

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

Project Information

Project Name: The-Village-SF-Urban-Indian-Project

HEROS Number: 900000010398139

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

RE Preparer: Madeleine Sweet

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Daniel Adams

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): The Friendship House Association of American Indians

Point of Contact: Peter Bratt

Consultant (if applicable): ETFenvironmental

Point of Contact: Eugene T Flannery

Project Location: 80 Julian Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

The project site (Assessor's Block 3547/052) is a 6,608-square-foot rectangular parcel on the west side of Julian Avenue between 14th Street to the north and 15th Street to

the south in San Francisco's Mission neighborhood. See Figure 1. The postal address is 80 Julian Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Direct Comments to: All comments should be directed to Madeleine Sweet, MOHCD Compliance Coordinator at: madeleine.sweet@sfgov.org.

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

The Friendship House Association of American Indians (project sponsor) currently operates a residential substance use disorder treatment and recovery center for American Indians at 56 Julian Avenue, which is immediately adjacent to and north of the project site at 80 Julian Avenue (Site). Separately, the Native American Health Clinic operates a medical and dental clinic at 160 Capp Street, three blocks from the project site. 80 Julian Avenue is vacant except for a paved basketball court. The project sponsor proposes to demolish the basketball court on the project site and construct "The Wellness Center," a six-story-over-basement, 79-foot-tall mixed-use building (with an additional 16-foot-tall elevator penthouse) containing 21 group housing units and approximately 30,250 square feet of community facility spaces consisting of cultural, recreational, and medical programming space for the American Indian community in San Francisco and the Bay Area. The proposed new building would occupy the entire 80 Julian lot. The existing building at 56 Julian Avenue would not be modified as part of the proposed project. The courtyard at 56 Julian Avenue would be used for construction staging and other construction activities and would be restored after construction of 80 Julian Avenue is complete. The new building would provide a community center, a medical and dental clinic, and interim-supportive housing

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

The need for a Community Wellness Center for the Bay Area American Indian and Alaskan Native (AI/AN) community is acute. The need is drawn out by a comparison of the key demographics and characteristics of this group to the general population of the United States in general and the Bay Area in particular. AI/AN persons comprise 2.9 percent of the United States population and 0.8 percent of San Francisco's population. Due to their small numbers as compared to other ethnic groups, their needs are often overlooked or underserved. American Indians and Alaska Natives die at higher rates than other Americans in most demographic categories and have long experienced lower health status when compared with other Americans. Lower life expectancy and disproportionate disease burden are a result of inadequate education, disproportionate poverty, discrimination in the delivery of health services, and cultural differences. These are broad quality of life issues rooted in economic adversity and poor social conditions. Mental health and substance use disorders are a major cause of premature deaths among AI/AN populations, mainly due to liver disease, suicides, and injuries. Wide discrepancies exist in various social conditions between AI/AN and the general population. The discrepancies lend support to the

need to develop an appropriate Wellness Center in the midst of the Native American cultural district of San Francisco. The Wellness Center will provide a broad spectrum of innovative services beyond medical care that involve health education, fitness, traditional, and alternative medicine and cultural events.

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

The Project Site is located on a single through lot (with an area of 6,608 square feet), which has a 66-ft of frontage along Julian Avenue and 66-ft of frontage along Caledonia Street, a 15-foot wide alley. The Project Site is a generally flat vacant lot. A basketball court and small landscaped area abut the courtyard of the adjacent Friendship House, located to the north of the project site at 56 Julian Avenue. The Project Site is located within the Valencia Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit Zoning District in the Mission Area Plan. The immediate context is mixed in character with residential, industrial, and institutional uses. To the south of the Project Site are a two-story brick building (1656-1660 15th Street), a one-story industrial building (1670 15th Street), and a two-story commercial building (1672 15th Street). Immediately across Julian Avenue is a five-story, 202-unit mixed-use residential building (1880 Mission Street). Across Caledonia Street from the Project Site fronting Valencia Street is a four-story, 52-unit mixed-use residential building with ground floor retail (1684-1688 15th Street/391 Valencia Street), a two-story, commercial building (375-377 Valencia Street) and a five-story mixed-use residential building with ground floor retail (363 Valencia Street). The Project Site is located in the American Indian Cultural District. This District holds a unique concentration of historical events, cultural resources, and Native American-based programming, services, and gathering spaces that are important to the American Indian community in the San Francisco Bay Area. Trends AI/AN migration to urban areas represents one of the most significant demographic shifts in U.S. history. In 1970, 38% of all AI/AN people lived in urban areas. In 2020, 87% of all AI/AN people identified in the Census lived outside of tribal statistical areas, with 60% living in metropolitan areas. This large influx into urban areas has not been met with a commensurate increase in relevant culturally competent community facilities. The development of the Wellness Center will improve the delivery of services to NA/AI persons.

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

[Plans.pdf](#)

[Vicinity Map.jpg](#)

[SF PIM Property Information Map SF Planning Page 1.jpg](#)

[80 Julian Topographic Map\(1\).pdf](#)

[80 Julian Topographic Map.pdf](#)

[Garden - Copy.HEIC](#)

[Friendship House Entrance - Copy.HEIC](#)

[Basketball Court - Copy\(1\).jpg](#)

[Basketball Court - Copy.HEIC](#)

Determination:

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

Approval Documents:

[80 Julian - SIGNED SIGNATURE PAGE.pdf](#)

7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer

on:

7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer

on:

Funding Information

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
B-23-CP-CA-0194	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program	\$750,000.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded, \$750,000.00

Assisted or Insured Amount:

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) \$92,200,000.00

(5)]:

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. The Site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or within 2,000 feet of a civilian airport. The airport nearest the Site is San Francisco International Airport located nine miles from the Site. The Site is not within the Accident Potential Zone or a Runway Protection Zone/Clear Zones of SFO airport. The proposed action would not result in a significant airport-related safety hazard. Sources: (3) (4) (5)
Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act .Source: (6)
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements. This location does not fall within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) pursuant to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). This location has an area of Low or Minimal Flood Risk - Flood Zone: X Unshaded. FIRM Number 060298011BA,

		<p>Effective March 23, 2021 (Not printed). "Unshaded" Zone X represents areas of minimal flood risk or areas that FEMA did not study or map. For San Francisco, FEMA did not study or map inland areas where stormwater flooding occurs during heavy rains. Flood insurance purchase requirements do not apply in these areas, but flood insurance may be purchased at reduced cost. Sources: (7) (8)</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5</p>		
<p>Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The project's county or air quality management district is in non-attainment status for the following: Carbon monoxide, Ozone, Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns. This project does not exceed de minimis emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act. Please see attached Air Quality Discussion.</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. The project site is not within a Coastal Zone Management (CZM) area and does not involve the acquisition of undeveloped land in a CZM area. There would be no conflict with the Coastal Zone Management Act. Sources: (7) (17)</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project has been determined to have No Effect on listed species. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation.</p>

<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>There is a current or planned stationary aboveground storage container of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The Separation Distance from the project is acceptable. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. There are 59 AST's within one mile of the project site. In accordance with HUD Fact Sheet H2 Determining Which Tanks to Evaluate for Acceptable Separation Distance, ETFevironmental calculated the blast distances of the tank closest to the project Site and the bkblast distances for the largest tank. Both tanks are within an acceptable separation distance.</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. No protected farmlands are located within the City and County of San Francisco. The project site is developed with existing structures, zoned NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit District), and has been historically used for residential and office uses. The area is classified as Urban Area by the United State Census Bureau. The proposed action would have no impact on farmlands. The proposed action would not conflict with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.</p>
<p>Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. This location does not fall within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) pursuant to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). This location has an area of Low or Minimal Flood Risk - Flood Zone: X Unshaded, FIRM Number 060298011BA, Effective <arch 23, 2021</p>

		<p>(Not printed). "Shaded" Zone X represents areas of moderate or low flood risk - these areas are subject to inundation during a flood having a 0.2-percent-annual-chance of occurrence, or during the 1-percent-annual-chance flood with depth less than 1 foot. "Unshaded" Zone X represents areas of minimal flood risk or areas that FEMA did not study or map. For San Francisco, FEMA did not study or map inland areas where stormwater flooding occurs during heavy rains. The project does not encourage development in a floodplain. Sources: (7) (8)</p>
<p>Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. Conditions: Avoidance. Upon satisfactory implementation of the conditions, which should be monitored, the project is in compliance with Section 106.</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 60.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. ETEnvironmental calculated the Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) using the HUD Electronic Assessment Tool (Calculator) to calculate noise levels for adjacent roadway. Aircraft and Rail sources were not included in the calculations as the Site is beyond reportable distances of either. Both the Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool Users Guide as well as the information contained in The HUD Noise Guidebook were used to complete the noise study calculations. The results of the calculation returned a DNL value of 60 dBA DNL, which is considered acceptable under HUD Noise Standards. With compliance with the California Building Code the interior noise goal will be met and 47 DNL is an acceptable level for the use of outdoor</p>

		spaces. No Noise mitigations are necessary.
<p>Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. The nearest sole source aquifer is the Santa Margarita Aquifer, located approximately 50 miles south of the project site. The proposed action would have no effect on a sole-source aquifer subject to the HUD-USEPA Memorandum of Understanding. Sources: (29)</p>
<p>Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. The Site does not appear on the National Wetlands Inventory database. There are no wetlands on, adjacent to or near the Project Site. No further consultations are required. Source: (25)</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. No wild and scenic rivers are located within San Francisco. The nearest Wild and Scenic River is the North Fork American River which is approximately 100 miles northeast of the Project Site. Source: (30)</p>
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
<p>Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>Adverse environmental impacts are not disproportionately high for low-income and/or minority communities. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.</p>

