliminary screening distance of the project site. San Francisco International (SFO) is located approximately 10 miles to the south and Oakland International Airport (OAK) is located approximately 9 miles to the southeast of the project site. However, the project site is located several miles outside of the 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. The resulting exterior noise levels at the project site based on the DNL Calculator would fall within HUD's "acceptable" range, which is less than 65 dBA LDN. Since the project site would not be exposed to noise levels exceeding 65 dBA LDN, mitigation would not be required. Although no additional mitigation would be required to reduce the noise exposure at the project site, future residential buildings must be designed to meet an interior CNEL (or DNL) of at least 45 dBA as required under Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. 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. <u>Construction Noise</u> The proposed project would consist of the construction of a 152-unit affordable housing structure. Project construction would require the use of off-road equipment along with other construction-related noise sources such as vehicle trips for deliveries and construction workers and would be expected to increase noise levels at 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. The nearest existing sensitive land uses to the project area are multi-family buildings located approximately 70 feet north and west and a residential project is currently under construction on the immediately adjacent parcel to the east of the project site. Additionally, there is a children's playground directly across China Basin Street. Construction noise is regulated by 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. 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. Construction at the project site generally would be limited to daytime hours. Construction would require either driven piles or auger cast piles to support the foundation. Pile driving and/or 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. Construction activities of the project shall comply with the above identified San Francisco Noise Ordinance Notwithstanding compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance, impact pile driving, if required, could result in an adverse impact to recently completed adjacent sensitive land uses. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has published what it considers reasonable criteria for the assessment of construction-related noise in its guidance document *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. For impacts to residential land uses, a daytime hourly Leq of 90 dBA is identified as the applicable criterion. Given that this FTA guidance identifies a reference noise level of 101 dBA at 50 feet from pile driving and that there are multi-family buildings located within 70 feet to the north and west and closer than 50 feet east of the project, impact pile driving would be considered a potential substantially adverse impact to adjacent sensitive land uses, warranting mitigation.

		The Mission Bay Good Neighbor Policy regarding construction noise is a standard policy of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) that applies to all development within the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan area. It specifies, "Pile driving or other extreme noise-generating activity (80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet) shall be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No pile driving or other extreme noise-generating activity is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. Requests for pile driving on Saturdays may be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) with approval at the sole discretion of the OCII Executive Director" In order to reduce the severity of construction-related noise from impact pile driving, the project should also implement **Mitigation Measure G.1** from the Mission Bay FSEIR. The FSEIR identified construction-related noise impact as less than significant with implementation of Mission Bay FSEIR Mitigation Measure G.1 to address noise from impact pile driving. Mission Bay FSEIR Mitigation Measure G.1 requires use of noise-reducing pile driving techniques and restricting the hours of operation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure G.1 from the Mission Bay FSEIR, construction noise impacts from the project would be less than significant. <u>Operational Noise</u> The project would generate a marginal number of additional daily vehicle trips as it only accommodates 30 parking spaces for residents and visitors. Given that a doubling of traffic is necessary to increase roadside noise to a level that is considered barely perceptible by Caltrans, project-generated traffic noise would be less than significant. Source Document(s): 1, 2, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 60, 61, 62, and Attachment 5.
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project is not served by a U.S. EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not effect a sole-source aquifer. Source Document(s): 29

Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is not located near, or within, a wetland area. The San Francisco Bay and China Basin are both located over 500 feet from the project site, and separated by existing development and roads. Therefore, the project would not affect wetland or riparian areas. Source Document(s): 30
Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes ☐ No ☒	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): 31
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes ☐ No ☒	The project site is currently vacant and serves no population. The project site is located in Census Tract 607 of the 2010 Census. Within this Tract, approximately 51.1 percent of the population is comprised of ethnic minorities and approximately 9.5 percent of the population has an income below the poverty line. Within the City of San Francisco, approximately 50.4 percent of the population is comprised of ethnic minorities and approximately 12.5 percent of the population has an income below the poverty level. The project area is not considered to have an environmental justice population. While the percentage of ethnic minorities within the Tract is greater than 50 percent, it is consistent with the percentage (within 1 percent) for the City of San Francisco. Additionally, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area. However, the project would provide new affordable housing, thereby adding to the environmental justice population of the area. While, the commercial space and resident amenity space on the ground floor would provide job opportunities for residents and the development on the project site would provide low-income families with affordable housing opportunities thus the providing benefits to an environmental justice population, this analysis further considers project impacts and their potential to disproportionately affect the project's introduced environmental justice population. <u>Summary of Project Impacts</u>

		From the consideration of regulatory factors in this EA, a number of environmental topics were identified to generate potential effects requiring mitigation. However, impacts would 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 an environmental justice population. *Air Quality:* 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 176-08, 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 in compliance with the City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance and BAAQMD fugitive dust control guidelines and these Best Management Practices would be effective in controlling construction-related fugitive dust to below a threshold level. *Lead and Asbestos:* 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. In addition, the project site, with 49,500 square feet of usable area is approximately 1.1 acres and as such is required to submit a Dust Control Plan. Standard dust control measures required by the San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance as well as compliance with the Maher Ordinance, and implementation of mitigation measures 3, 4, and 5 would reduce any potential for exposure to asbestos containing material. *Contamination and Toxic Substances:* In the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the project, two recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with the project site were identified, including: • Some Semi-volatile organic compounds constituents, arsenic, lead, and cyanide were reported in soil samples above the respective Regional Water Quality Control Board

