

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

Project Information

Project Name: 1150 3rd Street

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

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): Chinatown Community Development Center and Swords to Plowshares

State/Local Identifier: DUNS 070384255

Preparer: Eugene T. Flannery

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Olson Lee, 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: 1150 3rd Street San Francisco, CA, 94158; APN 8711/026

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

The project would develop a 101-unit affordable housing structure with 50 one-bedroom units for homeless veterans, 50 two- to three-bedroom low income family units, and one manager's unit, as well as a community room with a kitchen, computer lab, teen community space, children's play space, onsite laundry, 72 bike parking spaces, 21 car parking spaces including 1 accessible space, and separate services offices serving family and veteran households. The building would consist of a maximum of four floors, with a maximum height not to exceed 65 feet, and would be Type V over Type I construction to minimize cost. Project construction would take approximately 24 months to complete. For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that 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 therefore requires pile driving to reach bedrock.

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

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

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

- That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced (See Objectives 1-3, Objectives 7-9, and all related policies under those objectives).
- That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of 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 Northern Mission Bay neighborhood consistent with the 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 100 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 1150 3rd Street, is on the northwest corner of 3rd Street and Mission Rock Street in the Mission Bay neighborhood of San Francisco, California. The project site contains a surface parking lot. The project site is generally flat, rectangular square foot lot with 233 feet of frontage along 3rd Street and along the western property boundary, and 200 feet along Mission Rock Street and along Long Bridge Street (the private street on the north) with a usable area of 47,140 square feet. The project site is surrounded by recent development to the north and west, and empty lots zoned for future development to the south and east. The project area contains residential, commercial and public land uses in a medium-density urban environment. The project site is located just west the MUNI T-line and inland of Pier 50.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
#16-0025 S	VASH PBV – 55 vouchers	\$1,570,860

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: VASH project-based vouchers \$1,570,860

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

Construction Costs:	\$56,881,156
Non-Construction Costs:	\$21,589,424
Total	\$78,470,580

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		
<p>Airport Hazards</p> <p>24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The 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. The 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.</p> <p>There are no military airfields in San Francisco County or the nearby vicinity, the nearest air station, the Alameda Naval Air Station having closed; therefore, no military airfield Airport Protection Zone or Clear Zone would affect the proposed project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1 and Attachment 1</p>
<p>Coastal Barrier Resources</p> <p>Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>There are no Coastal Barrier Resource System (CBRS) Units, or CBRS buffer zones, as defined under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982 (PL 97-348), as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (PL 101-591) located within San Francisco Bay. The project site is</p>

		<p>therefore not located within a CBRS Unit, or CBRS buffer zone.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 2</p>
<p>Flood Insurance</p> <p>Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project does not involve HUD funding for construction, rehabilitation or property acquisition. Based on the 2015 Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and 2015 SF Floodplain Map the project site is not within a Special Flood Hazard Area 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." Flood insurance is not applicable to the project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3, 4, and Attachment 2</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5</p>		
<p>Clean Air</p> <p>Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Criteria Pollutants</u></p> <p>The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.1) was used to estimate construction and operational-related emissions resulting from the project to determine if it would exceed federal de minimis or local Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) construction and operational thresholds.</p> <p><u>Comparison to Federal De Minimis Levels</u></p> <p>The modeling results indicate that maximum annual emissions from construction would be approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG); • 3.5 tons per year of nitrogen oxides (NO_x); • 2.7 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO); • 0.3 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀); and • 0.2 tons per year of fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less (PM_{2.5}).