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

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

- (1) Minor beneficial impact

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

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	1	<p>General Plan Consistency. Applicable land use plans that regulate development on the project site include the San Francisco General Plan and the San Francisco Planning Code. The proposed project is in the Valencia Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit zoning district, which allows for residential and social service/community facilities. The Project is a residential and community facility development, providing 21 new group housing rooms in a mixed-use area. The on-site low-cost rooms for rent assist in furthering the City's affordable housing goals. The medical and dental facilities at the will be of value to community members. The residential and community serving uses can introduce new residents and visitors to the neighborhood to help patronize existing commercial uses, thus supporting local economic well-being. The Project is, on balance, consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. Zoning Consistency A Special Use District entitled</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>"The Village Special Use District" ("District") consisting of Assessor's Block 3547, Lot 52, was established by the Board of Supervisors ("BOS") on January 13, 2023. To further the purpose of the District the BOS authorized the Planning Commission to make exceptions from the Planning Code requirements governing Floor Area Ratio, Height and Bulk Restrictions, Rear Yard, Use Size Limits, Permitted Obstructions Prohibitions, Dwelling Unit Exposure, Active Use Governing Street Frontages, Setbacks on Narrow Streets and Alleys, and Fees. Additionally, the Planning Code was amended by revising Height and Bulk Map HT07, and Special Use Map SU07. The Conditional Use Authorization was approved by the San Francisco Planning Commission on January 26, 2023. Compatibility The project has met the applicable Design guidelines as set forth in the Urban Design Guidelines, Neighborhood Commercial Design Guidelines and Citywide Design Guidelines. The Project is compatible with the neighborhood and community. The proposed development will improve a vacant lot with a unique design of aesthetic and visual</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>interest and will augment the diversity of architectural styles and building sizes found throughout the nearby vicinity. The Project will be a distinctive building while still being well suited and compatible with the surrounding area. As the new center for the Bay Area American Indian community, it offers public and civic importance that warrants a prominent design. The surrounding neighborhood is characterized by mixed visual diversity, exhibiting a wide range of building height, massing, ages, architectural styles, materials, and more. While there is a heavy concentration of smaller scale, one- to two-story residential and commercial structures, a number of nearby buildings are of more considerable height and massing. Larger buildings include 1880 Mission (a 2010 five-story rental building), 391 Valencia Street (a four-story mixed-use building directly west of the subject property) and the nearby 65-foot tall Armory Building. Many surrounding structures are built to the full lot lines, with no consistent pattern of front, rear, or side setbacks. While the Project will be built taller than nearby properties, its lot size is smaller than many of</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>the larger nearby buildings' lots, thus avoiding a monolithic appearance of excessive mass and bulk. Building material also varies greatly with wood-framed, brick, concrete, and stucco clad structures all found nearby. The subject property is not located in a historic district. While a large concentration of older buildings exists, the neighborhood is also rich in newer development. Of high architectural merit, the landmark-quality design includes a unique terracotta baguette cladding on all four sides reminiscent of nearby older brick buildings, though designed in a contemporary way. Sources: (28) (32) (33) (34)</p>	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	<p>Rollo & Ridley Geotechnical (Rollo) conducted a Geotechnical Investigation in 2020. The site is underlain by 4 to 10 feet of fill of loose to very dense sand, sand with silt, and silty sand with some debris consisting of brick, glass, and concrete fragments. The fill is underlain by competent Alluvium consisting of dense to very dense sand, sand with silt, silty sand, and clayey sand to 51 feet below the ground surface. Rollo concluded the project is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint and</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>identified the following geotechnical issues that should be addressed.</p> <p>Foundation support, Shoring and underpinning, Construction considerations (including dewatering. Slope: the slope is less than six percent, which is considered optimal. Erosion: Grading and excavation would expose topsoil and may result in erosion. The project would comply with Section 146 of the San Francisco Public Works Code which requires all construction sites to implement best management practices to minimize surface runoff erosion and sedimentation. The project will disturb more than 5,000 square feet of ground surface so it is required to submit an erosion and sediment control plan to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission plan prior to any land-disturbing activities.</p> <p>Drainage: The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on or off site. It would not create or contribute runoff waters which would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems, it would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; nor would it impede or</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>redirect flood flows. The site is mostly unpaved, and the building footprint would cover most of the project site adding to impervious surfaces. The project would comply with the City's Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines and would implement measures to decrease the amount of stormwater runoff associated with the proposed project which includes a rooftop planting area and rainwater harvesting. Stormwater: Project construction would involve excavation of 5,200 cubic yards of material to a depth of up 22 feet and is likely to encounter groundwater; dewatering would be necessary. Because dewatering activities could adversely affect water quality the project would be required to submit an erosion and sediment control plan to the SFPUC. Groundwater encountered during construction would be subject to the requirements of article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code which requires groundwater to meet specified water quality standards before discharge to the combined sewer system. Prior to dewatering activities, the project sponsor would obtain a Batch Wastewater</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Discharge Permit from the SFPUC. The SFPUC may require water quality analysis prior to discharge. Once constructed, the project would not require operational dewatering. During project operations, wastewater and stormwater from the project site would flow into the city's combined stormwater and sewer system and be treated to the standards contained within the city's NPDES permit for the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. The proposed project would be required to meet the standards for stormwater management identified in the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance and meet the SFPUC stormwater management requirements. The project sponsor would be required to submit for approval by the SFPUC a stormwater control plan that complies with the city's 2016 Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines. The proposed project's construction and operational activities would not substantially degrade surface water or groundwater quality or violate water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. The proposed project would not</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		adversely affect water quality, and no mitigation measures are required. Sources: (20) (28) (35)	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	3	The construction period will last 21 months. The noisiest phases of construction would last for five months, during the site preparation, grading, and foundation/below-grade work, when equipment would include bore/drill rigs and excavators. Construction noise is regulated by San Francisco Police Code s.s. 2907, 2908. s. 2907 requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools are not subject to the equipment noise limit, provided that impact tools and equipment have intake and exhaust mufflers recommended by the manufacturers and are approved by the Director of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection (Directors) as best accomplishing maximum noise attenuation. Pavement breakers and jackhammers must be equipped with acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds recommended by the manufacturers and approved by the Directors as best accomplishing maximum	Compliance with recommendations contained in Rollo 2020 Geotechnical Investigation.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>noise attenuation. .2908 of the Police Code prohibits construction work between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m., if noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless a special permit is authorized by the Directors. The construction noise levels would be temporary, would not persist upon completion of construction activities, and individual pieces of construction equipment would be required to comply with the noise limits in Article 29 of the Police Code.</p> <p>Operational Noise: The site is an urban area with a mix of residential and commercial uses. The project would add residential and community uses. Traffic would have to double in volume to produce a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels. The project would generate 514 daily vehicle trips, which would not a doubling. The project would include a diesel-powered back-up emergency generator, HVAC, electrical, and plumbing equipment on the roof, which would generate operational noise. Rooftop mechanical equipment would be fully enclosed with vents or screened by 5- to 8- foot-tall parapets or screens. This equipment would comply</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>with the standards contained in Noise Ordinance. s. 2909(b) Construction and operational noise impacts would not be adverse. No mitigation measures are necessary</p> <p>Vibration: Construction vibration levels were determined to not exceed the 0.25 in/sec criterion established by the California Department of Transportation for historic and older buildings and would not be expected to damage adjacent structures. Thus, construction vibration impacts would not be adverse and no mitigation measures are necessary.</p> <p>SEISMIC: The primary seismic risks at the site are from earthquakes generated by the San Andreas, Hayward and San Gregorio Faults. The northwest corner of the project site is in a seismic hazard - liquefaction hazard zone; however, the geotechnical report states that the site does not fall within an area of San Francisco where known liquefaction has occurred or is expected, and the likelihood of sand layers liquefying at the site is low. Rollo concluded the likelihood of liquefaction, landsliding, and lateral spreading to occur at the site is low; and that of densification settlement, fault rupture and secondary</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>ground failure to be very low. The geotechnical report recommendations are contained in the attached Geotechnical Report. Finally, the geotechnical report cites specific provisions of the 2019 California Building Code for seismic design. Mitigations Required. Sources: (7) (28) (35) (36) (37) (38)</p>	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	<p>The proposed project would add approximately 21 new residents and 337 daily users (consisting of 40 employees and 297 visitors) at the project site. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) prepared projections of employment and housing growth for the Bay Area as part of Plan Bay Area 2050, adopted by ABAG and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in 2021. ABAG's growth projections anticipate that by 2050 San Francisco will have 578,000 households (or a population of approximately 1,364,080 persons) and 918,000 employees. The growth induced by the Wellness Center will be minimal as many of the future clients are presently clients of Friendship House and future employees may already be employed at the currently operating clinics run by Friendship House. The project will not adversely</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		affect either population or employment conditions. Sources: (27) (39)	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	The proposed project will not contribute to reducing or significantly altering the racial, ethnic, or income segregation of the project area's housing; on the contrary it will provide affordable supportive housing to the Indigenous population served by Friendship House, many of whom cannot afford to live in the area. The facility will improve access to the clientele by centralizing services in a location well served by public transit. The proposed project does not create a concentration of low-income or disadvantaged people in violation of HUD site and neighborhood standards. See above discussion in Employment and Income Patterns where effects on population are discussed. Sources: (28) (40)	