		San Francisco Region's Environmental Screening Levels in previous environmental investigations; and • Methane was reported at elevated levels in subsurface soils on the neighboring property. Based on the identified RECs, it is recommended that a subsequent subsurface investigation (Phase II Environmental Site Assessment), which would include soil, soil vapor and groundwater sampling to assess current subsurface conditions. In addition, because the project is located within the Maher Ordinance zone, it must comply with the Maher Ordinance compliance steps (Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code). Disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more would require coordination with the San Francisco Department of Public Health to determine if additional soil investigation is required. Article 22A requires preparation of a work plan for subsurface sampling and analysis and submission of a subsurface investigation report to the San Francisco Department of Public Health. Sites with contamination require a site mitigation plan. Contingent on the Phase II ESA findings, should contamination be found, the project would be required to fulfil the necessary site remediation and worker safety measures including additional site construction guidelines. As such, the project includes Mitigation Measures 3 – Phase II Environmental Site Assessment that would require a Phase II analysis. Should this analysis indicate the presence of a hazardous materials release Mitigation Measure 4 – Site Management Plan (SMP) would require additional site construction guidelines. Further, should findings of the Work Plan reports demonstrate adverse hazards, Mitigation Measure 5 – Health and Safety Plan (HSP), is included to reduce potential health risk to on-site construction workers and the public. The project site, with 49,500 square feet of usable area, is approximately 1.1 acres and as such would be required to submit a Dust Control Plan. These mitigatable project impacts to contamination and toxic substances do not represent an impact to an environmental justice population. *Floodplain Management:* The current preliminary FIRM and site elevation maps identify the project site as located partially within the 100-year floodplain (with a lowest current elevation of 9.7 feet at less than an eighth of an acre in its northeastern-most corner near China Basin Street). Based on the 2015 Preliminary FIRM and 2015 Floodplain Map the project site is within a

		SHRA. AS such, the Floodplain Management Act 8-Step Process was initiated with a public notification on December 12, 2017. Under this process, alternatives were considered that identified impacts to development within a floodplain, considered project alternatives, and identified a preferred action that raises the site out of the SFHA. In order to avoid impacts to a floodplain, the project shall adhere to, Mitigation Measure 1: Construction above the BFE and Mitigation Measure 2: FEMA Map Revision, which would require the project site be graded to a minimum elevation of 10 feet NAVD 88, and for all structures to be built with a lowest finished floor of 1 foot above BFE, and contingent upon the adoption of the Preliminary FIRM, require the submittal of a Conditional Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (CLOMR-F) application to FEMA prior to the construction of the project and subsequent Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) application upon completion construction. With the approved CLOMR-F and LOMR-F by FEMA the project would not involve development in a SFHA and flood insurance would not be required. However, should either the CLOMR-F or LOMR-F or both be rejected by FEMA, the project would be required to acquire Floodplain Insurance consistent with Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. These mitigatable project impacts to floodplain management do not represent an impact to an environmental justice population. *Historic Preservation:* Construction at the project site would have the potential to disturb archeological deposits through ground disturbance, however with implementation of mitigation measures, outlined in the project specific PA, the project would not adversely affect archeological resources. These mitigatable project impacts to historic resources do not represent an impact to an environmental justice population. *Construction Noise*: 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 sensitive land uses to the project area consist of a multi-family residences immediately adjacent to the project site's eastern boundary, parks and open space across the street to the north and south, and multi-family residences across the street to the west.

		The Mission Bay Good Neighbor Policy regarding construction noise is a standard policy of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) that applies to all development within the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan area. It specifies that "Pile driving or other extreme noise-generating activity (80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet) shall be limited to 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. No pile driving or other extreme noise-generating activity is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. Requests for pile driving on Saturdays may be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) with approval at the sole discretion of the OCII Executive Director" In order to reduce the severity of construction-related noise from impact pile driving, the project shall implement Mitigation Measure G.1 from the Mission Bay FSEIR to address noise from impact pile driving. Mission Bay FSEIR Mitigation Measure G.1 requires use of noise-reducing pile driving techniques and restricting the hours of operation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure G.1 from the Mission Bay FSEIR, construction noise impacts from the project would be less than significant. *Operational Noise*: 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. *Geology and Soils:* 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. <u>Conclusion</u> Overall, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area to existing populations, or to an introduced environmental justice population. Construction of housing for affordable family units would provide result in a beneficial impact by providing housing for low-income populations. Source Document(s): 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 13,14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, Attachment 1, 2, 4, and 5

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	The project is located within the Mission Bay neighborhood near the eastern edge of San Francisco. The project area contains primarily residential uses with nearby public open spaces, surface parking lots, and some commercial and industrial uses occurring to the south and east along the nearby piers. In the immediate vicinity, the adjacent parcel to the east of, and abutting the site, is an under construction 3-5-story, 143 unit affordable housing mixed-use building. Directly north of the project site, across China Basin Street, is Mission Bay Kids' Park, and various multi-story new residential developments. To the west of the project, across Merrimac Street is a recently constructed 6-story, 188-unit residential building. To the south of the project site across Mission Bay Boulevard North is a partially completed portion of land zoned for parks and recreation facilities; completed portions include a soccer field and the Spark Social SF gathering space. The project site is currently zoned as MB-RA, Block 6W SFRA, the Major Phase Concept Design Application indicates the site is permitted for 135 units plus 10 percent (for affordable housing). Block 6W is also zoned to

