

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

**Project Information**

**Project Name:** 758-Pacific-Avenue-Acquisition-and-Development

**HEROS Number:** 900000010360715

**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):** Chinatown Community Development Center

**PHA Code:**

**Point of Contact:** Bo Han

**Consultant (if applicable):** BayDesert, Inc

**Point of Contact:** Eugene Flannery

**Project Location:** 772 Pacific Ave, San Francisco, CA 94133

**Additional Location Information:**

The project site is approximately 11,450 square feet (0.26 acres) in size and is bound by Pacific Avenue to the south, commercial buildings to the east and west and mixed

commercial and residential buildings to the north. The site is identified by the City and County of San Francisco Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs): 0161-014 and 0161-015. The site is currently developed with a two-story commercial building (772 Pacific Avenue) and a two-story mixed use commercial building with a residential unit on the second floor (758 Pacific Avenue). The site is zoned as CRNC - Residential/Neighborhood Commercial. T. The two-story commercial building (772 Pacific Avenue) is occupied by New Asia Supermarket with the upper level being used for office space and storage associated with the Supermarket. The lower level of the two-story commercial building (758 Pacific Avenue) is occupied by a Chinese restaurant and the upper level is occupied by a residential space. The Site can be accessed from Pacific Street.

**Direct Comments to:** Madeleine Sweet, Compliance Coordinator  
SF Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development  
1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

The New Asia project seeks to acquire and develop the properties located at 758-772 Pacific Avenue as affordable senior housing for extremely low income persons. The project is planning a 15-story structure of 175 affordable units, including two 2-bedroom manager's units with the rest of the units comprised of studios and 1-bedroom units. Out of total 175 units, 25% of the units will be set aside for those having experienced homelessness funded through the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP). These residents will be referred to the project via a coordinated entry system through the San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("SF HSH"). The project is also planning on obtaining the local Senior Operating Subsidies ("SOS") for total of 48 units, which would allow city rental subsidies to come in to allow 15% and 25% local Area Median Income ("AMI") units to be financially sustainable at 60% Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD") AMI. There will be no parking required as there is robust public transportation, including bus lines and subway station within walking distance. The project will also comply with the local planning code to meet the bicycle parking requirements. On the ground floor, there will be a double-height commercial space for a Chinese Banquet Hall with a mezzanine space to re-introduce the banquet hall that the new project is replacing. Above the commercial space will be residential floors interspersed with Manager's units, laundry rooms, community room and property management and resident services offices to support the residents of the building. The entire project will aim to achieve affordability for extremely low-income seniors, not to exceed 30% AMI, which will require additional rental subsidies beyond the LOSP units as well as SOS units. The project will involve demolition of the existing structures at 758-772 Pacific Avenue and ground disturbing activities.

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

San Francisco's share of Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) housing targets has increased from 29,000 units (2014-2022) to 82,000 units (2023-2031). The City's unit allocation breakdown for identified income levels is 20,867 for Very Low Income (VLI), 12,014 for Low Income (LI), 13,717 for Moderate Income (MI), and 35,471 for Above Moderate Income (AMI). Implementation of the Project will assist the City in meeting its RHNA allocation target of 82,069 housing dwelling units for the 2023 to 2031 period set by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The cost of living in San Francisco, CA is 28% higher than that of the state average and 79% higher than the national average. This high cost of living is reflected in the housing market. The average monthly rent in San Francisco is \$3,313, while the median home price is \$1,502,557. The need for housing in San Francisco is acute due to limited inventory and high cost. Access to housing is limited for seniors in San Francisco. Seventy per cent of San Francisco senior renters are extremely low income or very low income which limits their ability to afford housing. Seniors represent a disproportionate share of cost-burdened renters: senior renters are 16% of all renters but are 23% of burdened renters and 24% of both severely burdened and extremely burdened renters. Half of rent-burdened seniors also have a disability and about half of burdened renters with a disability are seniors. Ten percent of seniors were homeless in 2019 in San Francisco. The Project would help the City attain its housing goals and objectives identified in the City's General Plan, including recognizing the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being (Goal One); fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods (Goal Three); Providing sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities (Goal Four); and Substantially expand the amount of permanently affordable housing for extremely low- to moderate-income households (Objective 4A). The United States Census Bureau 2020 Decennial Census estimated the population of the City to be 873,965. The 2010 Census estimate was 805,235. This increase of some 68,730 persons has increased the demand for housing, especially affordable housing. The need for additional housing is great, particularly for affordable senior housing. The population of seniors in the United States has grown significantly over the past ten years: those ages 65+ years rose by almost 30% and persons 85 years and over rose by 51%. In San Francisco the number of persons aged 65 and over has grown 16 percent. Of those San Francisco seniors who rent housing sixty-three percent are housing burdened as they spend more than 30 percent of their income on rental housing. Many extremely low-income households seek rental housing that is increasingly expensive and often substandard. They face housing problems including overpayment, crowding, or substandard housing conditions while some may have special needs such as mental or physical disabilities that are not being met.