Environmental Justice EA Factor	2	All adverse effects can be mitigated by implementing the mitigation measures identified in this Environmental Assessment. No adverse effects were identified that disproportionately affect environmental justice populations. The combined effects of all local sources of pollution do not pose an	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>overly significant impact as the City has adopted policies and regulations to reduce the impacts of traffic and air pollution on at risk populations. The project site is located in Census Tract 020101 of the 2020 U.S. Census. Within this Tract, approximately 62 percent of the population is comprised of ethnic minorities and approximately 14.6 percent of the population has an income below the poverty line. As such, the project site is located within a minority population community, as described previously. There is scarce supply and high demand for housing resources, especially in the affordable housing sector. The project area is ranked lower than or equal to both the State and Nationwide Percentile for all criteria pollutants by the EPA. These factors were taken into consideration in the planning and design of the proposed project. Project outreach included extensive informational and community meetings, public hearings and focus groups. Outreach began in 2021 and continues The community will be advised of the project's direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts. Climate change is affecting the City through higher</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>temperatures, more extreme heat days, more extreme storms with heavier rainfall and flooding, sea level rise, severe droughts, and poorer air quality. Due to its elevation the project site is not subject to adverse effects from climate change induced sea level rise and flooding that will affect lower lying areas, although the infrastructure of the City as a whole is at risk of harm from sea level rise. The project area will be affected by a predicted increase in extremely hot days (94% probability) and excessive precipitation (4% probability). By 2048, San Francisco is expected to have a 0.4" increase (from 26? to26.4?) in average annual precipitation. Implementation of the City's Climate Action Plan and Housing Element of the General Plan policies and actions will mitigate some of the effects of climate warming. The Housing Element includes a robust set of 300+ actions that will advance environmental justice. They include aggressively prioritizing housing preservation, tenant protection, and housing and cultural stabilization strategies in neighborhoods subject to rezoning programs, and prior to adoption of rezoning programs. The City</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>conducted a public engagement process to gather community input on the goals, strategies, and actions for the adopted Climate Action Plan. The feedback provided was addressed and incorporated into the final plan. In addition to integrating equity considerations through robust public outreach and engagement, the Plan used a Racial and Social Equity Assessment Tool to improve equity outcomes of climate actions. The California Energy Commission has updated its energy standards for new building construction. The standards will reduce energy costs by relying on increased ceiling and wall insulation, thermostat controls, fluorescent lighting, double and triple paned windows, passive solar design and solar water heating systems. While these standards will increase initial building costs, they will, in the long run, provide an economic benefit to consumers by reducing operating costs during the life of the building. Sources: (41) (42) (43)</p>	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	The proposed project would add 21 group housing units to San Francisco's housing inventory, nine of which could accommodate infants and	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>small children below school age, As the group housing is intended for supportive housing for persons in recovery it is unlikely to include families with school-aged children. Nevertheless, existing San Francisco Unified School District schools in the project vicinity would be able to accommodate any minor increase in demand associated with the project (less than nine) without the need for new or physically altered schools. Proximity to schools: Marshall Elementary School serving grades K through 5 is 0.10 miles from the Site; Mission High School is half a mile from the Site as is Everett Middle School which serves grades 6 through 8. Cultural Facilities The Site is within the newly founded American Indian Cultural District (AICD) which is dedicated to recognizing, honoring, and celebrating the American Indian legacy, culture, people, and contributions. The Mission District, within which the Site is located, has been a center for arts for decades, and much of it can be enjoyed while strolling the streets. Numerous murals brighten up the neighborhood, many with political themes. The number of cultural facilities in the Mission district is long and</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>representative of the various cultural groups that have made the district their home. An example of the cultural centers includes the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts, The Dance Brigade's Dance Mission Theater, and Theatre Flamenco. The San Francisco Public library branch at 1283 Valencia Street is located less than a mile away. Source: (7) (28) (44)</p>	
<p>Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The Mission neighborhood has a large number and variety of commercial facilities to serve the project residents and clients including retail food establishments, banking facilities, pharmacies and various restaurants and professional offices. The Site is within a ten minute walk of these facilities or can be accessed easily using the Mission Street transit facilities. There are more than enough commercial facilities to serve the project and the project will not overwhelm the existing businesses. The Mission district is southeast of downtown San Francisco. The neighborhood is large and features several major corridors. One block off of Julian Avenue is the Valencia Street corridor with street-level shops, restaurants and stores. The stately, palm-lined boulevard of Dolores Street passes major landmarks</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>including Dolores Park, Mission High School and Mission Dolores. The stretch of 24th Street running from Mission Street to Potrero Avenue is known as "El Corazon de la Mision," or "The Heart of the Mission." It boasts a vast number of colorful and unique specialty stores, restaurants, taquerias, Mexican bakeries, fresh produce grocers, butchers, cafes, and art galleries, as well as the greatest concentration of murals and Latino businesses in the city. The northeast Mission is a light industrial and retail neighborhood and home to many manufacturing businesses as well as a large art and high-tech community and a thriving retail, club and dining sector. Within one mile of the Site are 18 grocery stores ranging across a wide variety of ethnic specialties. A map of local grocery stores is included with the Source Documents. Sources: (26) (45) (46)</p>	
<p>Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>he facility will provide Health, Medical, Dental and Behavioral Services to over 4,100 clients per year. Additional services will include program and cultural services to 500 Native Youth and 200 Native Elders each year; supportive housing to 27 Native mothers and their</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>children and follow up services for graduates of the recovery programs at Friendship House. Furthermore, a wide array of health care and social services is accessible from the project site via public transit. The San Francisco Department of Public Health maintains two Divisions - the San Francisco Health Network and Population Health and Prevention. The SF Health Network is the City's health system and has locations throughout the City including San Francisco General Hospital Medical Center located on the eastern edge of the Mission District, Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center, and over 15 primary care health centers. The Population Health and Prevention Division has a broad focus on the communities of San Francisco and is comprised of the Community Health and Safety Branch, Community Health Promotion and Prevention Branch, and the Community Health Services Branch. Additionally, Kaiser Permanente and University of California at San Francisco offer healthcare services and have well-developed medical centers in Mission Bay, the Inner Sunset and the Western Addition. These facilities are</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>accessible by public transportation. The additional residents on the project site would not result in undue burdens on existing health care facilities or create substantial demand for new health care facilities. The facility is designed to address the medical, social and cultural needs of its clients and will not impose a burden on the existing social and medical networks in San Francisco. Sources: (40) (47)</p>	
<p>Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The city has a landfill disposal agreement with Recology, Inc. for disposal of all solid waste collected in San Francisco at the Recology Hay Road Landfill ("Landfill") in Solano County, through 2031 or when the city has disposed 5 million tons of solid waste, whichever occurs first. The City has the option of extending the contract or find and entitle an alternative landfill site. The Landfill is permitted to accept up to 2,400 tons per day of solid waste. At that maximum permitted rate, the landfill has the capacity to accommodate solid waste until approximately 2034. Under existing conditions, the landfill receives an average of approximately 1,850 tons per day from all sources, with approximately 1,200 tons per day from San Francisco, which</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>includes residential and commercial waste and demolition and construction debris that cannot be reused or recycled. At the current rate of disposal, the landfill has operating capacity until 2041. Using CalRecycle Solid Waste Generation Rates the project's estimated disposal would only incrementally increase the City's contribution of waste to the Landfill. The estimated contribution is 0.942 tons per day or 1,882 pounds per day. This estimated contribution would not substantially add to the amount of citywide disposed refuse. In point of fact, as the proposed project is a centralization of services currently offered to its client base it is not expected to substantially increase the amount of waste disposed of by the organization.</p> <p>Component Disposal Rate Units Total Disposed Per Day Employees- 40 0.57 40 0.06 tons/ 120 lbs. Social 0.60 200 0.32 tons/ 657 lbs. Educational 0.38 500 0.52 tons/ 1001lbs. Residential 0.74 21 0.042 tons/ 15.51 lbs. Total per year 0.942 tons/1882 lbs. In regard to construction debris, the project would comply with San Francisco's Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance which</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>prohibits the disposal of construction and demolition materials in the garbage or taken to the Landfill. All mixed debris would be transported by a registered hauler to a registered facility to be recycled. In addition, the proposed project would comply with San Francisco's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance by offering separate containers designated for recycling, composting, and trash and making the containers convenient for all users of the building. Sources: (28) (48) (49) (50)</p>	
<p>Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The project site is served by a combined wastewater system: sewage and stormwater flows are captured by a single collection system and the combined flows are treated through the same wastewater treatment plants. The SFPUC provides and operates water supply and wastewater treatment facilities for the city. Implementation of the proposed project would add approximately 21 residents and 337 daily visitors to the site and thereby incrementally increase wastewater flows from the project site. However, it should be borne in mind that many of these persons are currently receiving services in</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>alternate facilities and would not appreciably increase demand for waste or overall water services. The proposed project would incorporate water-efficient fixtures, as required by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the San Francisco Green Building Ordinance. Compliance with these regulations would reduce wastewater flows by reducing the amount of water used for building functions. The increased use of the site associated with the proposed project would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing wastewater treatment facilities. During project operations, wastewater and stormwater from the project site would flow into the city's combined stormwater and sewer system and be treated to the standards contained within the city's NPDES permit for the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. Treatment would be provided pursuant to the effluent discharge standards included within the city's NPDES permit for the treatment plant. The proposed project would be required to meet the standards for stormwater management identified in the</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance and meet the SFPUC stormwater management requirements, and the project sponsor would be required to submit for approval by the SFPUC a stormwater control plan that complies with the city's 2016 Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines. Source: (28)</p>	
<p>Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to meet its needs during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC") 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (2020 plan) plan estimates that current and projected water supplies will be sufficient to meet future demand for retail water customers through 2045 under wet- and normal-year conditions; however, in dry years, the SFPUC would implement water use and supply reductions through its water shortage contingency plan and a corresponding retail water shortage allocation plan. In addition, the proposed project would incorporate water-efficient fixtures as required by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the City's Green Building Ordinance. The projected average daily</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>demand of the project for water is substantially less than 50,000 gallons per day which is the maximum level the SFPUC has established for water demand for projects that do not meet the definitions provided in CEQA Guidelines section 15155(a)(1), which applies to the proposed project. For the proposed project to exceed the 50,000 cap on usage it would need to serve more than a thousand clients per day in addition to serving residential clients. Such a level of service is highly unlikely, it is estimated that the Wellness Center will serve 337 visitors per day and have 21 residential clients. It can be safely assumed the project would demand much less than 50,000 gallons of water per day. Its water demand would represent a small fraction of the total projected demand, ranging at most from 0.07 to 0.06 percent between 2025 and 2045. The project's water demand would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities. Sources: (28) (40) (51) (52) (53)</p>	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	80 Julian Avenue is served by SFPD Mission Station at 630 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94110 which is 0.3 miles distant. The development of	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>residential uses on the project site would incrementally increase demand for police services within the Mission police district. The current response time for priority calls is 8 minutes. There is no national standard for the definition, measurement, and public reporting of police response times. San Francisco Police Department has the highest ratio of officers per 10,000 residents in California cities with a population in excess of 100,000. In 2019 the ratio was 26 to 10,000 or 2.6 per 1,000 residents. Nationwide, the rate of sworn officers was 2.4 per 1,000 inhabitants. The services required by the increase in demand would be funded through project-related increases to the city's tax base and would not be substantial given the overall demand for police protection services on a citywide level. The project site is served by the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). The closest SFFD Station is Station 6 at 135 Sanchez Street, San Francisco, CA 94110, 0.6 miles distant. Station 6 averages 230 Emergency Medical Service Calls over a 30 day period; 258 EMS Non-Emergency Calls; 122 Fire Emergency Calls and 38 Fire Non-Emergency Calls. Response</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>times for emergency calls average just under 4 minutes. Although the project could incrementally increase demand for fire protection services within the project area, the increase would not exceed amounts anticipated under the City's General Plan. Additionally, the site is located along established streets within an existing service area and within the 0.5-mile radius threshold established in the Community Facilities Element, ensuring adequate response times would be maintained. The project also would be required to meet SFFD standards for adequate site access and water flow and would comply with current fire suppression building code requirements. Therefore, no substantial adverse effects on fire protection services are expected. SFFD firefighters are also trained as emergency medical technicians (EMTs), and some firefighters are also paramedics. Emergency medical response and patient transport is provided by SFFD, which also coordinates with Advanced Life Support and Basic Life Support Ambulance Providers. The median response time for emergency calls is measured from when the call is received to when the first unit arrives on-scene.