		allow buildings up to 65 feet in height and permits up to one vehicle parking space per unit. With up to 30 vehicle parking spaces and 110 bicycle spaces, the project would be consistent with the maximum parking permitted. At up to 74 feet in height and with 152 units, the proposed project would be above the initial capacity and height limit designed for the site. However, in March 2018, the project received approval from the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure for a variance to account for these differences. By providing affordable housing, the project is consistent with the proposed Mission Bay Project and zoning. Furthermore, the project design is consistent with the Mission Bay Blocks 2-7 and 13 Concept Design Application submitted in 2005. As such, the project would not conflict with applicable local planning and policies. Source Document(s): 13, 36, 37, 38, 39, 57, and 66
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	3	<u>Geology and Soils</u> The project site is located in the Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province, which extends along the California coast south to the Transverse Ranges and north to the Oregon border. The province is characterized by northwest-southeast trending mountains and faults sub-parallel to the San Andreas Fault Zone. The province comprises marine and terrestrial sedimentary deposits underlain by Salinian Block granitic rocks west of the San Andreas Fault Zone and the Franciscan Assemblage east of the San Andreas Fault Zone. The project site is underlain by fill, Bay Mud, sand and clay layers, Old Bay Clay and bedrock. The San Francisco Planning Department's CatEx Determination Layers Map shows that the project site is within a designated liquefaction hazard zone. While, the geotechnical report determined there was no documented observation of liquefaction at this site during the 1906 Earthquake or the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, potential impacts of site development will be mitigated by adherence to the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC). 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.

		The loose to medium dense sand and gravel soils with varying silt and clay at the project site could experience soil liquefaction, lateral spreading, and seismic densification during a major seismic event on a nearby active fault; the amount of settlement could be on the order of six inches depending on the amount of fill, fines, and earthquake magnitude. As differential settlement of fill may be large and erratic, the geotechnical report stated that seismic densification at the project site should be further evaluated in geotechnical investigations during the design phase. Based on the Geotechnical Investigation Report, the following techniques were identified as potential techniques to provide a sound foundation: • The proposed buildings should be supported on a driven steel H-pile pile system that gains support through a combination of friction in the soil below the Bay Mud and friction and end bearing in bedrock. • The floor slabs should be designed to span between pile caps, and because the building should settle little, while the ground surrounding the site could settle about nine inches (anticipated total static and earthquake induced settlement), the entrances to the building should be designed to accommodate the nine inches of anticipated differential settlement. <u>Stormwater</u> The project site, previously a paved parking area, is currently a vacant lot used for construction staging and stockpiling for the adjacent Block 6E. The area will be replaced by residential structures, and will remain impervious, similar to its previous condition as a paved parking area. Stormwater runoff from project construction would continue to drain into the combined sewer and stormwater system and be treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. Pursuant to the San Francisco Public Works Code, including the Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance, and the San Francisco Green Building Code, the project sponsor would be required to implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth BMP measures to reduce potential runoff and erosion impacts. The proposed project would construct all improvements according to the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance, which requires treatment of all runoff prior to leaving the site. The proposed stormwater management system for the project would collect, detain and potentially retain some stormwater within the project site such that the rate and amount of stormwater runoff from the site would not negatively impact the City's treatment facilities, and in a manner consistent with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) Stormwater Design Guidelines. Adherence to these requirements would

		ensure that the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality during either construction or operation. Source Document(s): 40, 41, 42, and 43
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise	3	<u>Hazardous Materials</u> Hazardous materials are described above in "Contamination and Toxic Substances." Historical records and potential hazards for the project site and immediate vicinity were reviewed. Based on the findings of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment a subsequent subsurface investigation (Phase II Environmental Site Assessment), is recommended, which would include soil, soil vapor and groundwater sampling to assess current subsurface conditions. In addition, because the project is located within the Maher Ordinance zone, it must comply with the Maher Ordinance compliance steps (Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code). Contingent on the Phase II ESA findings, should contamination be found, the project would be required to fulfil the necessary site remediation and worker safety measures including additional site construction guidelines. Due to this potential, the project shall implement Mitigation Measures 3 – Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Mitigation Measure 4 – Site Management Plan (SMP), and Mitigation Measure 5 – Health and Safety Plan (HSP), in conformance with applicable laws and regulations measures, to reduce potential exposure to on-site construction workers and the public. Additionally, the project site, with 49,500 square feet of usable area, is approximately 1.1 acres and as such is required to submit a Dust Control Plan. <u>Noise</u> Construction noise as discussed above "Noise Abatement and Control" would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. Source Document(s): 1, 2, 13, 14, and 19 through 28, 60, 61, 62, and Attachment 5
Energy Consumption	2	The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulation as enforced by the DBI. In addition, San Francisco's Green Building Code places more stringent energy, materials, and construction debris management requirements on new residential buildings than Title 24. New residential buildings are required to achieve at least 75 GreenPoints from the GreenPoints Multi-family New Construction Checklist, or LEED "Silver" certification. Other than natural gas and coal fuel used to generate the electricity for the project, the project would not have a substantial effect on the use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	I	The project site is currently vacant, though being temporarily used as a construction staging area. Therefore, no permanent existing employees would be affected by the project. Construction of the project site would result in temporary construction job growth at the project site but this is a small number that is anticipated to be accommodated by the existing employment pool. No impact is anticipated from the project on employment and income within the project area.
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	I	<u>Demographics</u> The project would provide a multi-family affordable housing structure on the project site, which is designated for affordable residential housing within the Mission Bay Land Use Plan. 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 proposed project is consistent with the planned use of the site, no adverse demographic changes are anticipated. <u>Displacement</u> The project involves the construction of a multi-family residential structure on a currently vacant lot. The project would not displace existing residents and thus there would be no impact with respect to displacement. Source Document(s): 36 and 44