	<p>Based on the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin's (SFBAAB) marginal nonattainment status for ozone and moderate nonattainment for PM_{2.5}, emissions of ozone precursors and PM_{2.5} would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{2.5} pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the federal Clean Air Act. Based on the SFBAAB designation as a maintenance area for CO, emissions of CO generated by project construction would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for CO.</p> <p>Operational emissions from the project would result primarily from consumer product, building energy demand (i.e., natural gas), and vehicle use related to the apartment residents. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual emissions from the operation of the project would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 0.7 tons per year of ROG;• 0.9 tons per year of NO_x;• 3.1 tons per year of CO;• 0.6 tons per year of PM₁₀; and• 0.2 tons per year of PM_{2.5}. <p>These emissions would be below the federal de minimis thresholds of 100 tons per year for ROG, NO_x, CO and PM_{2.5}.</p> <p><u>Comparison to Bay Area Air Quality Management District Thresholds</u></p> <p>The modeling results indicate that the maximum average daily emissions from construction, excluding fugitive dust, would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 5.8 pounds per day of ROG;• 24 pounds per day of NO_x;• 1.4 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀; and• 1.3 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{2.5}. <p>The average daily construction emissions would be below the BAAQMD's average daily construction emission thresholds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 54 pounds per day of ROG and NO_x;
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 54 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{2.5}; and • 82 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀. <p>It is important to note that the BAAQMD only considers exhaust particulate matter in its thresholds of significance and emphasizes implementation of its basic and enhanced construction mitigation control measures to ensure that fugitive dust impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Operational emissions from the project would result primarily from consumer product use, building energy demand (i.e., natural gas), and increased vehicle trips by occupants of the proposed project. Results from CalEEMod indicate that maximum annual and average daily emissions from the operation of the project would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.7 tons per year / 3.8 pounds per day of ROG; • 0.9 tons per year / 4.9 pounds per day of NO_x; • 0.6 tons per year / 3.3 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀; and • 0.2 tons per year / 1.1 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{2.5}. <p>These emissions would be below the BAAQMD's maximum annual and average daily operational emission thresholds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 tons per year / 54 pounds per day of ROG and NO_x; • 10 tons per year / 54 pounds per day of exhaust PM_{2.5}; and • 15 tons per year / 82 pounds per day of exhaust PM₁₀. <p>Consequently, criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation of the project would be less than significant with respect to both federal and local air quality standards.</p> <p><u>Fugitive Dust</u></p> <p>The City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008)</p>
--	---

		<p>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 (BMPs) in compliance with the City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance and BAAQMD fugitive dust control guidelines and these BMPs would be effective in controlling construction-related fugitive dust to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><u>Asbestos Containing Materials and Lead Based Paint</u></p> <p>There is no building currently on the project site, therefore, project activities would not likely result in a release of asbestos containing materials or lead based paint. While fill materials contain serpentine rock fragments, asbestos was not detected during the Phase II ESA sampling investigation. Standard dust control measures required by the San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance would reduce the potential for impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 5 through 9, 17 and Attachments 3, 3a and 3b</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is not located within Coastal Zone Management Area or San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's (BCDC) area of jurisdiction, which includes the first 100 feet shoreward from the mean high-tide-line around San Francisco Bay; therefore, no formal finding of consistency with BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan is required.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 11, 12, and Attachment 4</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances</p> <p>24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is currently a vacant lot, occupied by an asphalt parking lot. The project site is located in the Mission Bay area of San Francisco which is currently comprised of residential, commercial, and industrial properties.</p> <p>Historical land use at the project site is well documented and since 1887 the project site has</p>

been occupied by a portion of Fourth Street, railroad tracks, a grain warehouse, and most recently an asphalt paved parking lot. Historical uses and potential hazards for the project site and immediate vicinity were provided by the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker and EnviroStor databases and an EDR database search conducted as part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for this project.

The Phase I ESA identified the potential for elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons and heavy metals in soil, methane gas in soil vapor and naturally occurring asbestos in serpentinite rock fragments. In addition to petroleum hydrocarbons and heavy metals from historic fill material, pesticides and herbicides may be present in underlying soil from railroad operations prior to 1999. A Phase II ESA was conducted in August 2016 and the results of testing indicated that the site is underlain by a layer of fill material with elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons and heavy metals.

The project site is within the Maher Ordinance area and is subject to provisions of Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code. 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 (DPH). Sites with contamination require a site mitigation plan. A Site Mitigation Plan was completed for the project and will be enforced by DPH and the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI).

Mitigation Measure 1 Health and Safety Plan is included to reduce potential impacts associated with disturbance of soil contaminants to a less-than-significant level.

Source Document(s): 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and Attachment 5

<p>Endangered Species</p> <p>Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is a disturbed and paved surface parking lot, and does not provide potential habitat for any federally listed species. No federally listed species or proposed for listing or federally designated critical habitats are documented within the proposed project area. Listed species may occur in Corona Heights Park and the San Miguel Hills area however, neither of these areas would be affected by the project.</p> <p>No impacts on federally listed species or critical habitat are anticipated as a result of the project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 18, 19, 20 and Attachment 6</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</p> <p>24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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 tanks (ASTs) is located at 185 Berry Street.</p> <p>The AST at 185 Berry Street (Level 3 Communications LLC), contains approximately 6,400 gallons and has an Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) for thermal radiation of 600 feet (if unobstructed). The project site is approximately 1,000 feet south of 185 Berry Street, separated by Mission Creek and several buildings, it is thus located at an acceptable distance.</p> <p>Source Document(s): Attachment 7</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection</p> <p>Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site consists of urban land; therefore, the project would not affect farmlands (PL 97-98, December 22, 1981). There are no protected farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 21 and Attachment 8</p>