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

The site is identified by the City and County of San Francisco Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs): 0161-014 and 0161-015. The site is currently developed with a two-story commercial building (772 Pacific Avenue) and a two-story mixed use commercial building with a residential unit on the second floor (758 Pacific Avenue). The site is zoned as CRNC - Residential/Neighborhood Commercial. The two-story commercial building (772 Pacific Avenue) is occupied by New Asia Supermarket with the upper level being used for office space and storage associated with the Supermarket. The lower level of the two-story commercial building (758 Pacific Avenue) is occupied by a Chinese restaurant and the upper level is occupied by a residential space. The Site can be accessed from Pacific Street. The general site topography slopes down to the southeast, with adjacent ground surface elevations ranging from about Elevation 88 feet at the northwestern corner of the site to about Elevation 83 feet at the southeastern corner of the site. The existing building is bordered by Pacific Avenue on the south and by low-rise commercial and residential buildings on the west, north, and east. The Site is located in 2020 Census Tract 010701 San Francisco. This 0.038 square mile census tract has a population of 3,458 persons resulting in a population density of 91, 432 persons per square mile. The median age is 60.7 years old, of which 58 percent are between the ages of 18 and 64. 96 percent of the population is of Asian ancestry. 25.7 percent of the population lives below the poverty line; the median per capita income is \$22,585. 97 percent of the existing 2,026 housing units are occupied. There is scarce supply and high demand for scarce housing resources, especially in the affordable housing sector. According to HUD CHAS data 29 percent of renters in San Francisco have at least one of four serious housing problems, furthermore 97 percent of all renters have housing cost burden. Housing conditions in this census tract are often unhealthy and unsafe. The roots of these conditions can be traced to the lack of affordable housing, the high cost of housing, low paying jobs, and lack of knowledge of tenant rights and health risks. Violations of the San Francisco Health Code are widespread. Frequently reported problems are insect and rodent infestation, unsanitary conditions, noise disturbances, secondhand smoke exposure and lack of heat.

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

[SFPIM - 772+758 Pacific Parcel Nos.pdf](#)

[SF PIM 772 Pacific.pdf](#)

[SF PIM 758 Pacific.pdf](#)

[Maps of Site.pdf](#)

**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:**

[New Asia Signature Page \(1\).pdf](#)

[New Asia FONSI + NOI-RROF - Proof of Pulication - Notary.pdf](#)

**7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer** 5/31/2024  
on:

**7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer**  
on:

**Funding Information**

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
B-22-MC-06-0016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)	\$2,131,526.00

**Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount:** \$2,131,526.00

**Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]:** \$172,000,000.00

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

<b>Compliance Factors:</b> 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)
<b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.6</b>		

<p><b>Airport Hazards</b> Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>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 any identified noise contour, any airport clear zones or accident potential zones from any nearby airport and is outside the Area of Influence for the San Francisco International Airport which is 11.55 miles south of the project site. Sources: (10) (11)</p>
<p><b>Coastal Barrier Resources Act</b> Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>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: 12</p>
<p><b>Flood Insurance</b> Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>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 structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. There are no Wetlands in the project area as it is in a fully developed urban setting. Project Site is in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (Zone X). FEMA Map Number 0602980116A effective 03/23/2021. 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. Source (13)</p>
<p><b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.5</b></p>		
<p><b>Air Quality</b> Clean Air Act, as amended,</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The project's county or air quality management district is in non-</p>

