



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

espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review for Activity/Project that is Categorically Excluded Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.35(a)**

Project Information

Project Name: Gran Oriente, 106 South Park

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

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): Mission Housing Development Corporation

State/Local Identifier:

Preparer: Eugene T. Flannery

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Dan Adams, Acting Director, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Consultant (if applicable):

Direct Comments to: Eugene T. Flannery, Environmental Compliance Manager, MOHCD, One South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

Project Location: APN 3775/058, 106 South Park, San Francisco, CA 94107

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

The building will undergo a substantial rehabilitation and reconfiguration of the floor plan to create an interior corridor and courtyard for natural light and air. In addition, four ADA units will be added on the first floor, and an access ramp or lift will be added. Two units will likely be removed from Gran Oriente to accommodate the reconfiguration. Other improvements include:

- Seismic strengthening
- Bringing fire alarm and protection systems up to code
- Upgrading mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems
- Exterior and interior painting
- New roof and drainage system

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Categorically Excluded per 24 CFR 58.35(a), and subject to laws and authorities at §58.5. This proposal is determined to be categorically excluded according to:

24 CFR §58.35(a)(ii): Rehabilitation of multifamily residential buildings and improvements when the following conditions are met:

- A. Unit density is not changed more than 20 percent;
- B. The project does not involve changes in land use from residential to non-residential; and

C. The estimated cost of rehabilitation is less than 75 percent of the total estimated cost of replacement after rehabilitation.

Additionally, those activities not related to acquisition and rehabilitation are exempt per 24 CFR 58.34

- (a)(1) Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies;
- (a)(5) Inspections and testing of properties for hazards or defects;
- (a)(8) Engineering or design costs.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
	CDBG	2,000,000

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

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

Rehabilitation Costs: \$2,000,000
Non-Construction Costs: \$

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 & 58.6		
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project does not lie within an Airport Clear Zone or Accident Potential Zone. Source Document: 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 https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/SFO-AIA-B.pdf Prepared by Jacobs Consultancy, and Clarion.
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project is not located in a coastal barrier resource area. Source Document: 1. 16 USC §3501(a)(1) which defines the locations of coastal barrier resource areas. The Pacific Coast of the Continental United States is not included in that definition.

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
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project involves the rehabilitation of a residential building. The project site is not located in a FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard Area. FEMA has not completed a study to determine flood hazard for the selected location; therefore, a flood map has not been published at this time. The project is neither within a known FEMA floodplain nor within the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City and County of San Francisco in November 2015. The project would not involve either direct or indirect support of development in a floodplain.</p> <p>Source Documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City and County of San Francisco Interim Floodplain Map. Internet Web Site: https://sfgsa.org/san-francisco-floodplain-management-program Accessed on January 28, 2020. 2. United States Federal Emergency Management Administration. FEMA Issued Flood Maps, San Francisco County. Internet Web Site: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=106%20South%20Park%20San%20Francisco%20CA#searchresultsanchor Accessed on January 28, 2020.
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project does not involve acquisition of undeveloped land, a change in land use, major rehabilitation that would cost 75% or more of the property value, or new construction. The project does not meet thresholds for review by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) for air quality impacts, as it is minor in nature; thus, the project conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP).</p> <p>The buildings were constructed in 1907, before the 1978 federal bans on friable asbestos-containing building materials and lead-containing paints became effective. Due to the age of the subject</p>

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
		<p>property building, there is a potential that asbestos-containing material (ACM) and/or lead-based paint (LBP) are present.</p> <p>Overall, suspect ACMs and painted surfaces were observed to be in good condition and do not pose a health and safety concern at this time. According to a review of San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (SFDBI) records, a permit was issued in 1953 to apply asbestos siding to the rear side of the subject building along Taber Place. Visual observations of the rear side of the subject building indicated that the material was in good condition with no signs of damage. Should these materials be replaced, the identified suspect ACMs would need to be sampled to confirm the presence or absence of asbestos prior to any renovation or demolition activities to prevent potential exposure to workers and/or building occupants.</p> <p>Removal of asbestos materials would comply with the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Regulation 11, Rule 2.</p> <p>Partner Engineering and Science Inc. has performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E1527-13 of 106 South Park Street in the City of San Francisco, San Francisco County, California. This assessment has revealed no evidence of RECs in connection with the subject property; however, environmental issues were identified. Based on the conclusions of this assessment, Partner recommends the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Programs should be implemented in order to safely manage the suspect ACMs and LBP located at the subject property. <p>Source Documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment The Gran Oriente Filipino, 106 South Park, San Francisco, CA 94107, October 23,