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	The project would not displace educational or cultural facilities. Based on the analysis of school capacity done for Mission Bay Project, the development of Mission Bay includes a 2.2-acre school site to provide for up to 500 new students. Together, the capacity of a future school at this location as along with increased capacity at nearby schools supported by development fees would provide adequate capacity to accommodate any small increase in school age children occupying the completed project. Source Document(s): 45 and 46

Commercial Facilities	2	The Mission Bay neighborhood around the project provides various land use types, including several retail and grocery within one mile from the project site such as a Safeway grocery store off 4th Street and King Street, the Spark Social SF located less than a block away, and the Mission Bay farmers' market located at UCSF. In addition, the project would be located within the larger Mission Bay project area, which at buildout will include up to 500,000 square foot of city and neighborhood-serving retail space throughout the entire Mission Bay area. The project residents would contribute to the ongoing vitality of these commercial facilities. Given the project's location within this larger project area there would be adequate and convenient access to essential items such as food, medicine, banks and other convenience shopping services that would meet the needs of the project occupants. In addition, since the project site and proposed retail sites are currently vacant, there is no onsite existing retail and commercial services to be adversely affected or displaced by the project. Source Document(s): 46
Health Care and Social Services	2	The nearest major hospital is 2 miles southwest of the site (Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital). Several other medical services are provided nearer to the site, including the new UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay less than 0.5 miles south of the site, as well as a Dignity Health Medical Clinic less than 0.5 miles north of the site. Under the Mission Bay EIR, additional environmental health, personal health care, and mental health services are further identified within the Mission Bay vicinity. These existing facilities in the area would be adequate to serve the project residents. The project will, therefore, not impact any health care or social service facilities Source Document(s): 45 and 46
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	Recology, Inc. provides residential and commercial solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services for the City of San Francisco. Recyclable materials are taken to Recology's 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 of its municipal solid waste at the 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 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. Construction and demolition (C&D) debris in the City must be transported by a registered transporter to a registered facility that can process mixed C&D debris pursuant to the City and County of San Francisco C&D Ordinance. The Ordinance requires that at least 65 percent of C&D debris from a site go to a registered C&D recycling facility. This requirement has been augmented by the Green Building Ordinance, which requires that at least 75 percent of C&D debris be diverted from landfills. Compliance with this regulation would ensure any impact from construction debris is appropriately minimized. During operation, the project would be subject to the City's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires the separation of refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, thereby minimizing solid waste disposal and maximizing recycling and composting. Although the project could incrementally increase total waste generation from the City by increasing the number of residents at the project site, the increasing rate of diversion through recycling and other methods would result in a decreasing share of total waste that requires deposition into the landfill. Source Document(s): 47, 48, and 49
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	The project site is within an urban area that is served by the combined sewer/stormwater collection, storage and treatment facilities operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (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 drainage basins, which collect wastewater and stormwater from the east and west sides of the City, respectively, which are further divided into five distinct urban watersheds. The project site is located in the Channel urban watershed. Combined wastewater and stormwater from the project area is transported for treatment to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. Treated wastewater is discharged to San Francisco Bay through outfalls at Pier 80 (dry and wet weather), and in Islais Creek (wet weather). 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 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. The project would incrementally increase demand for and use of waste water and sanitary sewer services, but not in excess of existing capacity. In addition, the Mission Bay Project plans include the construction of a separated stormwater and sanitary sewer system in the Central/Bay drainage basin in Mission Bay South, in the area between the Channel and about 16th Street. This separated system would divert the "initial flows" of stormwater from each storm into the sewer system for treatment. Stormwater flows in excess of the "initial flows" would drain directly into the Bay or Channel. Mission Bay North and the Mariposa drainage basin (south of 16th Street in Mission Bay South) would continue to use the City's existing combined sewer system. Improvements would be made to the combined system in Mission Bay North and the Mariposa Basin to accommodate the increased demand created by the Mission Bay project, which includes the proposed project. Source Document(s): 45, 50, 51, and 52
Water Supply	2	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 *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 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.