<p>particularly section 176(c) &amp; (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>		<p>attainment status for the following: Ozone, Particulate Matter, &lt;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. The local Air Basin's, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), status is marginal nonattainment for ozone, moderate nonattainment for PM2.5, and maintenance for CO. Federal de minimis levels are 100 tons per year for each of these pollutants or their precursors: ROG, NOX, PM2.5, and CO. Construction and Operational emissions for the project (estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2020.4.0) are shown in the tables contained in the attached Air Quality Discussion. Emissions from both construction and operations are below the federal General Conformity de minimis levels and BAAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the Proposed Action is exempt from General Conformity regulations. 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. Air Pollutant Exposure Zone The project site, a residential facility, is in an area designated by the City and County of San Francisco as an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone due to elevated pollutant concentrations. As such it is subject to San Francisco Health Code Article 38. Article 38 protects residents</p>
--	--	--

		<p>from the effects of living in a poor air quality zone by requiring enhanced ventilation in new and renovated residential buildings. Projects located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone must: 1. Submit an application to DPH prior to the entitlement process with SF Planning, and 2. Submit a Ventilation Plan demonstrating compliance with Article 38 to DPH for approval before submitting plans to DBI for Mechanical Permit approval. The submission of a Ventilation Plan is a local condition of approval. Stationary Sources The project does not include any stationary permitted TAC sources. The project is within 1,000 feet of three stationary TAC sources (generators); evaluation for exposure for cancer and health risk was conducted for each source. The calculated risks are below the BAAQMD thresholds. # Facility Facility Address Details Adjusted Cancer Risk Adjusted Ha 1 13371 Chinese Hospital 845 Jackson Street Generator 0.1585 0.00012 2 16344 International Hotel 848 Kearny Street Generator 0.9888 0.00012 3 23736 Chinatown Community Development Centers Pacific Avenue Complex Generator 0.7432 0.00036 Vehicle trips are estimated to be 40 per day and would not result in substantial increases of traffic volume on nearby roads and would not result in substantial increases in TAC concentrations. Average Daily Trips on Broadway at Stockton at 343 feet distant are 27,000. According to BAAQMD Surface Street Screening Tables . The project's proximity to the roadway would create an excess cancer screening risk of less than 2.31 and a non-cancer acute hazard index of less than 0.02. These values are below the BAAQMD thresholds. A mobile source</p>
--	--	--

		TAC analysis need not be conducted. Source Documents: 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 64,
<b>Coastal Zone Management Act</b> Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	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 San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has permit authority over San Francisco Bay and lands located within 100 feet of the Bay shoreline. BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan is the Coastal Zone Management Program for the San Francisco Bay Segment of the California Coastal Zone Management Program, pursuant to the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). Under the CZMA, projects requiring federal approval or funding must, to the maximum extent practicable, be consistent with a state's coastal management program if the project would affect the coastal zone. The project site is located more than 100 feet from the San Francisco Bay shoreline; therefore, no formal finding of consistency with the San Francisco Bay Plan is required. The project activity does not involve activity within a Coastal Zone Management Area (CZM) area. Source Documents: 14
<b>Contamination and Toxic Substances</b> 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>Endangered Species Act</b> Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project has been determined to have No Effect on listed species. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation.
<b>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</b> Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	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. Source Documents: 9, 51, 52, 53
<b>Farmlands Protection</b> Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	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. Source Documents: 48
<b>Floodplain Management</b> Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. Source Document: 13
<b>Historic Preservation</b> National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. Upon reviewing the attached Historic and Cultural Resources Evaluation completed by Evans & DeShazo (June 2019), MOHCD, as the Responsible Entity, maintained concurrence with the description of the undertaking and the identified Areas of Potential Effects (APE). However, MOHCD ultimately did not agree with the determination of eligibility for the four properties identified as eligible for listing in the evaluation. Accordingly, MOHCD is withdrew its request for concurrence in these determinations. As such, the Undertaking results in a Finding of No Historic Properties affected for Historic Architectural resources, and a finding of No Historic Properties adversely affected for archeological resources. Thus, this project is in compliance with Section 106.
<b>Noise Abatement and Control</b> Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 62.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. A Noise Assessment was