<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project is not located within a 100-year floodplain on a known FEMA floodplain or within the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City dated November 12, 2015.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3, 4, and Attachment 9</p>
<p>Historic Preservation</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>A project-specific sensitivity assessment and records search conducted by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC File No.: 16-0279 Revised) indicate 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 May 2017.</p> <p>The PA includes measures to avoid adverse effects to buried or submerged historical resources. The terms of the PA include preparation of an Archaeological Testing 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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 10 and Attachment 10</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project would introduce new noise sources to the neighborhood from vehicle use on adjacent and nearby roadways by new residents and visitors. The project would also introduce short-term noises during the construction of the new building.</p> <p><u>HUD Noise Standards</u></p> <p>The acceptable exterior noise levels set forth by HUD regulations for new construction of housing are 65 day-night average sound level (Ldn) or less. Ldn is a 24-hour average noise level with a 10 decibel (dBA) penalty for noise occurring</p>

	<p>during the nighttime hours, defined as 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM. The regulations consider the range between 65 dBA Ldn and 75 dBA Ldn to be normally unacceptable, unless appropriate sound attenuation measures are provided. Unacceptable noise levels set by the HUD regulations are 75 dBA Ldn and higher.</p> <p>The San Francisco city-wide background noise level map, developed by the Department of Public Health, shows traffic noise levels on 3rd Street near the intersection of Mission Rock Street to be approximately 70 dBA Ldn or greater on the roadway and between approximately 65 to 70 dBA Ldn at the immediate roadside. However, the residential structure would be set back approximately 55 feet from the center of 3rd Street. Therefore, according to the San Francisco city-wide background noise level map, the exterior noise levels at the building setback would be between approximately 60 to 65 dBA Ldn with higher noise levels near 3rd Street and decreasing noise levels further away from 3rd Street. This setback for 3rd Street was utilized in the HUD web-based Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) Calculator, which is discussed in further detail below, as this would represent the actual roadway conditions once the project is operational, estimated in the year 2019 for the purposes of this analysis.</p> <p>The HUD DNL Calculator is an assessment tool that calculates the DNL from roadway and railway traffic as well as from aircraft and loud impulse sounds. ESA modeled noise levels according to the HUD DNL Calculator instructions which requires assessing noise impacts from roadways potentially affecting the project site of up to 1,000 feet away and railways potentially affecting the site of up to 3,000 feet away. The two roadways closest to the project site and having the most impact with motor vehicle and bus traffic are 3rd Street and 4th Street. There are two railways within 3,000 feet of the project site. The Muni Rail on 3rd Street, which is located</p>
--	--

	<p>approximately 55 feet from the project site buildings to the railway centerline, continues northbound along Channel Street/4th Street and then along King Street. The Caltrain terminus at 4th Street and King Street is approximately 1,600 feet to the northwest of the project site measured from the railway centerline and continues southbound further away from the project site.</p> <p>Transportation noise for 3rd Street and 4th Street as well as the Muni Rail on 3rd Street and the Caltrain terminus at 4th Street and King Street were calculated using the HUD DNL Calculator using best data available based on San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority (SFMTA) traffic volumes and Caltrain and SFMTA train headway schedules. The combined DNL exterior noise from these sources was calculated to be 71.9 dBA Ldn at the project site buildings.</p> <p>Two airports are located within the preliminary screening distance of the project site. SFO is located approximately 10 miles to the south and Oakland International Airport (OAK) is located approximately 8.5 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.</p> <p>The resulting exterior noise levels at the project site based on the DNL Calculator would fall within HUD's "normally unacceptable" range between 65 dBA and 75 dBA Ldn and mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations establishes uniform noise insulation standards for</p>
--	---

	<p>residential projects. Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or Ldn) of at least 45 dB. The San Francisco DBI would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall and floor/ceiling assemblies meet state standards regarding sound transmission. Compliance with this requirement would ensure that interior noise levels of the project residential units would meet the interior noise goal of HUD and the State of California.</p> <p><u>Construction Noise</u></p> <p>The nearest noise sensitive receptors to the project site are residential uses surrounding the project site, notably the adjacent apartment building to the west.</p> <p>Construction of the project would not require extensive demolition as the site is currently a surface parking lot. Minor demolition and grading activities would be required to remove the surface asphalt and perform fine grading. Project construction would consist of off-road equipment along with other construction-related noise sources including vehicle trips for deliveries and construction workers and would be expected to generate noise levels that could impact surrounding noise sensitive receptors. Construction equipment would consist of concrete industrial saws, rubber tired dozers, tractors/loaders/backhoes, cranes, forklifts, cement and mortar mixers, pavers, rollers and air compressors. Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the <i>Police Code</i>). The ordinance requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (e.g., jackhammers, hoe rams, impact wrenches) must have manufacturer-recommended and City-approved mufflers for both intake and exhaust. Section 2908 of the Ordinance prohibits The project would be</p>
--	--