		Implementation of the project, which consists of the development of up to 152 dwelling units, would incrementally increase the demand for water in San Francisco. Based on U.S. Census data, the latest estimate of average household size in the City and County of San Francisco is 2.32 persons per household. The development of 152 new housing units would increase the citywide population by an estimated 353 persons. Based on the *2015 Urban Water Management Plan* for the City and County of San Francisco (UWMP) estimate of average water consumption for residents of 44 gallons per day per capita in San Francisco (and assuming all this water enters sewer/stormwater drains), the project would create 15,532 gallons per day of wastewater flows plus flows associated with building amenity and childcare. This volume of wastewater flow would signify less than 0.03 percent of the current average daily wastewater flows of 60 million gallons per day to the Southwest Water Pollution Control Plant, or less than 0.02 percent of the total dry weather flow capacity of this wastewater treatment plant. Development of the site was considered in the Mission Bay Redevelopment project, thus the project water demand could be accommodated by the existing and planned supply anticipated under SFPUC's UWMP. The project would therefore, 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. Source Information: 45, 51, and 53
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The San Francisco Police Department, headquartered at 850 Bryant Street, provides police protection in the City and County of San Francisco. Police service is provided to the project site primarily by the San Francisco Police Department's Southern Station, at 1251 3rd Street approximately 850 feet east of the project site at Mission Rock Street and 3rd Street. The San Francisco Fire Department, headquartered at 698 Second Street, provides fire suppression services and unified emergency medical services 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 4, at 449 Mission Rock Street (less than 1,000 feet east), Station 8, at 36 Bluxome Street (at 4th Street, less than 0.5 mile to the northwest), and Station 29, at 299 Vermont Street (at 16th Street, approximately .75 mile to the southwest). If one or more of the engine or truck companies were to be out of service at the time of an alarm, the next closest available unit would respond. Emergency medical transportation to San Francisco hospitals is provided by a 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. 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. Source Document(s): 45, 54, 55, and 56
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	The Mission Bay project, which included the zoning for the Mission Bay 6 West project site, also provided an updated park and open space plan including: 41 acres of new public open space, with parks along Mission Creek and along the bay, plus 8 acres of open space within the UCSF campus. Additionally, the recently approved Mission Rock project would also involve up to 8 additional acres of parks and open space. The nearest public open spaces to the project site include the Mission Bay Kid's Park, the Mission Creek Park, several blocks of the Mission Bay Commons, including a basketball court, as well as the Mission Bay Parks offices, and sports courts, all within half a mile of the project site. The project would not directly impact any of these resources and the small increase in population caused by the project would not substantially increase park use or exceed existing or proposed capacities. Source Document(s): 45, 46, 57, and 58
Transportation and Accessibility	2	The project site is adequately served by pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and parking facilities. San Francisco utilizes vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a screening criteria for determining if a proposed 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 3.3, with a forecast of 2.4 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 proposed project is not anticipated to significantly affect area traffic. Source Document(s): 59

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	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. Source Document(s): 30
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	The project site is currently acting as a staging area for an adjacent construction project and does not support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife species. Source Document(s): 15, 16, 17, and 35
Other Factors	2	<u>Greenhouse Gas</u> The BAAQMD has established a numeric GHG threshold of significance of 1,100 $MTCO_2e$ for projects located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin supported by substantial evidence in its CEQA Thresholds Options and Justification Report developed by its staff in 2009. 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 "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 the 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. CalEEMod (version 2016.3.2) was used to estimate construction and operational-related greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the project to determine if it would exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 1,100 MTCO2e per year. Model results indicate that total GHG emissions

		from construction would be approximately 775 $MTCO_2e$. When amortized over 30 years, construction would contribute approximately 26 $MTCO_2e$ to the project's annual operational GHG emissions over a 30-year lifetime. The estimated annual operational emission from project operations would be approximately 793 $MTCO_2e$ per year. The combined amortized construction and annual operational GHG emissions would be approximately 819 $MTCO_2e$ per year, which would be below the threshold of 1,100 $MTCO_2e$ per year. Therefore, greenhouse gas emissions of the proposed project would be less than significant. The proposed project would neither substantially impact climate change by way of generated greenhouse gas emissions. Source(s): 6, 7, 10, and 63

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

1. November 20, 2017—site walk by Langan Treadwell Rollo. Geotechnical Investigation along with with Nibbi Construction, AEW Engineering, and Regent CM, LLC
2. November 30—December 1, 2017; boring samples by Pitcher Drilling Company on behalf of Langan Treadwell Rollo.
3. October 10, 2017—AEW Engineering, Inc., Phase I Investigation.

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 October 27, 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 October 27, 2017.
3. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2017. Results of Coastal Barrier Resources Overview, and System Mapper electronic database search for San Francisco, California. Available: www.fws.gov/cbra. Accessed October 27, 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 October 27, 2017. Also includes Panel 119 of 304.
5. U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2015. Flood Map Service Center, San Francisco County. Available: msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor. Accessed September 22, 2017.
6. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), July 2016. Available at: caleemod.com/. Accessed February 5, 2018.
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 February 5, 2018.
8. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 2012. 2008 Ground-level Ozone Standards – Region 9 Final Designations, April 2012. Available: https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/ozonepollution/designations/2008standards/final/region9f.htm. Accessed March 9, 2016. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 2012. 2008 Ground-level Ozone Standards – Region 9 Final Designations, April 2012. Available at: www.epa.gov/green-book. Accessed February 5, 2018.
9. U.S. EPA, 2016. General Conformity De Minimis Levels, August 4, 2017. Available: www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables. Accessed February 5, 2018.
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 September 26, 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 September 26 2017.
13. City of San Francisco, 2018. City of San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Report for Parcel 8711020. Available: http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/. Accessed May 10, 2018.
14. AEW Engineering, Inc., 2017. Final Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Report, Mission Bay Block 6W, San Francisco, CA. December 5, 2017
15. 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 Rafael, San Quentin, Richmond, Point Bonita, San Francisco North, Oakland West, San Francisco South, Hunters Point]. Accessed October 25, 2017.
16. 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 Rafael, San Quentin, Richmond, Point Bonita, San Francisco North, Oakland West, San Francisco South, Hunters Point]. Accessed October 25, 2017.
17. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016. USFWS ArcGIS Online: Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species. Available at: http://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77. Accessed June 26, 2018.
18. Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2016. Results of electronic Web Soil Survey database. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available: https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm. Accessed May 11, 2018.
19. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Noise Guidebook, March 2009. Available: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/. Accessed August 23, 2017.
20. San Francisco Department of Public Health, March 2009. Areas Potentially Requiring Noise Insulations. March 2009. Accessed August 23, 2017.
21. Federal Highway Administration, January 2006. Construction Noise Model User's Guide. Available: www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2017.
22. 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.
23. 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 November 7, 2017.
24. Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2018. KT Route Schedule. Accessed at https://511.org/transit/schedules-agency-info/agency/SF/schedules/route/KT. Accessed on February 13, 2018.
25. American Legal Publishing Corporation. Article 29: Regulation of Noise, 2015. Available: http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/police/policecode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sync=1. Accessed September 27, 2016.
26. Caltrain, 2018. Time Tables. Accessed at http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/Assets/Schedules/Full-Timetable_10012017.pdf. Accessed on February 13, 2018.
27. SFMTA, 2018. T-Owl Route Schedule. Accessed at https://511.org/transit/schedules-agency-info/agency/SF/schedules/route/T-OWL. Accessed on February 13, 2018.