		<p>conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 62.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. Construction Noise Reduction. Construction activity shall be limited to the period between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and to the period 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends. Construction outside of these hours would require a permit from the City. Furthermore, construction contractors for development on the project site shall implement appropriate noise reduction measures as determined by the City during the construction permit approval process. Required noise reduction measures shall be subject to San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) and may include: * Maintaining proper mufflers on equipment; * Relocating equipment away from noise-sensitive receptors where possible; and * Shutting off idling equipment. Source Documents:1, 8, 37, 59, 63,</p>
<p><b>Sole Source Aquifers</b> Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. Source Document: 11</p>
<p><b>Wetlands Protection</b> Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. Source Document: 36</p>
<p><b>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act</b> Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Source Document: 56</p>
<b>HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS</b>		
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</b>		
<p><b>Environmental Justice</b> Executive Order 12898</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total</p>

		environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.
--	--	--

**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
<b>LAND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	3	The project site is within the boundaries of the Chinatown Area Plan (Plan). Overall, the project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Plan with the exception of the height and bulk controls currently identified in the Zoning Code. Policy 3.2 of Objective 3 of the Plan states that the supply of housing should be increased where possible. The project will increase the supply of affordable housing by 175 units. The project sponsor has undertaken a Section 106 review as required by the National Historic Preservation Act and will proceed with development in accordance with the strictures of that Act. The buildings sited for demolition are not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Architecturally, the proposed	A Planning Code Amendment for the creation of Special Use District is required.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>structure will not adversely affect historic structures within the APE, thus, complying with the Plan Policy 1.4, to protect historic and aesthetic resources of Chinatown. The Site is currently zoned Chinatown Residential Neighborhood Commercial District (CRNC). The allowable height is 65 feet. As the project sponsor is proposing a structure of 150 feet high, they will be seeking a Special Use District (SUD). As the project will have a width of 88 feet of street frontage, the facade will be divided into architectural treatment so as to appear as two or more independent buildings. The scale and division will be designed to reflect the typical scale of older buildings within the Chinatown area. Such measures will ensure consistency with Policy 1.2 as varied by the granting of a SUD, The San Francisco Zoning Code controls for CRNC are designed to preserve neighborhood-serving uses and protect the residential livability of the area. The controls promote new residential development compatible with existing small-scale mixed-use character of the area. Consistent with the residential character of the area, commercial development is directed to the ground story. Housing development in new</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>buildings is encouraged above the ground floor. The proposed project meets these standards in that it is a new housing development and includes retail and community serving spaces on the ground floor. The San Francisco Planning Commission stated in its approval of the 2015 amendments to the Affordable Housing Bonus General Plan. Commissioners stated that In selected areas of Chinatown, height incentives related to provision of affordable housing should be provided. A Planning Code Text amendment is a request to modify a particular section of the Planning Code. The most common amendment is to create a new Special Use District and associated controls, which requires adding these details to the Planning Code. Source Documents: 8, 40</p>	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	3	<p>Soil Suitability: On December 15, 2022, Langan, Inc. conducted a subsurface investigation of the Site i to make recommendations for design and construction of the project. Langan concluded the project is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint. The primary geotechnical concerns for the project were: * presence of relatively weak near-surface soil and anticipated static and seismic settlement of these layers; and</p>	<p>Ensure recommendations contained in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation (Report Number: 731764201) of March 6, 2023, are incorporated in the design and contract documents, and are implemented during construction.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>* presence of adjacent neighboring buildings with unknown foundation depths. Langan concluded the site can be developed as planned provided the recommendations contained in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation (Number: 731764201) of March 6, 2023, are incorporated in the design and contract documents, and implemented during construction.</p> <p>Recommendations for foundation support, ground improvement, floor slabs, site preparation, grading, seismic design, and fill placement are presented in the report. The general site topography slopes down to the southeast, with adjacent ground surface elevations ranging from about Elevation 88 feet at the northwestern corner of the site to about Elevation 83 feet at the southeastern corner of the site. The site is completely occupied by existing structures, which includes a flat slab-on-grade. The site is underlain by up to about 13,1/2 feet of undocumented fill over dense to very dense sand which is in-turn likely underlain by bedrock. The undocumented fill consists of very soft to stiff clay with interbedded medium dense sand. The undocumented fill is underlain by dense to very dense sand, which was</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>encountered between depths of 5 and 131/2 feet bgs. Bedrock is expected at depths of about 30 to 50 feet bgs at the site.</p> <p>Slope: The grade of the site (percentage) is 5.682, this is considered slight and optimal for residential construction.</p> <p>Erosion: the site is fully developed and not subject to erosion. The project site is entirely comprised of urban land, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Web Soil Survey. The future developed site will also be fully developed and not subject to erosion. The project would not have potential hazards related to slope failure and would not create new slopes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is not in an erosion-sensitive area (near water, a drainage feature, or on a steep slope). The site would continue to be fully covered with impervious surfaces.