		<p>required to comply with regulations set forth in the Noise Ordinance.</p> <p>Construction at the project site generally would be limited to daytime hours. Project construction would use pile drivers, which would be required to construct the foundation since the site is located within the Mission Bay basin that overlays Bay Mud and fill, and pile driving is required to reach bedrock. Pile driving 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 are equipped with manufacturer recommended intake and exhaust mufflers. 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 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.</p> <p>Construction activities of the project shall comply with the above identified mitigation measure, Good Neighbor Policy and the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. Therefore construction noise impacts from the project would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 22-31, 63-67, Attachment 11, 11a, 11b, 11c, and 11d</p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers</p> <p>Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project is not served by a U.S. EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 32, Attachment 12</p>

<p>Wetlands Protection</p> <p>Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 33, Attachment 13.</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 34, Attachment 14.</p>
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</p>		
<p>Environmental Justice</p> <p>Executive Order 12898</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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 11.9 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 are greater than 50 percent, it is consistent with (within 1 percent of) the percentage for the City of San Francisco. Additionally, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts which would create permanent adverse effects in the project area.</p> <p>Construction housing for homeless veteran and affordable units would provide result in a beneficial impact by providing housing for low-income populations.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 35, 36, 37, 38 and Attachment 15.</p>

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

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

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

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	<p>The project 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 west of and abutting the site is a seven-story, mixed-use building. To the north of the project site, across Long Bridge Street, is a six-story 315-unit residential building. To the east side of 3rd Street is a 28-acre vacant lot currently used as an at grade parking area, but under planning review for the Mission Rock mixed use project. To the south of the project site across Mission Rock Street is a vacant lot zoned for affordable residential development.</p> <p>The project site is currently zoned as MB-RA, Block 3E SFRA with capacity for 90 units per acre with optional expansion to 10 percent beyond. As an SFRA Affordable Housing zoned site, at 1.075 acres the project site allows up to 106 units. Block 3E is also zoned to allow buildings up to 65 feet in height and permits up to one vehicle parking space per unit.</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44</p>
<p>Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Geology and Soils</u></p> <p>The project site is located in the Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province which extends along the California coast south to the Transverse Ranges and north to the Oregon border. The 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).</p> <p>The SFBC 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.</p> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <p>The project site is currently entirely paved, serving as an at-grade parking area, this area will be replaced by residential structures, and will remain similarly impervious. Stormwater runoff from project construction would continue to drain into the combined sewer and stormwater system and be treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. Pursuant to the San Francisco Public Works Code, including the Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance, and the San Francisco Green Building Code, the project sponsor would be required to implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth BMP measures to reduce potential runoff and erosion impacts. The proposed</p>