28. San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 2018. Modeling and Travel Forecasting. Accessed at: http://www.sfcta.org/modeling-and-travel-forecasting. Accessed on February 13, 2018.
29. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017. Sole Source Aquifer: Ground Water: Region 9. Available at: archive.epa.gov/region9/water/archive/web/html/ssa/html. Accessed October 25, 2017.
30. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016. National Wetlands Inventory, Results of electronic mapping search. Madison, Wisconsin: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Habitat and Resource Conservation Branch of Resource and Mapping Support. Available: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html. Accessed May 27, 2018.
31. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 2016. Electronic Database Search for National Wild and Scenic Rivers in California. Available: http://www.rivers.gov/index.php. Accessed on March 23, 2016
32. United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census), 2010. 2010 Census - Census Tract Reference Map: San Francisco County, CA. Available at: www2.census.gov/geo/maps/dc10map/tract/st06_ca/c06075_san_francisco/DC10CT_C06075_004.pdf.
33. United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census), "Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months," American Community Survey, 2012–2016 (for San Francisco and Census Tract 607), Available at: https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_14_5YRS1701&prodType=table Accessed June 20, 2018.
34. United States Census (U.S. Census), 2010. Summary File 1, Race Alone or in Combination and Hispanic or Latino: 2010. Available: http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_SF1_QTP4&prodType=table. Accessed October 7, 2016
35. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2018. List of Threatened and Endangered Species that May Occur in the Proposed Project Location, and/or May be Affected by the Proposed Project (Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2018-SLI-2560, Event Code: 08ESMF00-2018-E-07418). Accessed on June 26, 2018
36. City of San Francisco Planning Department, 2014. Mission Bay Land Use Map. Available at: http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Project%20Areas/MB/MB%20Land%20Use%20Map.pdf. Accessed October 6, 2016.
37. City of San Francisco Planning Department, 2004. Mission Bay Affordable Housing Map. Available at: http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/774-MB%20Affordable%20Housing.pdf. Accessed October 6, 2016.
38. San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, July 9, 2013. Redevelopment Plan for the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project. Available at http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/8895-MBS%20Red%20Plan%20First%20Amendment.pdf. Accessed October 6, 2016.
39. San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, November 1, 2005. Mission Bay Blocks 2-7 and 13 Major Phase and Parks P5, P6, P13, and P15 Concept Design Application. Available at http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/6626-Major%20Phase%20Book-reduced-Part1.pdf. Accessed October 6, 2016.
40. 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 October 27, 2017.
41. San Francisco Planning Department, March 17, 2015. CatEx Determination Layers. Available at: http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/catexposter.pdf. Accessed October 27, 2018.
42. Langan Treadwell Rollo, 2018. Geotechnical Investigation Mission Bay South Block 6 West – San Francisco, CA. February 22, 2018.

43. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), 2014. San Francisco's Wastewater Treatment Facilities. Available at: sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=5801. Accessed October 27, 2017
44. Association of Bay Area Governments. Regional Housing Need Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area 2014-2022. Available: http://abag.ca.gov/files/ABAG_Final_RHNA_Publication.pdf. Accessed October 16, 2016.
45. Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, 2016. Mission Bay EIR, Volume I-A. Available at: http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/3879-MISSION%20BAY%20SUBSEQUENT%20ENVIRONMENTAL%20IMPACT%20REPORT%20VOL%20IA.pdf, as well as, Volume II–A Available: http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/3876-MISSION%20BAY%20SUBSEQUENT%20ENVIRONMENTAL%20IMPACT%20REPORT%20VOL%20IIA.pdf, and Mission Bay EIR, Volume II - B. Available: http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/3875-MISSION%20BAY%20SUBSEQUENT%20ENVIRONMENTAL%20IMPACT%20REPORT%20VOL%20IIB.pdf.
46. Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, 2016. Mission Bay. Available at: http://sfocii.org/mission-bay. Accessed October 16, 2016
47. California Integrated Waste Management Board, 2017. Solid Waste Information System. Available: www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/48-AA-0002/Detail/. Accessed October 27, 2017.
48. City and County of San Francisco, 2015. Notice of Availability of and Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for the Agreement for Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. Available: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2014.0653E_NOA.pdf. Accessed October 27, 2017.
49. San Francisco Planning Department, Agreement for the Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste and Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County, Case No. 2014.0653E, Final Negative Declaration, July 21, 2015. Available: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2014.0653E_Revised_FND.pdf. Accessed October 27, 2017.
50. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2013. ORDER No. R2-2013-0029, NPDES No. CA0037664. Available: http://www.gsweventcenter.com/Appeal_Response_References/2013_0819_RWQCB.pdf.
51. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), 2015 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco, June 2016. Available: www.sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9300. Accessed October 27, 2017.
52. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2015. Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP): Bayside Drainage Basin Urban Watershed Characterization. Prepared by Urban Watershed Assessment Team. Available at: sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=4147. Accessed October 27, 2017.
53. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), 2013 Water Availability Study for the City and County of San Francisco, March 2013. Available at: www.sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3589. Accessed October 27, 2017.
54. 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 October 31, 2017
55. 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 October 31, 2017.
56. San Francisco Fire Department, 2017. City and County of San Francisco Fire Department Fire Station Locations Map. Available at: sf-fire.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/1975-Station%20Location%20Map%20-%20w%20FS51.pdf. Accessed October 31, 2017.