</p> <p>During construction and operation, the project applicant would be required to comply with all applicable federal and local water quality and wastewater discharge requirements that include compliance with Article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code, which incorporates and implements the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, and the nine minimum controls of the</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>federal Combined Sewer Overflow Control Policy. The minimum controls include development and implementation of a pollution prevention program and an erosion and sediment control plan that would be reviewed and approved by the City and County of San Francisco prior to implementation. Storm Water Runoff: Stormwater runoff from the site is affected by topography, drainage, and surface cover. Stormwater runoff from the site would enter the City's combined sewer and wastewater system. Prior to stormwater runoff from the proposed building leaving the site, it would be filtered by on-grade landscaping planters and capture systems. With implementation of these stormwater capture systems, development of the site would not result in substantial new sources of off-site stormwater pollution. The project applicant would be required to comply with all aspects of the federal combined sewer system (CSO) Control Policy, and appropriate pre-treatment and pollution prevention programs, which would ensure consistency with existing water quality regulations protecting San Francisco Bay and ocean water quality. Source Documents 8, 29, 36, 38, 39, 40, 55</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
<p>Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>REGIONAL SEISMICITY AND FAULTING The Site is in a seismically active region. Numerous earthquakes have been recorded in the region and moderate to large earthquakes should be anticipated during the service life of the project. The San Andreas, San Gregorio, and Hayward faults are the major faults closest to the site.</p> <p>GEOLOGIC AND SEISMIC HAZARDS During a major earthquake on one of the nearby faults, strong shaking is expected to occur at the site. Strong shaking during an earthquake can result in ground failure such as that associated with soil liquefaction, lateral spreading, and cyclic densification. These conditions have been evaluated based on Langan's literature review, field investigation, and analyses and are discussed fully in the Investigation Report.</p> <p>Liquefaction and Lateral Spreading Langan estimated up to 1 inch of seismically induced liquefaction settlement could occur at the site; differential settlement between columns may be on the order of 1/2 inch during a major earthquake. Additional confirmatory borings and CPTs should be advanced following demolition of the building, and liquefaction potential should be reevaluated using the data from additional</p>	<p>Ensure recommendations contained in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation (Report Number: 731764201) of March 6, 2023, are incorporated in the design and contract documents, and are implemented during construction.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>explorations, as required. While Langan preliminarily judged the potential for lateral spreading at the site to be low, they believe lateral spreading potential should be reevaluated using data obtained from additional explorations advanced at the site following building demolition. Seismic densification Langan concluded the sand layers above the water table are sufficiently dense or have sufficient cohesion to resist seismic densification.</p> <p>Fault Rupture The site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act and no known active or potentially active faults exist on the site. Therefore, the risk of fault offset at the site from a known active fault is low. In a seismically active area, the remote possibility exists for future faulting in areas where no faults previously existed; however, the risk of surface faulting and consequent secondary ground failure is low. As construction would comply with the California Building Code, which includes compliance with earthquake standards and fire codes regulations. Site Safety Development of the site with residential uses would not create a risk of natural hazards, explosion, release of hazardous</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>substances, or other dangers to public health. The site is located in an urban setting and development on the site would be compatible with surrounding uses. Construction Noise Construction Noise Reduction. Construction activity would be limited to the period between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and to the period 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends. Construction outside of these hours would require a permit from the City. Furthermore, construction contractors for development on the site shall implement appropriate noise reduction measures, as determined by the City during the construction permit approval process. Required noise reduction measures shall be subject to San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) and may include but are not limited to: *</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Maintaining proper mufflers on equipment;</li> <li>* Relocating equipment away from noise-sensitive receptors where possible; and</li> <li>* Shutting off idling equipment.</li> </ul> <p>Community Noise As discussed in Noise Abatement and Control, the project would place new residential units in an area subject to "acceptable" noise levels for residential uses. Construction of the project</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		would be required to use building facade materials, acoustic insulation in building walls and ceilings, acoustically rated windows, and similar measures to achieve sufficient reductions from outdoor Ldn levels that building interior Ldn noise levels would be 45 dBA or less.. Source Documents: 38, 39	
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC</b>			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	With the exception of adding short-term construction jobs, the Project will have little impact on employment. Post construction employment at the Site will include staffing for the commercial space, the number of which is not yet determined. Additionally, several employees for property management and supportive services will be at the site. Impacts to employment and income patterns will not be adverse	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	3	DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTER CHANGES At 175 units, the project is not anticipated to induce substantial growth in population in the area. The project will help to address the need for housing identified in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation. The number of future residents is estimated to be 400 at most. The population of the City of San Francisco was 873,965 in 2020, an additional 400 people would represent 0.050 percent of that	Preparation and implementation of a Relocation Plan as required by the URA/