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
		<p>2017, Partner Engineering and Science Inc.</p> <p>2. Bay Area Air Quality Management District Regulation 11, Rule 2, The Bay Area Air Quality Management District</p> <p>3. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing, Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, Second Edition, July 2012</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has permit authority over San Francisco Bay and lands located within 100 feet of the Bay shoreline.</p> <p>BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan is the Coastal Zone Management Program for the San Francisco Bay Segment of the California Coastal Zone Management Program, pursuant to the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA).</p> <p>Under the CZMA, projects requiring federal approval or funding must, to the maximum extent practicable, be consistent with a state's coastal management program if the project would affect the coastal zone.</p> <p>The project site is located more than 100 feet from the San Francisco Bay shoreline; therefore, no formal finding of consistency with the San Francisco Bay Plan is required. The project activity does not involve activity within a Coastal Zone Management Area (CZM) area.</p> <p>Source Documents:</p> <p>1. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. San Francisco Bay Plan. Adopted 1973. Reprinted in February 2008.</p> <p>http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/laws_plans/plans/sfbay_plan.shtml</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>2. United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. State Coastal Zone Boundaries, California. Internet Web Site: http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/docs/StateCZBoundaries.pdf 3. San Francisco Property Information Map: https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Partner Engineering and Science Inc. has performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E1527-13 of 106 South Park Street in the City of San Francisco, San Francisco County, California. This assessment has revealed no evidence of RECs in connection with the subject property; however, environmental issues were identified.</p> <p>Based on the age of the subject property building (pre-1978), there is a potential that LBP is present. Overall, interior and exterior painted surfaces were observed to be in good condition and therefore are not expected to represent a "hazard," although the condition of the paint should be monitored and maintained to ensure that it does not become deteriorated. Actual material samples would need to be collected in order to determine if LBP is present.</p> <p>The search of GeoTracker returned one open LUST site within 1,000 feet of the project site. The site at 551 3rd Street does not pose a risk of harm to the project inhabitants there is no ground disturbing activity proposed as part of the project.</p> <p>The search of Envirostor returned two reported cases within 1,000 feet of the project site.</p> <p>355 Bryant Street is a four-story brick and wood building with a partial basement covering the site. It was originally constructed in 1916 and was used as a print shop and warehouse. It was later developed into condominiums in a live/work</p>

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
		<p>complex. DTSC signed a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement to review a number of site documents prepared by two different consultants and determine whether chemicals of concern at this Site posed a significant risk to public health or the environment under current site conditions. The reports indicated that polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) were the chemicals of concern at this site. Based on this review, DTSC determined that the potential risk posed by PAHs at the site did not pose an unacceptable level of risk to public health or the environment under current site conditions. Accordingly, it poses no risk of harm to the project site inhabitants.</p> <p>415 Bryant Street was referred to the LOSP for removal of lead impacted soil. Soil sampling has detected elevated levels of lead. County will oversee soil removal. The property is to be constructed into a 3 Story live-work loft building with ground floor parking garage. Due to the distance and the fact that no ground disturbing activities are planned it does not pose a risk of harm to the project inhabitants,</p> <p>A search using NEPAassist indicated that the site is within 0.5 miles of 2 large quantity RCRA generators and 22 small quantity RCRA generators. All small quantity generator sites and both of the large quantity generator sites are in compliance with applicable regulatory authorities and no violations are listed.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Target Property is listed in the Maher Ordinance Area of San Francisco and subject to the requirements of Article 22A for construction activities. Should the proposed activities result in the disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, compliance with the Ordinance is required.</p> <p>Source Documents:</p>

