

# 730 STANYAN PROJECT

## Scoping Report

Prepared for  
San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing  
and Community Development

December 2017





# 730 STANYAN PROJECT

## Scoping Report

Prepared for  
San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing  
and Community Development

December 2017

550 Kearny Street  
Suite 800  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
415.896.5900  
[www.esassoc.com](http://www.esassoc.com)



Bend	Oakland	San Francisco
Camarillo	Orlando	Santa Monica
Delray Beach	Pasadena	Sarasota
Destin	Petaluma	Seattle
Irvine	Portland	Sunrise
Los Angeles	Sacramento	Tampa
Miami	San Diego	

130656.23

**OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY** | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 730 Stanyan Project Scoping Report

	<u>Page</u>
<b>1. Introduction and Scoping Overview.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Scoping Overview .....	1
Public Outreach.....	1
Availability of Environmental Documents .....	2
Other Environmental Review and Consultation Requirements.....	2
Timing .....	2
1.2 Proposed Project and Location .....	2
1.3 Public Notice .....	2
1.4 Public Scoping Meeting.....	5
1.5 Written Comments.....	5
<b>2. Summary of Written Public Comments.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Topics Addressed.....	8
Public Services.....	8
Aesthetics.....	8
Transportation .....	8
Historic Resources .....	8
Oppose the Project Alternatives.....	8
Support the Project Alternatives.....	8
Concern Regarding Services Provided .....	9
Clarification of the Project .....	9

### Appendices

- A. Scoping Notices
- B. Scoping Meeting Materials
- C. Scoping Meeting Transcript
- D. Written Scoping Comments

### List of Figures

Figure 1	Project Location .....	3
Figure 2	Preferred Alternative .....	4

### List of Tables

Table 2-1	Public Hearing Comments .....	6
Table 2-2	Written Comment Letters .....	7

---

This page intentionally left blank

# 730 STANYAN PROJECT

---

## Scoping Report

### 1. Introduction and Scoping Overview

The San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), acting for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), is the lead agency for implementing National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements for the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is the approval of HUD funding for the proposed project. MOHCD is considering investing Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds in the development and the project sponsor may apply for Section 8 project-based housing vouchers. Approval of HUD funding is subject to NEPA and HUD NEPA regulations at 24 CFR Part 58. MOHCD is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the environmental and socioeconomic effects of acquiring the project site at 730 Stanyan Street for the purpose of development for affordable housing (proposed project).

As part of the public involvement process for the EA, the lead agency asked for input on the scope of the environmental review for the project through one public scoping meeting (November 7, 2017) and a written comment period (October 20, 2017 through November 30, 2017). This report presents a summary of the issues raised during scoping.

#### 1.1 Scoping Overview

The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 40, Section 1501.7 describes federal requirements for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action during an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). While the project does not require an EIS level of scoping, public input can be solicited and assist in the NEPA process for an EA. Similarly, views of the public are essential to informed federal decision making in the Section 106 process. The regulations implementing Section 106 (CFR Part 36 Section 800.2(d)) call for the federal agency official to actively seek and consider the views of the public as the Section 106 review process moves forward. The sections below address MOHCD's approach to meeting these requirements.

#### Public Outreach

As part of the scoping process, MOHCD sent the notices for consultation to 2,001 recipients; this list consisted of federal, state, regional and local agencies, and private groups, representatives of Native American groups, and individuals within a two to three-block radius of the project site (which covers a radius of approximately 600 feet to 1,375 feet from the project site). Refer to

---

Section 1.3, Public Notice, below, as well as to **Appendix A** for a copy of this notice, a radius map, and complete list of recipients.

## Availability of Environmental Documents

The EA will be available online at: <http://sfmohcd.org/environmental-reviews>, following the publication of the FONSI for the project.

## Other Environmental Review and Consultation Requirements

Other regulatory requirements for the Proposed Action include the following:

- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
- Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act
- Executive Order 11988 - Floodplain Management
- Executive Order 11990 - Wetland Protection
- Executive Order 12898 – Environmental Justice
- All statutes and regulations listed at 24 CFR Parts 58.5 and 58.6
- Compliance with applicable state and local codes, ordinances, and regulations

## Timing

The tentative schedule for release and circulation of the EA, Notice for Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and Notice of Intent to Request Release of Funds (NOI RROF), is January 2018. This will be followed by a 30-day objection period, and submittal of the RROF to HUD for objections in March.

## 1.2 Proposed Project and Location

The proposed project is for MOHCD to acquire the property at 730 Stanyan (APN #1249-024; Figure 1) with the intent to demolish the existing 5,000 square-foot (sf) building and paved parking lot to construct affordable housing with ground floor services and commercial space (Figure 2). It is assumed that any earthwork or ground disturbing activities would occur on the project site, an area where there may be deep sand, and therefore may require pile driving to reach bedrock or soil improvements to support a foundation.