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>population. In fact, the future residents may be current residents of San Francisco and not cause an increase in population. The Project contribution will not significantly alter the racial, ethnic, or income segregation of the area's housing. It will not result in physical barriers or difficult access which would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group, making access to local services, facilities, and institutions or other parts of the city more difficult. The development of the Project at this Site does not create a concentration of low income or disadvantaged people, in violation of HUD standards and Environmental Justice policies.</p> <p>DISPLACEMENT The Uniform Relocation Act (URA), passed by Congress in 1970, establishes minimum standards for federally funded programs and projects that require the acquisition of real property (real estate) or displace persons from their homes, businesses, or farms. The Uniform Act's protections and assistance apply to the acquisition, rehabilitation, or demolition of real property for federal or federally funded projects. Section 205 of the URA requires that, "Programs or projects undertaken by a federal agency</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>or with federal financial assistance shall be planned in a manner that (1) recognizes, at an early stage in the planning of such programs or projects and before the commencement of any actions which will cause displacements, the problems associated with the displacement of individuals, families, businesses, and farm operations, and (2) provides for the resolution of such problems in order to minimize adverse impacts on displaced persons and to expedite program or project advancement and completion." In developing the proposed project relocation of the current business establishment, New Asia Restaurant, will occur and trigger relocation obligations per the URA. Source Documents: 3, 4, 6</p>	
Environmental Justice EA Factor	2	<p>All adverse effects can be mitigated by implementing the mitigation measures identified in the 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. The project is located</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>in Census Tract 010701. This tract has a population of 3,458 and a population density of 91,432 persons per square mile. The median age is 60.7 years old. 96% of the population is of Asian ancestry. 25.7% of the population lives below the poverty line; the median per capita income is \$22,585. 97% of the existing 2,026 housing units are occupied. There is scarce supply and high demand for housing resources, especially in the affordable housing sector. 97% of all renters have housing cost burden. Housing conditions in this tract are unhealthy and unsafe. Violations of the San Francisco Health Code are widespread. Frequent problems are insect and rodent infestation, unsanitary conditions, noise disturbances, secondhand smoke exposure and lack of heat. 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 will include informational and community meetings, public hearings and focus groups. Outreach will begin in the beginning of the new year. The community will be advised of</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>the project's direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts. Climate change is affecting the City through higher 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 high elevation the project site is not subject to adverse effects from climate change induced sea level rise and flooding that will affect low 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" to 26.4" . 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</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>adoption of rezoning programs. The City 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. Source Documents:1, 2,3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16, 17,18, 19, 20, 58, 60</p>	
<b>COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	The proposed project is for the development of affordable senior housing. As the potential residents will be over the age of	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>55 it is highly unlikely that they will attend elementary, middle or high schools operated by the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). They may avail themselves of either of the two local branches of the Community College of San Francisco (CCSF) which are located blocks away at 808 Kearny Street and 28 Washington Street. Tuition at CCSF is free. The project will not adversely affect educational facilities. The project site is located in San Francisco's Chinatown which is the oldest Chinatown in North America. Chinatown has been an important and influential center in the history and culture of ethnic Chinese immigrants in North America. Chinatown is an enclave that has retained its own customs, languages, places of worship, social clubs, and identity. There are two hospitals, several parks and squares, numerous churches, a post office, and other infrastructure located in the neighborhood. Notable cultural facilities include the Dragon Gate entrance to Chinatown, Saint Mary's Square which is also a memorial for Chinese-American veterans of World Wars I and II; the Sing Chong building, one of the earliest buildings erected after the 1906 earthquake;</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Portsmouth