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
		<p>1. California State Water Resources Control Board Geo Tracker Website: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=106+South+Park+San+Francisco+CA Site accessed January 28, 2020.</p> <p>2. California Department of Toxic Substance Control Envirostor website: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=106+South+Park+San+Francisco+CA Site accessed on January 28, 2020.</p> <p>3. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment The Gran Oriente Filipino, 106 South Park, San Francisco, CA 94107, October 23, 2017, Partner Engineering and Science Inc.</p>
<p>Endangered Species</p> <p>Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project activity involves a previously developed urban property and thus would have no effect on any natural habitats or federally protected species. The project site is entirely developed and therefore does not support these species' habitat requirements.</p> <p>Source Documents:</p> <p>1. City of San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Map, http://ec2-50-17-237-182.compute-1.amazonaws.com/PIM/?dept=planning Accessed on January 28, 2020.</p> <p>2. City of San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco General Plan. Internet Web Site: https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/ Accessed on January 28, 2020.</p> <p>3. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services Information for Planning and Consultation Website (IPaC). https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/location/5HP5WJ62IBDNP2CZGFYOSB4BQ/resources Accessed on January 28, 2020.</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project will not result in an increased number of people being exposed to hazardous operations by increasing residential densities, converting the</p>

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
24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C		<p>type of use of a building to habitation, or making a vacant building habitable. The project does not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations.</p> <p>No evidence of current or former ASTs or USTs was observed during the site reconnaissance</p> <p>Source Documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Environmental Criteria and Standards. 24 CFR Part 51 2. San Francisco Department of Public Health List of Above Ground Storage Tanks in San Francisco, 3. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near Hazardous Facilities: Acceptable Separation Distances from Explosive and Flammable Hazards. Office of Community Planning and Development, Office of Environment and Energy. Washington, CD September 1996. 4. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment The Gran Oriente Filipino, 106 South Park, San Francisco, CA 94107, October 23, 2017, Partner Engineering and Science Inc.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site consists of urban land; therefore, the project would not affect farmlands. There are no protected farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco.</p> <p>Source Documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. United States Department of Agriculture. 7 CFR Part 658.2(a) Farmland Protection Policy Act 2. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Services. Web Soil Survey. Internet Web Site:

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilsurvey.aspx. Accessed on January 28, 2020.</p>
<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The Federal Emergency Management Agency [24 CFR 55, Executive Order 11988] (FEMA) prepares Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) that identify areas subject to flood inundation, most often from a flood having a one percent chance of occurrence in 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 Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA). No finalized flood hazard zones have been mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in San Francisco.</p> <p>FEMA has not completed a study to determine flood hazard for the selected location; therefore, a flood map has not been published at this time.</p> <p>The project is neither within a known FEMA floodplain nor within the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City and County of San Francisco in November 2015. The project would not involve either direct or indirect support of development in a floodplain.</p> <p>Source Documents:</p> <p>1. City and County of San Francisco Interim Floodplain Map. Internet Web Site: https://sfgsa.org/san-francisco-floodplain-management-program Accessed on January 28, 2020.</p> <p>2. United States Federal Emergency Management Administration. FEMA Issued Flood Maps, San Francisco County. Internet Web Site: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=401%20rose%20street%20San%20Francisco%20CA#searchresultsanchor Accessed on January 28, 2020.</p>
<p>Historic Preservation</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The building was constructed in 1907. As such, it is a potential historic resources and subject to the</p>

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
<p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>		<p>Programmatic Agreement By And Among The City And County Of San Francisco, The California State Historic Preservation Officer, And The Advisory Council On Historic Preservation Regarding Historic Properties Affected By Use Of Revenue From The Department Of Housing And Urban Development Part 58 Programs (PA).</p> <p>The San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development has reviewed the project under the 2007 Programmatic Agreement and determined that the undertaking is exempt from review by the SHPO or ACHP per Stipulations II.A and IV.A. The City has determined that the Undertaking conforms to the Standards and the State Historic Building Code.</p> <p>No Historic Properties are Affected.</p> <p>Source Documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City and County of San Francisco. Programmatic V Agreement by and among the City and County of Son Francisco, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Historic Properties Affected by Use of Revenue from the Department of Housing and Urban Development Part 58 Programs. January 19, 2007; 2. City of San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Map, http://ec2-50-17-237-182.compute-1.amazonaws.com/PIM//?dept=planning 3. United States Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. 36 CFR Part 800 Protection of Historic Properties.
<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project would not create new noise sources and would have no noise impacts under HUD guidelines. The project does lie within 15 miles of San Francisco International Airport, but because the project would not significantly expand existing operations, this airport noise would not have an effect on the area.</p>