		<p>project would construct all improvements according to the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance, which requires treatment of all runoff prior to leaving the site. The proposed stormwater management system for the project would collect, detain and potentially retain some stormwater within the project site such that the rate and amount of stormwater runoff from the site does not negatively impact the City's treatment facilities, and in a manner that is consistent with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) Stormwater Design Guidelines. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality during either construction or operation.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 45 and 46</p>
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise	2	<p><u>Hazardous Materials</u></p> <p>Hazardous materials are described above in "Contamination and Toxic Substances". Historical records and potential hazards for the project site and immediate vicinity were reviewed. A Site Mitigation Plan has been prepared and will be enforced through the San Francisco Maher Ordinance. Additionally, preparation of a HASP for construction activities is included as Mitigation Measure 1.</p> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Construction noise as discussed above "Noise Abatement and Control" would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22-31, and 63-67</p>
Energy Consumption	2	<p>The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulation as enforced by the 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.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	1	The project site is currently vacant and therefore there are no employees at the portion of the site that 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	1	<p><u>Demographics</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Displacement</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 40</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p>The project would not displace educational or cultural facilities. 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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 48 and 49</p>
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>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 of 4th Street and King Street, and "The Market Hall" which is one block away. 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.</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 49</p>
Health Care and Social Services	2	<p>The project will not impact any health care or social service facilities. 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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 48 and 49</p>
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	<p>Recology, Inc. provides residential and commercial solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services for the City of San Francisco. Recyclable materials are taken to Recology's Pier 96 facility, where they are separated into commodities (e.g., aluminum, glass, and paper) and transported to other users for reprocessing. Compostables (e.g., food waste, plant trimmings, soiled paper) are transferred to a Recology composting facility in Solano County, where they are converted to soil amendment and compost. The remaining material is transported to a landfill.</p> <p>In September 2015, San Francisco approved an Agreement with Recology, Inc., for the transport and disposal of the City's municipal solid waste at the Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. The City began disposing its municipal solid waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in January 2016, and is anticipated to continue for approximately nine years, with an option to renew the Agreement thereafter for an additional six years. The Recology Hay Road Landfill is permitted to accept up to 2,400 tons of waste per day, and, at this maximum rate of acceptance, the landfill has permitted capacity to continue to receive waste approximately through the year 2077.</p> <p>Construction and demolition (C&D) debris in the City must be transported by a registered transporter to a registered facility that can process mixed C&D debris pursuant to the City and County of San Francisco C&D Ordinance.</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>During operation, the project would be subject to the City's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires the separation of refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, thereby minimizing solid waste disposal and maximizing recycling and composting. Although the project could incrementally increase total waste generation from the City by increasing the number of residents at the project site, the increasing rate of diversion through recycling and other methods would result in a decreasing share of total waste that requires deposition into the landfill.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 49, 50, 51, and 52</p>
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	<p>The project site is within an urban area that is well served by the combined sewer/stormwater collection, storage and treatment facilities operated by SFPUC.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The combined sewer and wastewater system currently operates under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits. The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant is currently operating under the 2008 NPDES Permit No. CA0037664 (Order No. R2-2008-0007) issued and enforced by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, which monitors discharge prohibitions, dry-weather effluent limitations, wet-</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 48, 53, and 54</p>
Water Supply	2	<p>Water would be provided to the project by SFPUC. SFPUC forecasted future water demand using regional growth projections that incorporate existing land use designations and reasonably foreseeable future projects within San Francisco. According to the <i>2010 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco</i> (UWMP) and the updated retail demand forecasts contained in the 2013 Water Availability Study, the SFPUC would be able to meet the future demand in years of average precipitation as well as in a single dry year and a multiple dry year event, for each five-year projection beginning in 2020.</p> <p>Implementation of the project, which consists of the development of up to 101 dwelling units, would incrementally increase the demand for water in San Francisco. Since project water demand could be accommodated by the existing and planned supply anticipated under SFPUC's UWMP, it would not result in a substantial increase in water use on the project site that could not be accommodated by existing water supply entitlements and water resources.</p> <p>Source Information: 48, 55, and 56</p>
Public Safety - Police, Fire and	2	<p>The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), headquartered at 850 Bryant Street, provides police protection in the City and County of San Francisco.</p>

Emergency Medical		<p>Police service is provided to the project site primarily by the San Francisco Police Department's Southern Station, at 1251 3rd Street approximately 160 feet away (across the corner from the project site at Mission Rock Street and 3rd Street).</p> <p>The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), headquartered at 698 Second Street, provides fire suppression services and unified emergency medical services (EMS) and transport, including basic life support and advanced life support services, in the City and County of San Francisco. Fire protection to the project site is provided primarily by the San Francisco Fire Department's Station 4, at 449 Mission Rock Street (approximately 175 feet east), Station 8, at 36 Bluxome Street (at 4th approximately 0.4 miles to the northwest), and Station 29, at 299 Vermont Street (at 16th Street, approximately .9 miles 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 dynamically deployed fleet of both public and private ambulance services. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes.</p> <p>Implementation of the project could increase the demand for fire protection, emergency medical and police protection services. However, the increase would be incremental, funded largely through project-related increases to the City's tax base, and would not be substantial given the overall demand for such services on a citywide basis. Fire protection, emergency medical, and police protection resources are regularly redeployed based on need in order to maintain acceptable service ratios.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 48, 58, and 59</p>
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	<p>The Mission Bay project, which included the zoning for the 1150 3rd Street Project, 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 Mission Rock project would also involve up to 8 additional acres of parks and open space. Under the existing setting 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.</p>

		Source Document(s): 40, 43, 44, 49, and 59
Transportation and Accessibility	2	<p>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 significant affect area traffic.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 60</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	<p>No known unique natural, or water features are present onsite. Implementation of the project would not affect water resources, nor would it increase demands on groundwater resources. As noted above, water service would be provided by SFPUC. No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 48</p>
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	<p>The project site is currently a parking lot and does not support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife species.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 18, 19, and 20</p>
Other Factors	2	<p><u>Greenhouse Gas</u></p> <p>In August 2016, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued its Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews. The CEQ's Final Guidance directs that analysis include the impact of the project on climate and the impact of climate change on the project.</p> <p>The BAAQMD has established a numeric GHG threshold of significance of 1,100 MTCO₂e for projects located in the SFBAAB supported by substantial evidence in its CEQA Thresholds Options and Justification Report developed by its staff in 2009. The BAAQMD threshold excludes</p>