Square, the oldest public space in San Francisco; Chinese Historical Society of America and the YWCA building designed by Julia Morgan. Yerba Buena Center, the Museum of Modern Arts, the San Francisco Jewish Museum, the Mexican American Museum and Union Square are a short distance down Stockton Street and are accessible by the newly constructed subway. San Francisco cultural facilities include the de Young Museum, the Randall Museum, Legion of Honor Museum, and the Asian Art Museum. Many cultural facilities are located within walking distance of the project site or accessible from the project site via public transportation and would be accessible to future project residents. The proposed action would not adversely affect existing cultural facilities by its operation. Source Document: 3, 6, 21</p>	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	<p>The project site is in the center of San Francisco's Chinatown. There are over thirty grocery stores of a wide variety within walking distance as well as banking facilities, clothing and variety stores and restaurants. The Union Square shopping district is within walking distance and can also be accessed by use of the newly constructed subway. North</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Beach and Fisherman's Wharf are also accessible by public transit. Source Documents: 11, 21, 22	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	Health care and social services are within walking distance of the project site. Also, a wide range of these social services are 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, 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. The Chinese Hospital is one block from the project site. Additionally, Kaiser Permanente offers private healthcare services and has two well-developed medical centers in San Francisco. These facilities could be accessed by MUNI facilities adjacent to the project	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>site. Additionally, Self Help for the Elderly has five sites in Chinatown where a wide range of senior services are available. 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. As discussed in Demographic Character Changes, Displacement, the project would potentially increase the population by at most 400 people, which is approximately 0.02 percent. The level of population increase described above would not represent a substantial change to the demographic of the area and would not result in substantial impacts on the existing social services serving the project area. Source Documents: 11, 21, 20</p>	
<p>Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Recology San Francisco, Recology Sunset Scavenger, and Recology Golden Gate provide residential and commercial garbage and recycling services for the City of San Francisco. Solid waste generated by the project (during both construction and operational activities) would be disposed of at one of the City's licensed facilities. The solid waste generated by the project would be adequately served by existing providers with</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>sufficient permitted capacity. During operation, the project could generate an estimated 275 tons of solid waste per year, based on conservative generation rates summarized by CalRecycle for multi-family residential (8.6 pounds/per unit/per day). The following facilities have the capacity to process waste from the proposed project: Facility Remaining Capacity (tons)                      Recology Hay Road 30,433,000                      Corinda Los Trancos Landfill 22,180,000                      Altamont Landfill 65,400,000                      Potrero Hills Landfill 13,872,000                      Monterey Peninsula Landfill 49,700,000</p> <p>The amount of solid waste generated by the project would be a small amount compared to the maximum daily throughput of these solid waste facilities and would not exceed facility capacities. Furthermore, pursuant to Section 1402 of the San Francisco Environment Code, the project applicant would be required to submit a waste diversion plan providing for a minimum of 65 percent diversion from landfill of construction and demolition debris. Section 1904 of the San Francisco Environment Code also would require the property manager to supply appropriate containers for recyclable and compostable material. Based on reported citywide diversion</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>rates, it is expected that approximately 80 percent of solid waste generated on-site would be diverted from landfills. Therefore, the proposed action would not substantially increase the demand for solid waste removal service beyond current demand in this area. Source Documents: 24, 25, 26, 27, 28</p>	