</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Priority A emergency calls involving serious incidents, such as an immediate threat to life or substantial risk of major property loss or damage, are responded to in less than five minutes. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes. The project would be required to conform to these standards, which may include development of an emergency procedure manual and an exit drill plan for the proposed development. The project site is adequately served by emergency medical services and the project would not result in a significant change to existing emergency medical services already provided in the area. Sources: (54) (55) (56) (57) (58)</p>	
<p>Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The clients of the proposed project would be served by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, which administers more than 220 parks, playgrounds, and open spaces throughout the city, as well as recreational facilities including recreation centers, swimming pools, golf courses, and athletic fields, tennis courts, and basketball courts. The nearest park is Kid Power Park at 45 Hoff Street, two</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>blocks (0.2 mile) south of the project site. Dolores Park is 0.7 mile southwest of the project site; Duboce Park is 0.8 mile west of project site; and In Chan Kaajal Park at 17th and Folsom streets is 0.7 mile to the southeast of the project site. The increased demand on recreational facilities from the client base would be negligible as many of the clients may be San Francisco residents and the extensive nature of San Francisco recreational facilities would not be overwhelmed by new clients. Also, the proposed project includes recreational facilities including an outdoor play area and an indoor basketball court. Implementation of the proposed project would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated, and no adverse impact will occur. No mitigation measures are required. Source Documents: (28) (40)</p>	
<p>Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Transit: The proposed project site is located near public transit, including the 16th Street and Mission Street Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station, located approximately 0.2 mile northeast. Several San</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (Muni) bus routes also operate in the area, including the 33? Ashbury/18th along 18th Street and Mission Street, 22?Fillmore along 16th Street, 14?Mission and 14R? Mission Rapid along Mission Street, 49?Van Ness/Mission along Mission Street, and the 55?16th Street along 16th Street. Bicycle Parking. The proposed project would provide 10 class 1 bicycle parking spaces in the basement of the proposed building and 10 class 2 bicycle parking spaces on the sidewalk along Julian Avenue at the 56 Julian Avenue frontage, subject to San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco Public Works approval. Accessibility: Will not Interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the project site, and adjoining areas, or result in inadequate emergency access. Daily Vehicle trips are estimated to be 514 per day. The project site is an area where projected year 2040 VMT per capita is more than 15 percent below the future regional per capita and per employee averages. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>cumulative VMT impact. Streetscape and Circulation Improvements. No off-street parking or loading would be provided. Along the Julian Avenue frontage, three on-street parking spaces would be removed to provide a 60-foot-long passenger loading zone. A 4-foot-wide curb cut ramp would be installed to allow for a passenger loading ramp. Landscaping, benches, and bike racks would be added, and decorative painting would be added in front of the 56 Julian Avenue courtyard. An electrical transformer vault would be installed and decorative street painting in the right of way along Julian Ave extending from the courtyard between the 56 and 80 Julian Avenue buildings. Along the Caledonia Street frontage, the building would be set back, and a 1.5-foot-wide pedestrian access easement would be dedicated to allowing for a repaved 4-foot-wide ADA-compliant sidewalk. Sources: (28) (54)</p>	
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	<p>The Site is approximately 6,608 square feet (0.15 acres) in size and is bound by Julian Avenue to the east, Caldonia Street to the west, Friendship House to the north and a commercial building to the south. The Site is currently developed with a basketball</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>court in the southeast corner and a small, landscaped area abutting Julian Avenue. The landscaped area and basketball court are used as a recreational facility for the adjoining Friendship House clients. There are no unique natural features or water resources on the site including water courses, creeks, streams, seasonal wetlands, or other water resources on the project site. There is no impact in this regard. The project location, construction, or its users will not adversely impact unique or locally important natural features on or near the site. Nor will the project destroy or isolate from public or scientific access any unique natural features. The site does not exist above an aquifer. The site is not subject to rapid water withdrawal problems that could change the depth or character of a water table or an aquifer. Groundwater was encountered during site investigations at 16 to 18.5 feet below ground surface (bgs). The groundwater level at the site is expected to fluctuate three feet seasonally with potentially larger fluctuations annually, depending on the amount of rainfall. The project will not use groundwater for its water supply. The project will not</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>use a septic system but will connect to the wastewater disposal system. The project will slightly increase impervious surface area. There are no sensitive groundwater dependent features (e.g., rare wetlands) present that could be affected. Regardless of the absence of rare wetlands, appropriate measure been included in the design to promote groundwater recharge. Sources: (7) (20) (26) (28) (35)</p>	
<p>Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Trees. There are 11 existing trees on the project site and eight street trees along Julian Avenue in front of the project site. All 11 trees within the project site and three of the street trees would be removed as part of the proposed project. Five street trees would be protected in place and seven new street trees would be planted along Julian Avenue. The trees on and adjacent to the Site could provide nesting habitat for birds, including migratory birds and raptors. Nesting birds are among the species protected under provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Development of the Site during the nesting season (i.e., February 1 to August 31) could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure Wildlife1: Protection of Migratory Birds. The project sponsor shall implement the following: 1. Preconstruction bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the breeding season (breeding season is defined as February 1st through August 15th) if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during the breeding season. 2. For other nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, a pre-construction survey for active nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 2 weeks before construction if work shall occur during the breeding season. The survey shall be conducted within 100 feet of the work areas. If</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>nest abandonment. Disturbance that causes abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort is considered a taking under the Migratory Bird Treaty and Environmental Protection Act. Future construction activities such as tree removal and site grading that disturb a nesting bird or raptor on-Site or immediately adjacent to the construction zone would also constitute an impact. In conformance with the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act development would be required to implement measures to avoid and/or reduce impacts to nesting birds (if present on or adjacent to the Site) to a less than significant level. If project demolition and tree removals occur during breeding season, it could result in an adverse impact to nesting birds. Mitigation measures are identified in the Mitigation Measures and Conditions Section. Sources: (26) (59) (60)</p>	<p>construction would affect the nest, then work shall not occur within 100 feet of the nest until a qualified biologist, in coordination with the appropriate agencies, has established an appropriate buffer zone. 3. Outside of the breeding season (August 16th through January 31st), or after young birds have fledged, as determined by the biologist, work activities may proceed.</p>
Other Factors 1	2	<p>Greenhouse Gases - There are no established federal significance criteria for GHG emissions. In the absence of a federal standard, analysis is conducted using local standards. BAAQMD has established evaluation criteria and emission limits for ozone precursors and greenhouse</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>gases for construction and operation emissions. GHG updated thresholds for land use projects include an alternative performance-based threshold; if a project meets all of the following criteria, the project would result in a less than significant GHG impact: * Project does not include natural gas and would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use; * Project would result in VMT per capita that is 15 percent below the regional average and meet the CalGreen Tier 2 off-street electric vehicle requirement. The proposed project would increase the intensity of the use of the site and contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by directly or indirectly emitting GHGs during construction and operation. Direct operational effects from the proposed project include the GHG emissions from new vehicle trips and a stationary source (backup diesel generator). Indirect effects include the GHG emissions from electricity providers, including the generation of the energy required to pump, treat, and convey water; other GHG emissions are associated with waste removal, waste disposal, and landfill operations. San Francisco's</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>2017 GHG Reduction Strategy Update presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy in compliance with BAAQMD guidelines. The proposed project would be subject to regulations identified in the GHG reduction strategy and demonstrated in the GHG checklist completed for the proposed project. The project would meet the requirements listed in the GHG checklist, which include the all-electric building ordinance, green building requirements for energy efficiency, water use reduction, and renewable energy use, light pollution reduction, and street tree planting. The proposed project would comply with regulations that would reduce the project's GHG emissions related to waste reduction through recycling and composting, construction and demolition debris recycling and recovery, construction site runoff pollution prevention, stormwater management, and the use of low-emitting building materials. The proposed project would be consistent with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy and those of the BAAQMD and would</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		not adversely contribute to GHG emissions. Sources: (28) (59) (61) (62)	
Other Factors 2	3	Toxic Air Contaminants and Fugitive Dust The project will implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) in compliance with the BAAQMD recommended measures for controlling fugitive dust during soil disturbing activities. These methods would control construction related fugitive dust, such that there would be no adverse project related impacts. BMP's are listed in the Mitigation section of this EA. Construction-related activities result in the generation of TACs that pose a risk to human health; specifically, diesel particulate matter (DPM). In accordance with applicable standards the project contractor would be required to use equipment with Tier 2 or higher engines or equipment which operates with the most effective Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategies (VDECS) as certified by the California Air Resources Board. The project would not cause adverse risks to community health from construction activities as the project's construction-related exhaust emissions of PM10 are substantially below the BAAQMD threshold of significance and	Mitigation Measure AQ-1a: Clean Off-Road Construction Equipment Mitigation Measure -AQ-1b: Clean Diesel Generators for Building Operations Mitigation Measure AQ-1c: Compliance with San Francisco Health Code Article 38