57. Sesay, Dadia, Executive Director Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure. Agenda Item No 5(f), March 20, 2018. Subject: Conditionally approving the Basic Concept and Schematic Design, and a variance to the 20-foot upper-floor stepback requirement, of an affordable housing project at Mission Bay South Block 6W, which consists of approximately 152 affordable family rental units including one manager's unit, and is within the scope of and adequately described in the Mission Bay Redevelopment Project, approved under the Mission Bay Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("FSEIR"), a program EIR; and, adopting environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area.
58. Mission Bay Parks, September 2016. Mission Bay Parks Map. Available at: http://1a74hq3x1mln95w1n1r7ou21.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/MBP_Map_9_1_16.pdf. Accessed June 26, 2018.
59. San Francisco Planning Department, 2018. San Francisco Transportation Information Map. Available at: http://sftransportationmap.org/. Accessed June 26, 2018.
60. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006.
61. City and County of San Francisco and San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, 1998. *Final Mission Bay Subsequent Environmental Impact Report*. Planning Department File No. 96.771E, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Case No. ER 919-97, State Clearinghouse No. 97092068. Certified September 17, 1998
62. Caltrans, *Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*, September 2013, p. 2-44
63. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, December 2008, updated September 2016. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County.
64. Northwest Information Center, 2017. Record Search Results for the Mission Bay Project. File No: 16-1689, prepared May 2, 2017.
65. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 2017. Letter to Eugene Flannery Ref: Proposed Mission Bay South Block 6 West Housing Development/ City and County of San Francisco, CA. Sent on August 9, 2017.
66. Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure, *Resolution No. 8-2018,* Adopted March 20, 2018

Attachments:

1. Floodplain Management Noticing and 8-Step Process Documentation
2. Air Quality Models
3. Explosive and Flammable Facilities Worksheet
4. Programmatic Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and the California State Historic Preservation Officer regarding Mission Bay Block 6 West Street Affordable Housing Development
5. Noise Abatement and Control Worksheet

List of Permits Obtained:

Mission Bay South Block 6W is governed by the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan, which outlines the development program for the Mission Bay South Project Area, and the Mission Bay South Design for Development, which provides land use controls and development standards such as height, bulk, and setbacks. These documents, which were approved by the former Redevelopment Agency Commission and Board of Supervisors in 1998 serve as the entitlement for the basic development program and the regulatory land use framework in the Mission Bay South neighborhood. The only discretionary authority OCII has on the project is Schematic Design approval (design review), which is scheduled for Q1 2018.

The Mission Bay South Block 6 West site plan was approved on February 21, 2017, when the developer team of Mercy Housing and Paulett Taggard Architects, which scored highest out of 5 teams in a competitive RFP process, was formally approved to move forward with their development by the OCII Commission.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]:
The proposed project is part of the Mission Bay Project for which the San Francisco Planning Department conducted considerable outreach and received public comments.

In addition, a public notice describing the project was published the San Francisco Examiner a local and regional paper of general circulation, on December 12, 2017. The ad targeted local residents, including those in the floodplain. The notice was also sent to interested federal, state, and local agencies, as well as neighbors, and a group of individuals known by MOHCD to be interested in such notices. A list of specific agencies and individuals and a copy of the published notification is kept in the project's environmental review record and attached to this document. The required 15 calendar days were allowed for public comment with two additional days included to account for the December 25 National Holiday. No comments were received in response to the public notice.

Lastly, a notice of availability of the EA and FONSI will 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 proposed action which would contribute to the reasonably foreseeable cumulative environment include full buildout under the Mission Bay Project, the University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) 2014 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) at Mission Bay Campus, the Eastern Neighborhoods Program, Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use Project (Mission Rock), Pier 70 Mixed-Use Development, Golden State Warriors Event Center and Mixed-Use Development at Mission Bay Blocks 29-32, and the recently proposed Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development project. This analysis focuses on the Proposed Action's potential to contribute significantly to that environment.

The project would not result in adverse impacts for certain issues areas including: airport hazards, coastal resources, biological resources, agricultural resources, land use, environmental justice, socioeconomics; thus, the project would not contribute to potentially adverse cumulative impacts for these issues.