## 1.3 Public Notice

MOHCD published an early notice (provided in **Appendix A** to this report) to inform agencies and the general public that an EA was being prepared along with the compliance under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 and invited comments on the scope and content of the document. The notice also provided information on the date and time





SOURCE: ESRI

MOHCD 730 Stanyan Street

**Figure 1**  
Project Location





130656.23

SOURCE: Asian Neighborhood Design

MOHCD 730 Stanyan Street

**Figure 2**  
Preferred Alternative

---

of the public scoping meeting, located within the project's Height-Ashbury neighborhood. MOHCD mailed this notice to 2,001 recipients, published a public notice with similar information on their Environmental Reviews website: <http://sfmohcd.org/environmental-reviews>, and also posted a notice of the scoping comment period and public scoping meeting via a legal notice in the *San Francisco Examiner* newspaper on October 20, 2017 (see **Appendix A** for a copy of all notices, a radius map, and complete list of recipients).

## 1.4 Public Scoping Meeting

MOCHD held a public scoping meeting to solicit input from interested parties to be considered in alternatives development, cultural and historic resources and the scope and content of the EA. The meeting was held at the Park Branch Library at 1833 Page Street, San Francisco, starting at 6:00 pm. The public scoping meeting was held in a presentation-style format with a presentation on the project followed by public comments by attendees submitting comments in a two minute on-the-record format. During this meeting MOHCD and their consultant provided a presentation to summarize the background for the proposed project and describe the EA and NHPA Section 106 process. A court recorder was present to receive oral comments on the record from interested parties.

During the public comment portion of the meeting, 36 speakers provided comments. These questions and comments primarily concerned the need for affordable housing, the height and density of the project and the potential impacts to residents due potential impacts concerning the nature of residents and services provided by the project, aesthetics, and traffic/parking. Copies of the meeting materials are presented in **Appendix B**; and transcripts of the meeting are provided in **Appendix C** and comments are summarized below.

## 1.5 Written Comments

Throughout the scoping process, 34 written scoping comments were received. These comments are summarized in Section 2 and are reproduced in **Appendix D**.

# 2. Summary of Public Comments

During the comment period, 36 speakers presented comments at the public hearing as listed in table 2-1, and 33 comment letters were submitted by the public as listed in **Table 2-2**. The letters are included as **Appendix B**. Comments were also received at a public scoping meeting. Comments are summarized below and include the number of the associated comment letter in parenthesis or PH for public hearing comments. In addition, there was one additional comment which was received after the close of the comment period, this is included in **Appendix B**.

**TABLE 2-1  
PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS**

<b>Letter</b>	<b>Name</b>
PH.1	Joycelynn Stone
PH.2	Marina Rosen
PH.3	Richard Ivanhoe
PH.4	David Moser
PH.5	Alicia Noyola
PH.6	Lisa Awbrey
PH.7	Denis Mosgofian
PH.8	Calvin Welch
PH.9	Renee Curran
PH.10	Rupert Clayton
PH.11	Marc Lambros
PH.12	Barbara Super
PH.13	Lizz Cady
PH.14	Tes Welborn
PH.15	Rob Weaver
PH.16	Aram Denian
PH.17	Maggie Lohmeyer
PH.18	David Stone
PH.19	Shira Noel
PH.20	Bruce Wolfe
PH.21	Steven Madrid
PH.22	Ruby Valeria
PH.23	Henry Brown
PH.24	Brandon Harami
PH.25	Sunshine Powers
PH.26	Henry Pruitt
PH.27	Corey Smith
PH.28	Claire Howard
PH.29	Glenn Berens
PH.30	Kent Miller
PH.31	John Doe
PH.32	Greg Navicoff
PH.33	Karen Fishkin
PH.34	Tina Stromsted
PH.35	Scot Campbell
PH.36	Norm Dagelman

**TABLE 2-2  
WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS**

<b>Letter</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Date</b>
1	Rupert Clayton	Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council	11/30/2017
2	Connie Kullberg	Cole Valley Improvement Association	11/10/2017
3	Annie Armstrong	Neighbor	11/13/2017
4	Marilyn Cassol	Neighbor	11/13/2017
5	Katherine Cohen	Neighbor	11/18/2017
6	David Diez	Neighbor	11/12/2017
7	Michael DiNapoli	Neighbor	11/20/2017
8	Bill Haskell	Neighbor	10/31/2017
9	Alyssa Jennings	Neighbor	11/27/2017
10	Rich Kallet	Neighbor	10/24/2017
11	Margery Knyper	Neighbor	11/12/2017
12	Phillip Kobernick	Neighbor	11/27/2017
13	Elise Kroeber	Neighbor	11/21/2017
14	Elsie Kroeber	Neighbor	11/11/2017
15	Tiffany Lam	Neighbor	11/8/2017
16	Norman Larson	Neighbor	11/17/2017
17	Anthony Levintow	Neighbor	10/23/2017
18	Steven Madrid	Neighbor	11/14/2017
19	Steven Madrid	Neighbor	11/27/2017
20	Bill Moliski	Neighbor	10/23/2017
21	Bill Moliski	Neighbor	11/7/2017
22	Susan Pollack	Neighbor	10/25/2017
23	Kendra Robins	Neighbor	11/15/2017
24	Kendra Robins	Neighbor	11/17/2017
25	Pam Scrutton	Neighbor	11/13/2017
26	Karen Sharp	Neighbor	11/30/2017
27	David Stone	Neighbor	11/7/2017
28	Kristin Tiesch	Neighbor	11/3/2017
29	Mike Vladimer	Neighbor	11/30/2017
30	Robert Weaver	Neighbor	11/22/2017
31	Rob Wells	Neighbor	11/7/2017
32	Jannie Wong	Neighbor	11/6/2017
33	Tes Welborn	Neighbor	11/30/2017
34* late	Oren Rosenberg	Neighbor	12/1/2017