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>implementation of the requirements of the BAAQMD's BMPs would further reduce the exhaust levels. A diesel generator is proposed and will have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of diesel emissions, a known toxic air contaminant, resulting in a significant air quality impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1b: Clean Diesel Generators for Building Operations would apply to the proposed project. The Site is located approximately 1,000 feet south of the Central Freeway and within 450 feet of Mission Street, which has been designated an arterial roadway by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Works. The Site is within the BAAQMD's threshold distance of 1,000 feet for mobile source screening. BAAQMD's Highway Screening Analysis Tool has generated screening tables that provide estimated cancer risks, hazards, and PM2.5 concentrations for all Bay Area highways and surface streets. Mission Street average daily traffic between 10th Street and 24th Street ranges from 11,200 vehicles to 13,500 vehicles per day. As a precise count of traffic was not available for the point of</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Mission Street closest to the Site, this range was used for assessing risks for Cancer Risk and Chronic Noncancer Hazard Index. The ADT for the Central Freeway is 72,000. The results are as follows: MOBILE SOURCE EMISSIONS Cancer Risk Threshold Hazard Index Threshold Exceeded Mission Lower Range 10,000 ADT 0.041/10 in one million 0/>1 No Mission Upper Range 20,000 ADT 0.082/10 in one million 0/>1 No Central Freeway 72,000 ADT 0.10 (1 x 10⁶) 0 No The risk of harm from Stationary Source emissions was determined by referencing the BAAQMD Stationary Source Screening Map. The Map indicates that there are 4 permitted stationary sources within a 1,000 foot radius of the Site. The combined (cumulative) Cancer Risk is 33.73, which is below the Cumulative threshold of 100 in one million. Local Requirements. San Francisco Health Code Article 38 mandates that new construction in areas of poor air quality to install enhanced ventilation systems to protect residents from respiratory, heart, and other health effects associated with breathing polluted air. The Site is located within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone and must submit an application</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>for Article 38 Compliance Assessment to the Department of Public Health. The Code requires that those buildings requiring enhanced ventilation "design a system capable of achieving the protection from particulate matter (PM2.5) equivalent to that associated with MERV 13 filtration (as defined by ASHRAE standard 52.2)". Building engineers and designers may choose the ventilation design that works best for their setting.</p>	
CLIMATE AND ENERGY			
Climate Change	2	<p>Projections from the United States Climate Resilience Toolkit Climate Explorer indicate that the City's periods of consecutive days without precipitation will vary from 7 fewer to 7 more per year during the period of 2020 to 2050. Historically, San Francisco averaged 13 (7 - 21) dry spells per year. Historically, the longest yearly dry spell in San Francisco averaged 85 (34 - 173) days. The Frequency of coastal flooding may increase as global sea level rises 0.5 - 2 feet. Ocean warming and acidification may affect homes and other coastal infrastructure, marine flora and fauna, and people who depend on coastal resources. However, the project site is not in an area of San</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Francisco that has been identified as subject to inundation from coastal flooding. Coastal flooding could impact the combined stormwater system which could impact the project</p> <p>Extreme temperatures on the hottest days of the year are projected to have between a 5 degrees F decrease and a 25 degrees F increase. Historically, extreme temperatures in San Francisco averaged 85 degrees F (76 - 103 degrees F). One hundred percent of the census tract in which the site is located lacks tree canopy and 94 per cent of the census tract's surface is impervious. The NOAA National Center for Environmental Information warns that Sea Level Rise (while not directly affecting the project area with inundation) may have an effect on stormwater infrastructure and affect the quality of drinking water supply because of saltwater intrusion. State of the art surface coverings, conservation techniques and HVAC systems will reduce the effect of increased temperature on project residents and participants. The project reduces its direct contribution to climate change by using low-carbon building materials to reduce</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>greenhouse gas emissions from construction and material fabrication. LEED Platinum certification (administered by the U.S. Green Building Council) or GreenPoint Rated points would be met by incorporating a variety of design features including community design and planning, site design, landscape design, building envelope performance, and material selections. Source Documents: (41) (63) (64)</p>	
Energy Efficiency	2	<p>Energy Consumption - The Project would use energy produced in regional power plants using hydropower and natural gas, oil, coal, and nuclear fuels. Development would be required to meet current state and local standards regarding energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by the DBI. Beyond compliance with the 2019 San Francisco Green Building Code and Title 24 requirements, the project would be required to achieve GreenPoint Rated status or achieve a status of LEED Platinum. To reach the applicable standards, the project would apply green building measures, which will be detailed in the project's architectural plan set. Since the project would be required</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		to adhere to 2019 California Green Build Standards, and would include energy reducing design features, the proposed action would not result in foreseeable energy inefficiencies and would not have an adverse effect on energy consumption. Sources: (28) (59)	