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
		Source Documents: 1. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development: The Noise Guidebook Environmental Planning Division, Office of Environment and Energy. September 1900. 2. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Environmental Criteria and Standards. 24 CFR Part 51
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project is not served by a US EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer subject to the HUD EPA MOU. Source Documents: 1. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Sole Source Aquifers subject to HUD-EPA Memorandum of Understanding, dated September 30, 1990. 2. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Sole Source Aquifers in Region 9. Internet Websites: https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/www3/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html Accessed on January 28, 2020.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project activities are not located near any coastal, riparian or bayfront wetlands. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not affect wetland or riparian areas. Source Document: 1. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Habitat and Resource Conservation. Wetlands Geodatabase. Internet Web Site: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html Accessed on January 28, 2020.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No wild and scenic rivers are located within the City and County of San Francisco. Source Documents:

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
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1973, particularly section 7(b) and (c)		1. United States National Park Service. Designated Wild and Scenic Rivers by State. California. Internet Web Site: https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1912/plan-your-visit.htm Accessed on January 28, 2020.
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project would not result in disproportionately adverse environmental effects on minority or low-income populations as the project will not result in any significant impacts. The project does not involve displacement of residents. The rehabilitation activities would enhance the quality of life for low income residents of the complex. Source Documents: 1. EPA NEPAassist EJSCREEN tool: https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/ Site accessed on January 28, 2020 2. HUD Guidance and Technical Advice, Environmental Justice. http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?srrv/progrmmoffices/commplanning/environment/review/iusUce

Field Inspection (Date and completed by
 Site Assessment Performed By: Ryan Ahrling
 Site Assessment Conducted On: October 5, 2017
 No potential environmental concerns were identified during the onsite reconnaissance

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.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
<p>Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Recommendation: Observed suspect materials should be sampled for asbestos analysis prior to any renovations or demolitions of the buildings.</p> <p>A detailed survey of the building should be conducted prior to disturbance. All asbestos containing materials (ACM, >1%) and asbestos-containing construction materials (ACCM, >0.1%), prior to renovation, should be abated by a DOSH- registered abatement contractor. Worker and disposal requirements should comply with all federal, state and local regulations.</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>The buildings at the Target Property have the coatings and materials that may contain measurable amounts of lead. Refer to Section 6.3.15.</p> <p>Recommendation: Representative samples of coatings should be collected to evaluate lead content, and samples of materials that frequently contain elevated levels of lead (e.g., vinyl flooring, etc.) should also be collected. Dust control procedures should be implemented for compliance with Cal/OSHA's Construction Lead Standard under 8 CCR 1532.1 during any renovations. In addition, waste profiling should be completed by the contractor to characterize waste prior to disposal.</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>The Target Property is listed in the Maher Ordinance Area of San Francisco and subject to the requirements of Article 22A for construction activities. If the project will result in the disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, compliance with the Ordinance is required.</p>

Determination:

- This categorically excluded activity/project converts to **EXEMPT** per Section 58.34(a)(12), because it does not require any mitigation for compliance with any listed statutes or authorities, nor requires any formal permit or license; **Funds may be committed and drawn down after certification of this part** for this (now) EXEMPT project; OR
- This categorically excluded activity/project cannot convert to Exempt status because one or more statutes or authorities listed at Section 58.5 requires formal consultation or mitigation. Complete consultation/mitigation protocol requirements, **publish NOI/RROF and obtain "Authority to Use Grant Funds"** (HUD 7015.16) per Section 58.70 and 58.71 before committing or drawing down any funds; OR
- This project is not categorically excluded OR, if originally categorically excluded, is now subject to a full Environmental Assessment according to Part 58 Subpart E due to extraordinary circumstances (Section 58.35(c)).

PREPARER SIGNATURE
PREPARER NAME, COMPANY


Eugene J. Flannery Mayor's Office of Housing
and Community Development, City and County
of San Francisco

January 29, 2020
DATE

RESPONSIBLE ENTITY
AGENCY OFFICIAL /
SIGNATURE
NAME, TITLE:


Dan Adams, Acting Director, Mayor's Office of
Housing and Community Development

January 29, 2020
DATE

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).