---

## 2.1 Topics Addressed

### Public Services

- Inadequate public utilities or concern for overburden of utilities. (2, 26)
- Inadequate school capacity. (2)

### Aesthetics

- Project alternatives are too tall. (13)
- Seven Stories too high. (PH.15, 3, 4, 11, 14, 26)
- Project should provide pleasing design. (14)
- Project scale should be in character/scale with surrounding neighborhood. (6, 9, 30)

### Transportation

- Project should be designed from the start to be “transit oriented.” (1)
- Inadequate parking proposed. (2, 18, 19)
- N-Judah line is overcrowded or inadequate transit service. (2, 18, 19)

### Historic Resources

- Concern that a seven-story 65-foot tall project would adversely affect the historic value of Golden Gate Park, and Stanyan Park Hotel. (1)
- Project would negatively impact historic value of the neighborhood. (26)

### Project Alternatives

- Commenter would support a three or four story building. (3, 25)
- Commenter would prefer a 40-foot height. (PH.21, 14)
- Commenter suggested looking at a smaller scale project. (11)
- Commenter suggested looking at other income ranges or mixed income vs. “very low” income housing. (PH.5, PH.13, PH.17, PH.34, PH.21, 2, 30)

### Opposition to the Project

Several commenters stated general opposition to the project (PH.11, PH.12, 2, 4, 7, 26, 30) for reasons including:

- Opposed to homeless services. (2)
- Too close to drugs. (2)
- Inadequate infrastructure, parking, and/or transit. (2)
- Height or height too tall. (PH.11, 4, 7)

- 
- Preserve existing use. (PH.29, 4)
  - Housing is not the best use of site. (7)
  - Inconsistent with zoning. (30)
  - Neighborhood character will change. (30)
  - Impact to property values. (PH. 11, PH.12, 30)
  - Prefers No Build Alternative. (26)

## **Support for the Project**

Several commenters expressed general support for the project (PH.2, PH.4, PH.5, PH.6, PH.7, PH.8, PH.9, PH.13, PH.16, PH.17, PH.18, PH.19, PH.20, PH.21, PH.22, PH.23, PH.25, PH.26, PH.27, PH.28, PH.30, PH.31, PH.34, PH.35, 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 23, 27, 29, 32, 33), with others specifying specific support for the following reasons:

- Housing is needed. (PH.6, 5)
- Family housing is needed. (PH.26)
- Preferable to existing use. (5, 7, 10)
- Opportunity to create entrance into Golden Gate Park. (PH.8)
- Provides for greater good, improved quality of life. (PH.9, 5)
- Support for Alternative 1 (five story). (PH. 31, 17, 32, 33)
- Support for Alternative 2 (seven story). (PH.2, PH.5, PH.18, PH.22, 15)

## **Concern Regarding Services Provided**

- Project should provide housing for persons earning less than 80 percent of the area median income, with preference to residents living and working in the neighborhood, and support for young peoples displaced, should provide non-profit space, oppose a micro-unit scale. (1)
- Project should include services for homeless persons. (PH.22, 28)
- Ground floor should provide residential services (e.g., workforce development). (PH.5, PH.13, PH.16, PH.17, PH.18, PH.19, PH.20, PH.22, PH.25, PH.28, PH.34)
- Oppose navigation center and injection site. (PH.4, 24)
- Opposed to site being used as a resource center/services for homeless. (31)

## **Clarification of the Project**

- Question whether there is a design (PH.1, PH.30)
- Question on the purchase price. (PH.3)
- Question on the difference between and EA and EIR. (PH.3)
- Question whether Market Rate housing would be included. (20, 21)
- Questions regarding size, define affordable, what is definition of community. (PH15, 22)

- 
- Question timeline of process. (PH.14, PH.24)
  - Question what will happen when property changes hands. (PH.36)
  - Longer FONSI review period than 10 days. (PH.10)

## **Other**

- Try to keep purchase price fair. (6)
- Project would impact property values. (30)
- Project is inconsistent with zoning. (30)
- Development should engage community. (PH.6)