Supporting documentation

- [BAAQMD Highway Screening Analysis Tool.pdf](#)
- [Distance to Freeway\(1\).pdf](#)
- [BAAQMD Permitted Stationary Sources 1000 foot radius\(1\).pdf](#)
- [80 Julian Ave NOA and supplement.pdf](#)
- [Groceries Google Maps.pdf](#)
- [San Francisco Property Information Map.pdf](#)
- [CalEnviroScreen\(1\).png](#)
- [2020 UA COUNTY\(1\).xlsx](#)
- [Web Soil Map.pdf](#)
- [Output file - 80 Julian Avenue Geotech Report 01 15 21.pdf](#)
- [80 Julian Ave PMND initial study SIGNED.pdf](#)
- [legislation.pdf](#)
- [Board Pkt 031423Use this.pdf](#)
- [80 Julian NSR recorded.pdf](#)

Additional Studies Performed:

See attached Source List

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed

by:

Eugene Flannery

3/1/2024 12:00:00 AM

- [Garden - Copy.HEIC](#)
- [Friendship House Entrance - Copy.HEIC](#)
- [Basketball Court - Copy\(1\).jpg](#)
- [Basketball Court - Copy.HEIC](#)

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

See attached Source List

[Bibliography.pdf](#)

List of Permits Obtained:

No Federal Permits are required

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

The project has been open to public comment for three years. A Community Meeting was held on June 10, 2021. Notice of the Community Meeting was mailed to 335 residents and businesses in the project area. The Notice included a detailed pamphlet regarding the project which is attached. Public Hearings were held before the San Francisco Planning Commission on January 26, 2023, and subsequently the Board of Supervisors approving the Special use District and Conditional Use Approval necessary for the development of the project. Public Notices regarding the Commission meetings were distributed December 7, 2022. Native American Tribal representatives were sent letters inviting their comments. A Finding of No Significant Impact will be published by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development online and in the San Francisco Examiner. The project has garnered the support of the following organizations: American Indian Cultural District, Curtura y Arte Native de las Americas, Mission Housing Development Corporation, Northern California Carpenter's Union, Centro Latino de San Francisco, Latino Task Force, Native American Health Center, Mission Housing Development Corporation. Sources: (65) (66) (67) (68) (69)

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The various factors upon which the project may have an effect have been evaluated as part of the project review and have been found to not be significantly impacted. Just as the proposed project is required to comply with applicable laws, plans, policies, and regulations, so are these six projects. The proposed project would not combine with these projects to conflict with these authorities and would not create a significant cumulative impacts. The project does not increase the demand on services as the project sponsor currently offers these services, with the exception of housing, in alternate locations which will be moved to the new facility. Proposed services are within the parameters identified by the ABAG and would only incrementally cumulatively contribute to the growth that is projected by ABAG in the Plan Bay Area. The project site is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Priority Development Area (PDA). The Plan Bay Area 2050 estimates that 16,761 units could be expected in the Eastern Neighborhoods Corridors PDA. The cumulative context for archeological resources and human remains is generally site specific and limited to the immediate construction area. There are no cumulative projects on the project

block and none of the cumulative projects are anticipated to impact the known archeological resources in the vicinity of the project site. The project's air pollutant emissions would not exceed thresholds and the project would generate a nominal number of new vehicle trips. Noise impacts are typically localized; there are no other cumulative projects within the project block; . All cumulative projects are required to comply with the SF noise ordinance, which places limits on construction and operational noise. The project would not result in adverse impacts for certain issues areas including airport hazards, coastal resources, biological resources, floodplains, agricultural resources, land use, geology and soils, environmental justice, socioeconomics; thus, the project would not contribute to potentially adverse cumulative impacts for these issues. 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. Impacts associated with hazardous materials and cultural resources are generally site-specific and not cumulative in nature. The project would comply with the site-specific PA for impacts to archeological resources. Federal, state and local regulations as well as the Mitigation Measures for Toxic Contamination will ensure that the project's contribution to any cumulative impacts is not significant. Regarding air quality, the 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. Project emissions are below applicable thresholds and thus the project would not contribute to potentially adverse cumulative impacts. The proposed project's 514 daily vehicle trips in combination with daily vehicle trips from cumulative projects would be dispersed along the local roadway network and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative traffic noise impact. In sum, the project would not contribute significantly to identified cumulative impacts. Sources: (70) (71)

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

An alternative project was considered which would have replaced a building since demolished on the proposed site. The alternative project would have replaced a vacant three-story residential building with a 45-foot-tall, four-story, 16,000-square-foot (s.f.), Native American Health Center building consisting of medical and dental clinics, office space, and Friendship House Association of American Indians transitional housing for single mothers (8 units). The alternative project would not have included any off-street parking. The alternative was considered infeasible as it would not have provided sufficient space to meet the needs of the community and would have resulted in an increase in the per capita cost of services. Environmental effects would have been the same as the proposed project with fewer benefits. Source: (72)

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

The no action alternative would mean that the project site would not be developed with affordable housing, recovery and educational services and the garden and basketball court would remain. Due to the lack of available suitable sites in the City, 21 units of supportive housing would not be developed. Thus, limiting the City's ability to achieve its Housing allocation (RHNA). Savings resulting from the consolidation of the various medical clinics would not be achieved.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

With applicable laws, authorities, factors or other enforceable measures, all potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures concerning Air Quality, Toxic Contamination, Seismic Hazards and Migratory Birds would reduce related impacts to less than significant. Implementation of the site specific PA would resolve impacts to cultural resources. 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 [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete
Historic Preservation	Please see attached SMMA.	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan	
Contamination and Toxic Substances	In March 2023 A Maher Ordinance Subsurface Investigation Report was conducted by AEI. The investigation results indicated that TPH, VOCs, and metals with the exception of cobalt were either not detected or detected at concentrations below their respective ESLs in groundwater. Cobalt was detected in one	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan	

	<p>groundwater sample at a concentration (6.3 µg/L in SB-8) slightly above its direct exposure ESL/MCL (6.0 µg/L), which is considered conservative. TPH, VOCs, PCBs, SVOCs, pesticides, herbicides, cyanide, asbestos, and metals with the exception of arsenic, were either not detected or detected at concentrations below their respective ESLs, if established, in the soil samples collected at the Site. Though arsenic was detected above its ESLs, the concentrations detected were consistent with typical background concentrations (up to 11 mg/kg) for the Bay Area.</p> <p>In June 2023 the Site Management Plan was prepared by AEI to address elevated metals in soil and groundwater to be compliant with the Maher Program at the request of the SFDPH. The SMP does not replace the requirements of Federal and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) training and worker protection rules and regulations, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 29, Part 1910.120 and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 8, s. 5192. The SMP Protocols are detailed in the SMP at Chapter 5, Risk Management Measures and include pre-construction planning and notification, preparation of Health and Safety Plan, Soil Management Procedures for Field screening, soil segregation and stockpile management, transport and disposal, dust control, and</p>			
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

	preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and groundwater management.			
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	Compliance with recommendations contained in Rollo 2020 Geotechnical Investigation.	N/A	See Attached Mitigation Plan	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	Mitigation Measure Wildlife1: Protection of Migratory Birds. The project sponsor shall implement the following: 1. Preconstruction bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the breeding season (breeding season is defined as February 1st through August 15th) if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during the breeding season. 2. For other nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, a pre-construction survey for active nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 2 weeks before construction if work shall occur during the breeding season. The survey shall be conducted within 100 feet of the work areas. If construction would affect the nest, then work shall not occur within 100 feet of the nest until a qualified biologist, in coordination with the appropriate agencies, has established an appropriate buffer zone. 3. Outside of the breeding season (August 16th through January 31st), or after young birds have fledged, as determined by the biologist, work activities may proceed.	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan	