Impacts associated with hazardous materials, floodplain management, cultural resources and geology and soils are generally site-specific and not cumulative in nature. The project would comply with the applicable Programmatic Agreement for cultural resources; federal, state and local regulations; and Mitigation Measures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 to ensure that the project's contribution to any cumulative impacts is not significant.

For noise, public services and utilities (police, fire, solid waste, water, wastewater, stormwater) and transportation, City-wide resources and thresholds were considered. The Proposed Action does not

contribute significantly to these issues on a City-wide basis and impacts would be mitigated by an increased tax base (for public services, utilities and transportation) and by compliance with the Mission Bay Good Neighbor Policy, the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and Mitigation Measure G.1 (for noise).

Within the reasonably foreseeable cumulative environment, the recent Golden State Warriors Event Center and Mixed-Use Development at Mission Bay Blocks 29-32 EIR, along with the Pier 70 EIR identified cumulative air quality impacts. As discussed above under *Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations Listed at 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5- Clean Air Act*, the project would result in construction and operational emissions below federal and local air quality thresholds. These project-specific thresholds take into consideration the entire cumulative air basin and thus are considered indicative of whether a project contributes significantly to a cumulative impact. The proposed action is below applicable thresholds and thus does not contribute significantly to this impact.

In sum, the project would not contribute significantly to an identified cumulative impact.

Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]:
Alternative size configurations and locations for the project were contemplated, and are further described in Attachment 1; however, the project best meets the purpose and need for new affordable housing in the Mission Bay area and is consistent with development planned at the project site. A larger development could have greater impacts on the human environment although they could potentially 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 necessarily avoid any impacts.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]:
The no action alternative would mean that the project site would not be 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:
With applicable laws, authorities, factors or other enforceable measures, all potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a significant level with the exception of floodplain management, construction noise, and hazardous materials. For these resources, 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)]:
Summarize below all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Mitigation Measure G.1
Use noise-reducing pile driving techniques such as pre-drilling holes (if feasible, based on soils) to the maximum feasible depth, installing intake and exhaust mufflers on pile driving equipment, vibrating piles into place when feasible, installing shrouds around the pile driving hammer where feasible and restricting the hours of operation. Applies to Mission Bay North and Mission Bay South.

Mitigation Measure 1: Construction above the BFE
The project site, Mission Bay Block 6 West (Block 6W) shall be constructed on an elevated site area to no less than 10 feet NAVD 88 and establish a lowest finished floor (FF) elevation with a freeboard of one (1) foot above Base Flood Elevation. Under this measure, the FF of the project shall be elevated to no less than 11 feet NAVD 88.

Mitigation Measure 2: FEMA Map Revision
If the project site, Mission Bay Block 6 West (Block 6W) is located within a SFHA due to adoption the currently Preliminary FIRMs or it anticipated to be located in an SFHA at the commencement of construction, the project applicant shall coordinate with OCII submission of a Conditional Letter of Map Revision Based on Fill (CLOMR-F) to FEMA. The CLOMR-F shall remove Block 6W from the SFHA as classified by FEMA and establish a lowest finished floor elevation with a freeboard of 1 foot above BFE. Because a CLOMR-F is conditional and preliminary to construction and/or should the preliminary FIRM be approved after the project is constructed, then upon the completion of construction of Block 6W, the project applicant shall coordinate with OCII prior to certification of occupancy to obtain a LOMR-F demonstrating the site is out of the SFHA. Should OCII's CLOMR-F or LOMR-F application not address the project site completely, the applicant shall submit project site-specific application(s). Should FEMA reject either of the aforementioned applications, the project applicant shall obtain flood insurance.

Mitigation Measure 3 – Phase II ESA
Prior to certification of building permits the project applicant shall complete a subsurface investigation, Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, which would include soil, soil vapor and groundwater sampling to assess current subsurface conditions. Based on the findings of the Phase II analysis, additional remediation and construction measures could be necessary. Should the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment indicate the presence of a hazardous materials release, in conformance with applicable laws and regulations measures Mitigation Measures 4 and 5 shall be required.

Mitigation Measure 4 – Site Mitigation Plan (SMP)
In conformance with applicable laws and regulations, should the findings of the Phase II analysis indicate 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 5 – Health and Safety Plan (HSP)

In conformance with applicable laws and regulations, should the Phase II analysis indicate the presence of a hazardous materials release, and a SMP is prepared that demonstrate adverse hazards, the project applicant shall also develop and implement a comprehensive Health and Safety Plant (HSP), 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 HSP. A copy of this plan will be kept on site during field activities and will be reviewed and updated as necessary. The HSP 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.

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.
Maher Ordinance (San Francisco Maher Ordinance: Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code and Article 106A.3.4.2 of the San Francisco Building Code)	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 Environmental Site Assessment) and soil quality be assessed (Phase II Environmental Site Assessment or ESC). Development of the project within requirements outlined by the SFDPH, and as included as Project-specific mitigation measures 3, 4 and 5, will ensure the project does not result in any adverse effects due to hazardous materials.
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 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.

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.
Mission Bay Good Neighbor Policy	Applies to all development within the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan area. It specifies that pile driving or other extreme noise-generating activity shall be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No pile driving or other extreme noise-generating activity is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.
Project-Specific Programmatic Agreement (PA; Attachment 4)	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 Plan/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.

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 Brown Date: June 27, 2018

Name/Title/Organization: Jennifer Brown/ Senior Associate/ ESA

Certifying Officer Signature: _____ Date: 6/27/18

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).