	<p>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) <i>Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County</i> states that “lead agencies may decide to amortize the level of short-term construction emissions over the expected (long-term) operational life of a project”. Consistent with SMAQMD guidance, GHG emissions from construction, which are temporary, have been amortized over 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.</p> <p>CalEEMod (version 2016.3.1) was used to estimate construction and operational-related greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the project to determine if it would exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e per year. Model results indicate that total GHG emissions from construction would be approximately 852 MTCO₂e. When amortized over 30 years, construction would contribute approximately 28 MTCO₂e to the project’s annual operational GHG emissions over a 30 year lifetime. The estimated annual operational emission from project operations would be approximately 913 MTCO₂e per year. The combined amortized construction and annual operational GHG emissions would be approximately 941 MTCO₂e per year, which would be below the threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e per year.</p> <p>In addition to the project’s generation of greenhouse gasses, the project would also be subject to climate change, namely in the form of sea level rise. In March 2016, the City of San Francisco released the <i>San Francisco Sea Level Rise Action Plan</i>, to “further understand and address the threat of sea level rise.” HUD guidance for sea level rise is also provided by an October 28, 2016 proposed rule which would expand the floodplain to include a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard (FFRMS) floodplain which, “for non-critical actions, the FFRMS floodplain would be defined as areas less than two feet above the 100-year floodplain.” While the project site is currently outside of a 100-year floodplain as discussed above, the 100-year floodplain in the project vicinity has a base flood elevation height of 10 feet. The project is proposed to be graded with a base floor elevation of 12.236 feet. At this elevation the project would remain above the two feet freeboard elevation proposed under this rule and thus would remain beyond the FFRMS reach.</p>
--	---

		<p>The proposed project would neither substantially impact climate change by way of generated greenhouse gas emissions, nor would it be substantially impacted by potential sea level rise.</p> <p>Source(s): 3, 9, 61, 62, 68, 69</p>
--	--	--

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

1. May 16-18, 2016; Langan Treadwell Rollo. Geotechnical Investigation
2. April 4, 2016; Langan Treadwell Rollo. 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: http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Consolidated_CCAG_ALUCP_November-20121.pdf. Accessed September 8, 2016. Prepared by Ricondo & Associates, Inc., Jacobs Consultancy, and Clarion.
2. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016. Results of Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper electronic database search for San Francisco, California. Available: <http://www.fws.gov/cbra/Maps/Mapper.html>. Accessed September 8, 2016.
3. City and County of San Francisco, Office of the City Administrator, November 12, 2015. Interim Floodplain Map, SE San Francisco. Available: http://sfgsa.org/sites/default/files/Document/SF_SE.pdf. Accessed September 8, 2016.
4. U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2015. Flood Map Service Center, San Francisco County. Available: <http://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor>. Accessed September 8, 2016.
5. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), July 2013. Available: <http://caleemod.com/>. Accessed November 10, 2016.
6. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2010. Draft California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, May 2010. Available: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>. Accessed September 4, 2016.
7. 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.
8. USEPA, 2016. General Conformity De Minimis Levels, February 2016. Available: <http://www3.epa.gov/airquality/genconform/deminimis.html>. Accessed March 9, 2016.
9. BAAQMD, 2009. Revised Draft Options and Justification Report California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance.
10. ESA, 2017. Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment for 1150 3rd Street (Block 3 East). January 2017.
11. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016. Coastal Zone Management Program. Office for Coastal Management. Available: <https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/mystate/?redirect=301ocm>. Accessed October 5, 2016.
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 October 5, 2016.
13. City of San Francisco, 2016. City of San Francisco Planning Department Property Information Report for Parcel 8711026. Available: <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/>. Accessed October 4, 2016.
14. California State Water Resources Control Board, 2016. GeoTracker. Available: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=1150+3rd+street%2C+san+francisco> Accessed October 4, 2016.
15. California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2016. EnviroStor. Available: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mapfull.asp?global_id=&x=-