Other Factors 2	Mitigation Measure AQ-1a: Clean Off-Road Construction Equipment Mitigation Measure - AQ-1b: Clean Diesel Generators for Building Operations Mitigation Measure AQ-1c: Compliance with San Francisco Health Code Article 38	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan under Clean Air Act	
--------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Project Mitigation Plan

See attached Mitigation Plan

[Mitigation Measures Freindship House.pdf](#)

Supporting documentation on completed measures

APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

Airport Hazards

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

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

✓ No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. The Site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or within 2,000 feet of a civilian airport. The airport nearest the Site is San Francisco International Airport located nine miles from the Site. The Site is not within the Accident Potential Zone or a Runway Protection Zone/Clear Zones of SFO airport. The proposed action would not result in a significant airport-related safety hazard. Sources: (3) (4) (5)

Supporting documentation

- [SFO CLUP Map of AIA.pdf](#)
- [Map of AIA SFO.jpg](#)
- [Google Earth Map to SFO.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Barrier Resources

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

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

Compliance Determination

This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act .Source: (6)

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Flood Insurance

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

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

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

Yes

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

[FIRMETTE_0648f7d3-f1b9-47aa-9590-7436f98d58bd.pdf](#)

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

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

No

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

Yes

4. While flood insurance is not mandatory for this project, HUD strongly recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Will flood insurance be required as a mitigation measure or condition?

Yes

✓ No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements. This location does not fall within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) pursuant to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). This location has an area of Low or Minimal Flood Risk - Flood Zone: X Unshaded. FIRM Number 060298011BA, Effective March 23, 2021 (Not printed). "Unshaded" Zone X represents areas of minimal flood risk or areas that FEMA did not study or map. For San Francisco, FEMA did not study or map inland areas where stormwater flooding occurs during heavy rains. Flood insurance purchase requirements do not apply in these areas, but flood insurance may be purchased at reduced cost. Sources: (7) (8)

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Air Quality

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

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

Yes

No

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

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

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

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

Carbon Monoxide

Lead

Nitrogen dioxide

Sulfur dioxide

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

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

Carbon monoxide	100.00	ppm (parts per million)
Ozone	100.00	ppb (parts per million)
Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns	100.00	µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air)

Provide your source used to determine levels here:

9. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Stationary Source Screening Map. 2023. 10. --. 2021 Stationary Source Screening Map Data. 2023. 11. City and County of San Francisco. Article 38 Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments. San Francisco Health Code. 2014. Ord. 281-08, File No. 080934, 12/5/2008; amended by Ord. 224-14 , File No. 140806,. 12. District, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Chapter 5 PROJECT-LEVEL AIR QUALITY IMPACTS. 2022 CEQA Guidelines. 13. Bay Area air Quality Management District. Fugitive Dust. [Online] [Cited: March 5, 2024.] <https://www.baaqmd.gov/rules-and-compliance/rule-development/fugitive-dust>. 14. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Mobile Source Screening Map. [Online] [Cited: March 5, 2024.] <https://mtc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/sidebar/index.html?appid=c5f9b1a40326409a89076bdc0d95e429>. 15. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants (Green Book). [Online] [Cited: March 5, 2024.] <https://www.epa.gov/green-book>.

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

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

Enter the estimate emission levels:

Carbon monoxide	4.51	ppm (parts per million)
Ozone	0.97	ppb (parts per million)
Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns	0.22	µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air)

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

[CalEEMod Report Final Report.pdf](#)

[CalEEMod.xls](#)

[Distance to Freeway.pdf](#)

[BAAQMD Permitted Stationary Sources 1000 foot radius.pdf](#)

[Air Quality Discussion.docx](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Zone Management Act

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

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

Yes

No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. The project site is not within a Coastal Zone Management (CZM) area and does not involve the acquisition of undeveloped land in a CZM area. There would be no conflict with the Coastal Zone Management Act. Sources: (7) (17)

Supporting documentation

[06CZB_SanFrancisco.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Contamination and Toxic Substances

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

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

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

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

No

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Supporting documentation

- [Phase One ESA Final for HUD.pdf](#)
- [RAdon Map\(1\).jpg](#)
- [Subsurface Investigation Report.pdf](#)
- [Site Management Plan.pdf](#)
- [Draft PH II \(Friendship\).pdf](#)

[80 Julian Geotracker Sites.pdf](#)
[Auto Stop Summary Report.pdf](#)
[Mojo Theater Summary Report.pdf](#)
[GeoTracker Map Open Sites.pdf](#)
[EnviroStor Database Map.pdf](#)
[AEI Phase I - 80 Julian Ave Ph 1 07-15-20.pdf](#)
[CDC Radon Map for SF County.jpg](#)
[RADon Map.jpg](#)
[Toxic Contaminants Discussion.docx](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Endangered Species

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

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

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

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

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

2. Are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area?

No, the project will have No Effect due to the absence of federally listed species and designated critical habitat

- ✓ Yes, there are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area.

3. What effects, if any, will your project have on federally listed species or designated critical habitat?

- ✓ No Effect: Based on the specifics of both the project and any federally listed species in the action area, you have determined that the project will have absolutely no effect on listed species or critical habitat. in the action area.

Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below. Documentation should include a species list and explanation of your conclusion, and may require maps, photographs, and surveys as appropriate

May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect: Any effects that the project may have on federally listed species or critical habitats would be beneficial, discountable, or insignificant.

Likely to Adversely Affect: The project may have negative effects on one or more listed species or critical habitat.

6. For the project to be brought into compliance with this section, all adverse impacts must be mitigated. Explain in detail the exact measures that must be implemented to mitigate for the impact or effect, including the timeline for implementation. This information will be automatically included in the Mitigation summary for the environmental review. If negative effects cannot be mitigated, cancel the project using the button at the bottom of this screen.

Mitigation as follows will be implemented:

- ✓ No mitigation is necessary.

Explain why mitigation will not be made here:

The Site is a fully developed urban site. Currently the Site is used as a park space and basketball court. No sensitive habitats or wetlands are on or adjacent to the Site. The nearest waterway to the Site is over 15,000 feet from the Site. Surrounding properties include commercial and residential establishments. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife's

Screen

(USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) web based planning tool was accessed for a list of Threatened and Endangered species that may occur within the boundary of the Project Site or that may be affected by the Project. There are Federal Endangered and Threatened species listed for the vicinity, however the Site does not contain critical habitats for these species. Species are listed below in the attached IPaC List for the project area. There are no wetlands on, adjacent to or near the Project Site.

Summary

Compliance Determination

This project has been determined to have No Effect on listed species. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation.

Supporting documentation

[Wetlands Map.pdf](#)
[IPac Resource List.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Explosive and Flammable Hazards

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

1. Is the proposed HUD-assisted project itself the development of a hazardous facility (a facility that mainly stores, handles or processes flammable or combustible chemicals such as bulk fuel storage facilities and refineries)?

No

Yes

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

No

Yes

3. Within 1 mile of the project site, are there any current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers that are covered by 24 CFR 51C? Containers that are NOT covered under the regulation include:

- Containers 100 gallons or less in capacity, containing common liquid industrial fuels OR

- Containers of liquified petroleum gas (LPG) or propane with a water volume capacity of 1,000 gallons or less that meet the requirements of the 2017 or later version of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code 58.

If all containers within the search area fit the above criteria, answer "No." For any other type of aboveground storage container within the search area that holds one of the flammable or explosive materials listed in Appendix I of 24 CFR part 51 subpart C, answer "Yes."

No

Yes

4. Based on the analysis, is the proposed HUD-assisted project located at or beyond the required separation distance from all covered tanks?

Yes

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

No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

There is a current or planned stationary aboveground storage container of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The Separation Distance from the project is acceptable. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. There are 59 AST's within one mile of the project site. In accordance with HUD Fact Sheet H2 Determining Which Tanks to Evaluate for Acceptable Separation Distance, ETFevironmental calculated the blast distances of the tank closest to the project Site and the bklast distances for the largest tank. Both tanks are within an acceptable separation distance.