- 119&y=37&zl=18&ms=640,480&mt=m&findaddress=True&city=1150%20rd%20street&zip=&county=&federal_superfund=true&state_response=true&voluntary_cleanup=true&school_cleanup=true&ca_site=true&tiered_permit=true&evaluation=true&military_evaluation=true&school_investigation=true&operating=true&post_closure=true&non_operating=true. Accessed October 4, 2016.
16. Langan Treadwell Rollo, 2016. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Block 3 East – Mission Bay- 1150 Third Street, San Francisco, CA. August 2, 2016.
 17. Langan Treadwell Rollo, 2016. Site Mitigation Plan Block 3 East – Mission Bay, San Francisco, CA. December 16, 2016.
 18. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2016. 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: 08ESMF00-2017-SLI-0038, Event Code: 08ESMF00-2017-E-0005908ESMF000-2016-SLI-1154). Accessed on October 06, 2016
 19. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2016. California Natural Diversity Database, Results of electronic records search. Sacramento, California: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat Data Analysis Branch. [USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles San Francisco North, Point Bonita, San Rafael, San Quentin, Richmond, Oakland West, Hunters Point, San Francisco South]. Accessed March 30, 2016.
 20. 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 October 6, 2016.
 21. Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2016. Results of electronic Web Soil Survey database. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available: <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed October 6, 2016.
 22. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Noise Guidebook, March 2009. Available: <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/>. Accessed March 11, 2016.
 23. San Francisco Department of Public Health, March 2009. Areas Potentially Requiring Noise Insulations. March 2009. Accessed March 14, 2016.
 24. Federal Highway Administration, January 2006. Construction Noise Model User's Guide. Available: www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf. Accessed March 14, 2016.
 25. San Francisco Metropolitan Transit Agency (SFMTA). Traffic Count Data 1995 – 2013, March 2014. Available: <https://www.sfmta.com/about-sfmta/reports/sfmta-traffic-count-data-1995-2013>. Accessed November 14, 2016.
 26. SFMTA. Muni Map, March 2014. Available: <https://www.sfmta.com/maps/muni-system-map>. Accessed March 25, 2016.
 27. Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2016. KT: K-Ingleside/T-Third Street Map. Available <https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/transit/routes-stops/k-t-kt-k-inglesidet-third-street>. Accessed October 13, 2016.
 28. 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](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.
 29. Caltrain, 2016. San Francisco Station, Weekend Timetables. Accessed at: <http://www.caltrain.com/stations/sanfranciscostation.html>. Available at: Accessed September 29, 2016
 30. U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, September 1980. Highway Noise Fundamentals.
 31. American Legal Publishing Corporation. Article 700- Speed Limits. Available at: <http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/transportation/divisionii/article700sp>. Accessed September 29, 2016.
 32. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016. Sole Source Aquifers in Region 9. Available: <http://www3.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html>. Accessed October 6, 2016.
 33. 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 October 6, 2016.
 34. 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

35. 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.
36. United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census), "Poverty Thresholds for 2010 and 2014 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years," available at: www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html, accessed October 7, 2016.
37. United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census), "Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months," American Community Survey, 2010–2014, Available at: factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_14_5YR_S1701&prodType=table Accessed October 7, 2016
38. 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
39. City of San Francisco Planning Department, 2016. San Francisco Property Information Map. Available at: <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/>. Accessed October 6, 2016.
40. 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.
41. 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.
42. 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.
43. 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.
44. Port of San Francisco, 2016. Mission Rock. Available at: <http://sfport.com/missionrock>. Accessed October 6, 2016.
45. San Francisco Planning Department, March 17, 2015. CatEx Determination Layers. Available at: <http://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/catexposter.pdf>. Accessed October 6, 2016.
46. Langan Treadwell Rollo, 2016. Geotechnical Investigation Block 3 East – Mission Bay- San Francisco, CA. September 23, 2016.
47. 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.
48. 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 at: <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 at: <http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/3875-MISSION%20BAY%20SUBSEQUENT%20ENVIRONMENTAL%20IMPACT%20REPORT%20VOL%20IIB.pdf>. Accessed October 16, 2016.
49. Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, 2016. Mission Bay. Available at: <http://sfocii.org/mission-bay>. Accessed October 16, 2016
50. California Integrated Waste Management Board, 2016. Solid Waste Information System. Available: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/48-AA-0002/Detail/>. Accessed November 16, 2016.
51. City and County of San Francisco, 2015. Notice of Availability of and Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for the Agreement for Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. Available: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1828>. Accessed November 14, 2016.