Supporting documentation

[list of AST.pdf](#)

[Fact-Sheet-Determining-Which-Tanks-to-Evaluate-for-Acceptable-Separation-Distance \(1\).pdf](#)

[Acceptable Separation Distance 1940 Harrison.pdf](#)

[Acceptable Separation Distance 195 Guerro.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Farmlands Protection

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

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

Yes

No

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

No protected farmlands are located within the City and County of San Francisco. The project site is developed with existing structures, zoned NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit District), and has been historically used for residential and office uses. The area is classified as Urban Area by the United State Census Bureau. The proposed action would have no impact on farmlands. The proposed action would not conflict with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. Sources: (27)

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. No protected farmlands are located within the City and County of San Francisco. The project site is developed with existing structures, zoned NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit District), and has been historically used for residential and office uses. The area is classified as Urban Area by the United State Census Bureau. The proposed action would have no impact on farmlands. The proposed action would not conflict with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

Supporting documentation

[Tiger Web Urban Area Map.pdf](#)
[DLRP Important Farmland Finder.pdf](#)
[2020 UA COUNTY.xlsx](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Floodplain Management

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

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

- 55.12(c)(3)
- 55.12(c)(4)
- 55.12(c)(5)
- 55.12(c)(6)
- 55.12(c)(7)
- 55.12(c)(8)
- 55.12(c)(9)
- 55.12(c)(10)
- 55.12(c)(11)

None of the above

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

[FIRMETTE_0648f7d3-f1b9-47aa-9590-7436f98d58bd.pdf](#)

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

Does your project occur in a floodplain?

No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. This location does not fall within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) pursuant to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). This location has an area of Low or Minimal Flood Risk - Flood Zone: X Unshaded, FIRM Number 060298011BA, Effective March 23, 2021 (Not printed). "Shaded" Zone X represents areas of moderate or low flood risk - these areas are subject to inundation during a flood having a 0.2-percent-annual-chance of occurrence, or during the 1-percent-annual-chance flood with depth less than 1 foot. "Unshaded" Zone X represents areas of minimal flood risk or areas that FEMA did not study or map. For San Francisco, FEMA did not study or map inland areas where stormwater flooding occurs during heavy rains. The project does not encourage development in a floodplain. Sources: (7) (8)

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Historic Preservation

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Regulations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) require a consultative process to identify historic properties, assess project impacts on them, and avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)	36 CFR 800 “Protection of Historic Properties” https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf

Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

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

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

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

Step 1 – Initiate Consultation

Select all consulting parties below (check all that apply):

- ✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Completed

- ✓ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Not Required

- ✓ Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs)

- ✓ Amah Mutsun Tribal Band Mission San Juan Bautista Response Period Elapsed

- ✓ Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ The Ohlone Indian Tribe In progress
- ✓ Wuksachi Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band Response Period Elapsed

Other Consulting Parties

Describe the process of selecting consulting parties and initiating consultation here:

Emailed the Native American Heritage Commission for a list of tribal representatives and then emailed those identified by the NAHC. Contacted SHPO as required by Programmatic Agreement in effect.. Contacted NWIC at Sonoma State;

Document and upload all correspondence, notices and notes (including comments and objections received below).

Was the Section 106 Lender Delegation Memo used for Section 106 consultation?

- Yes
- No

Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties

1. **Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE), either by entering the address(es) or uploading a map depicting the APE below:**

Please see uploaded APE

In the chart below, list historic properties identified and evaluated in the APE. Every historic property that may be affected by the project should be included in the chart.

Upload the documentation (survey forms, Register nominations, concurrence(s) and/or objection(s), notes, and photos) that justify your National Register Status determination below.

Address / Location / District	National Register Status	SHPO Concurrence	Sensitive Information
375 Valencia Street	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive

Additional Notes:

2. Was a survey of historic buildings and/or archeological sites done as part of the project?

✓ Yes

Document and upload surveys and report(s) below.
For Archeological surveys, refer to HP Fact Sheet #6, Guidance on Archeological Investigations in HUD Projects.

Additional Notes:

Properties within the APE were evaluated for inclusion in the National Register. NWIC was contacted for a n evaluation of archeological resources.

No

Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties

Only properties that are listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places receive further consideration under Section 106. Assess the effect(s) of the project by applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect. (36 CFR 800.5)] Consider direct and indirect effects as applicable as per guidance on direct and indirect effects.

Choose one of the findings below - No Historic Properties Affected, No Adverse Effect, or Adverse Effect; and seek concurrence from consulting parties.

No Historic Properties Affected

✓ No Adverse Effect

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

Document reason for finding:

Archeological Resources may be present and will be treated in compliance with Standard Mitigation Measures Agreement negotiated with SHPO.

Does the No Adverse Effect finding contain conditions?

✓ Yes (check all that apply)

✓ Avoidance

Modification of project

Other

Describe conditions here:

Please see attached SMMA.

No

Adverse Effect

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. Conditions: Avoidance. Upon satisfactory implementation of the conditions, which should be monitored, the project is in compliance with Section 106.

Supporting documentation

[Friendship House of Native Americans Wellness Center SMMA.pdf](#)

[Sacred-Lands-File-NA-Contact-Request.pdf](#)

[Sacred-Lands-File-NA-Contact-Form2.pdf](#)

[PrimaryRecord 1672 15th Street.pdf](#)

[PrimaryRecord 1670 15th Street.pdf](#)

[PrimaryRecord 1656 15th.pdf](#)

[NAHC First Response Mail - Eugene Flannery - Outlook.pdf](#)

[List of Tribal Contacts.xlsx](#)

[Final APE.pdf](#)

[Email sent to Native Americans.pdf](#)
[DPR Update - 1684-1688 15th St All files.pdf](#)
[DPR Update - 1672 15th Street All Files.pdf](#)
[DPR Update - 1670 15th Street All Files.pdf](#)
[DPR Update - 1656-1660 15th Street All files.pdf](#)
[DPR Update - 375 Valencia Street all files.pdf](#)
[80 Julian St NWIC Response Letter.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Noise Abatement and Control

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

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

- New construction for residential use

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

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

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

An interstate land sales registration

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

None of the above

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

Indicate the findings of the Preliminary Screening below:

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

- ✓ Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.

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

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

Indicate noise level here: 60

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

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

Unacceptable: (Above 75 decibels)

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

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

Indicate noise level here: 60

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 60.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. ETfenvironmental calculated the Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) using the HUD Electronic Assessment Tool (Calculator) to calculate noise levels for adjacent roadway. Aircraft and Rail sources were not included in the calculations as the Site is beyond

reportable distances of either. Both the Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool Users Guide as well as the information contained in The HUD Noise Guidebook were used to complete the noise study calculations. The results of the calculation returned a DNL value of 60 dBA DNL, which is considered acceptable under HUD Noise Standards. With compliance with the California Building Code the interior noise goal will be met and 47 DNL is an acceptable level for the use of outdoor spaces. No Noise mitigations are necessary.

Supporting documentation

[Traffic Calculations.xlsx](#)

[Map for Noise.pdf](#)

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

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Sole Source Aquifers

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

1. Does the project consist solely of acquisition, leasing, or rehabilitation of an existing building(s)?

- Yes
- ✓ No

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

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

- ✓ No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. The nearest sole source aquifer is the Santa Margarita Aquifer, located approximately 50 miles south of the project site. The

proposed action would have no effect on a sole-source aquifer subject to the HUD-USEPA Memorandum of Understanding. Sources: (29)

Supporting documentation

[Distance to Sole Source Aquifer.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wetlands Protection

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

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

No

✓ Yes

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

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

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

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. The Site does not appear on the National Wetlands Inventory database. There are no wetlands on, adjacent to or near the Project Site. No further consultations are required. Source: (25)

Supporting documentation

[Wetlands Map\(1\).pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

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

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

No

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. No wild and scenic rivers are located within San Francisco. The nearest Wild and Scenic River is the North Fork American River which is approximately 100 miles northeast of the Project Site. Source: (30)

Supporting documentation

[80 Julian Avenue to North Fork American River.pdf](#)
[Wild Scenic Rivers.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Environmental Justice

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

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

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

Yes

No

2. Were these adverse environmental impacts disproportionately high for low-income and/or minority communities?

Yes

No

Explain:

All adverse effects can be mitigated by implementing the mitigation measures identified in this Environmental Assessment. No adverse effects were identified that disproportionately affect environmental justice populations. The combined effects of all local sources of pollution do not pose an overly significant impact as the City has adopted policies and regulations to reduce the impacts of traffic and air pollution on at risk populations. The project site is located in Census Tract 020101 of the 2020 U.S. Census. Within this Tract, approximately 62 percent of the population is comprised of ethnic minorities and approximately 14.6 percent of the population has an income below the poverty line. As such, the project site is located within a minority population community, as described previously. There is scarce supply and high demand for housing resources, especially in the affordable housing sector. The project

area is ranked lower than or equal to both the State and Nationwide Percentile for all criteria pollutants by the EPA. These factors were taken into consideration in the planning and design of the proposed project. Project outreach included extensive informational and community meetings, public hearings and focus groups. Outreach began in 2021 and continues. The community will be advised of the project's direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload any supporting documentation below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Adverse environmental impacts are not disproportionately high for low-income and/or minority communities. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

Supporting documentation

[CalEnviroScreen 4.png](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No