52. San Francisco Planning Department, Agreement for the Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste and Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County, Case No. 2014.0653E, Final Negative Declaration, July 21, 2015. Available: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2014.0653E_Revised_FND.pdf. Accessed November 14, 2016.
53. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, ORDER NO. R2-2008-0007, NPDES NO. CA0037664. Available: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb2/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2008. Accessed November 16, 2016.
54. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2015. SSIP On The Bayside. Available at: <http://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=785>. Accessed November 16, 2016
55. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), *2010 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco*, adopted June 2011. Available online at <http://sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=1055>. Accessed April 4, 2016.
56. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), *2013 Water Availability Study for the City and County of San Francisco*, May 2013. Available online at <http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=75>. Accessed April 4, 2016.
57. San Francisco Police Department, 2016. City and County of San Francisco Police Department District Stations and Map. Available: <http://sf-police.org/index.aspx?page=796>. Accessed November 16, 2016.
58. San Francisco Fire Department, 2016. City and County of San Francisco Fire Department Fire Station Locations. Available: <http://www.sf-fire.org/index.aspx?page=176>. Accessed November 16, 2016.
59. Mission Bay Parks, September 2016. Mission Bay Parks Map. Available at: http://1a74hq3x1mln95wln1r7ou21.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/MBP_Map_9_1_16.pdf. Accessed November 16, 2016.
60. San Francisco Planning Department, 2016. San Francisco Transportation Information Map. Available at: <http://sftransportationmap.org/>. Accessed November 16, 2016.
61. HUD Exchange, 2016. Federal Flood Risk Management Standard (FFRMS). Available at: <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/environmental-review/ffrms/>. Accessed November 17, 2016.
62. LMS Architects 2016. 1st Floor Grade, Elevations, and Coordinates.
63. Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, 2014. Event Center and Mixed-Use Development at Mission Bay Blocks 29-32 Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report - Appendices
64. Oakland International Airport Master Plan, March 2006. Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) Contours 2004 and 2010 (Figure 6.17).
65. Final 14 Code of Federal Regulations Part 150, August 13, 2015. Study Update Noise Exposure Map Report for San Francisco International Airport- 2019 Noise Exposure Map.
66. San Francisco Planning Department, 2010. Draft EIR/EIS Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan- Appendix Noise Data.
67. Roadway Construction Noise Model. October 13, 2016. Crane Saw Impact Pile.
68. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, December 2008, updated September 2016. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County.
69. Council of Environmental Quality, August 1, 2016. Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews. Available at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/documents/nepa_final_ghg_guidance.pdf. Accessed November 16, 2016.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Airport Hazards Worksheet
2. Flood Insurance Worksheet
3. Air Quality Worksheet
 - a. Criteria Pollutant Emission Summary and CalEEMod Output
 - b. Construction Emissions 2016
4. Coastal Zone Management Worksheet
5. Site Contamination (Multi-Family) Worksheet
6. Endangered Species Act Worksheet
7. Explosive and Flammable Facilities Worksheet

8. Farmlands Protection Worksheet
9. Floodplain Management Worksheet
10. Programmatic Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and the California State Historic Preservation Officer regarding 1150 3rd Street Affordable Housing Development
11. Noise Abatement and Control Worksheet
 - a. Noise Assessment Preparation Calculations
 - b. Noise Assessment Preparation Calculations
 - c. HUD DNEL Calculator
 - d. SFMTA Route KT 2016 data
12. Sole Source Aquifers Worksheet
13. Wetland Protection Worksheet
14. Wild and Scenic Rivers Worksheet
15. Environmental Justice Worksheet

List of Permits Obtained:

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

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, and Golden State Warriors Event Center and Mixed-Use Development at Mission Bay Blocks 29-32. 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, floodplain, biological resources, agricultural resources, land use, environmental justice, socioeconomic; thus, the project would not contribute to potentially adverse cumulative impacts for these issues.

Impacts associated with hazardous materials, cultural resources and geology and soils are generally site-specific and not cumulative in nature. The project would comply with the applicable Programmatic Agreement; federal, state and local regulations; and Mitigation Measure 1 (HASP) 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 compliance with the Mission Bay Good Neighbor Policy and San Francisco Noise Ordinance (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 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 does 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 have been contemplated; 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 may be mitigated depending on the size of the development. A smaller development would not maximize the potential use of the property for affordable housing and would not serve to avoid any impacts.

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

Summary of Findings and Conclusions: With applicable laws, authorities, factors or other enforceable measures all potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a significant level with the exception of hazardous materials. For hazardous materials, the project would result in minor adverse but mitigable impacts. No impacts are potentially significant to the extent that an Environmental Impact Statement would be required. The project would result primarily in less than significant impacts to the environment with beneficial socioeconomic impacts.

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

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 1 - Health and Safety Plan (HASP)

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

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance (San Francisco Health Code Article 22B, and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.3.2.6)	All site preparation work, demolition, or other construction in San Francisco that could create dust or expose or disturb more than 10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of soil, must comply with specified dust control measures.
24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	It is a HUD goal that the interior auditory environment shall not exceed a day-night average sound level of 45 decibels.
Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations	Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or DNL) of at least 45 decibels.
San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code)	The ordinance established acceptable noise levels for construction activities unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works.
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.
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.
Project-Specific Programmatic Agreement (PA; Attachment 10)	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.
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)	A Site Mitigation Plan has been prepared for the project which will be enforced by San Francisco DPH and San Francisco DBI. The Site Mitigation Plan characterizes potential contamination and addresses contaminated soil management and disposal.

Determination:

Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

Finding of Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Preparer Signature: Jennifer Wade Date: May 25, 2017

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

Certifying Officer Signature: Olson Lee Date: _____

Name/Title: Olson Lee, 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).