<p>Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The SFPUC has a combined sewer and wastewater system, which collects sewage and stormwater in the same pipe network. The CSO is divided into the Bayside and Westside drainage basins, which collect wastewater and stormwater from the east and west sides of the City, respectively. The City currently has two NPDES permits that cover its wastewater treatment facilities. One permit from August 2013 includes the SEWPCP and the CSO discharges to the Bay. The second covers the OWPCP, Southwest Ocean Outfall, and Westside Wet Weather Facilities. The permits specify discharge prohibitions, dry-weather effluent limitations, wet-weather effluent performance criteria, receiving water limitations, sludge management practices, and monitoring and reporting requirements. The permits prohibit overflows from the CSO structures during dry weather</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>and require wet-weather overflows to comply with the nine minimum controls specified in the federal CSO Control Policy. The total volume of wastewater collected in 2015 was approximately 74.3 million gallons per day (mgd). Project generated wastewater would be treated at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (SEWPCP) facility, which provides wastewater collection and transfer services to the eastern side of the City. Approximately 65 mgd of the wastewater was treated and discharged from the combined sewer outflow (CSO) to the San Francisco Bay through the SEWCPCP and to the Pacific Ocean through the OWPCP. Total project wastewater generation is estimated by CalEEMod to be approximately 4,254,376 gallons per year or 11,655 gallons per day. This level of generation would not contribute to a citywide increase in sanitary flows that would adversely affect CSO discharges. The City's sewer system has the capacity to treat 575 million gallons per day. There would be no adverse impacts to water quality as a result of the project development. Source Documents: 29</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The addition of 175 affordable senior housing units would use approximately 31,000 gallons of water per day, an incremental increase relative to the total use of the City. The source of the water would be the SFPUC. The 2020 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco found that water supply for residential customers in the City would meet demand under all drought conditions through the year 2045. Since the project's anticipated population increase is accounted for in City and regional forecasts, the project's demand for water is within the forecasted supply estimates. Implementation of the proposed action would not have an adverse effect on water supply. Source Documents: 29	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The San Francisco Fire Department (fire department) provides fire suppression services and unified emergency medical services and transport, including basic life support and advanced life support services, in the city. The project site is within the service area of the fire department's Fire Stations 2 and 13 located 0.20 and 0.5 miles from the project site, respectively. The San Francisco Police Department (police department) provides police protection in the city. Police department services include	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>responding to calls for police assistance, monitoring and managing traffic, and performing general surveillance duties. The project site is within the police department's Central District, and the closest police station is the Central Police Station at 766 Vallejo Street (between Stockton and Powell streets), approximately 0.35 mile northwest of the project site. The proposed project would result in growth of at most a half of one percent of the city's population. This represents an incremental increase in the service population for both the police and fire departments. The time it takes emergency medical personnel of the San Francisco Fire Department and Police Department to respond to a call has remained relatively stable since 2001, at an average of just under eight minutes for the Police Department for Priority A calls and four minutes for the Fire Department. Emergency medical personnel arrive at 90% of sites within approximately five minutes. The fire and police departments respond to growth and other changing service needs through ongoing analysis of applicable metrics, such as staffing, capacity, response times, and call volumes. As a result, project development would not result</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>in any service gap in citywide police, fire, and emergency medical services nor would it result in adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new or physically altered facilities. Acceptable service ratios, response times, and other performance objectives for fire and police protection would be maintained. The project site is located near and already served by police and fire protection services, Overall, the proposed project would not increase the number of service calls or the service population in the area to such an extent that response times would be adversely affected. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on public services, and no mitigation measures are necessary. Source Documents: 30, 31</p>	
<p>Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>San Francisco owns and operates approximately 4,090 acres of public open space across 220 neighborhood parks, playgrounds, and open spaces in the city. These recreational facilities include recreation centers and clubhouses, soccer/playfields, basketball courts, and tennis courts. The City also has contains over 250 acres of open space owned and managed by the State of California, and another 1600 acres of federally-owned open</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>space. Recreational facilities and open spaces make up almost 20% of the City's total land area. The quantity of usable open space increases even more when one includes the other spaces owned by city agencies, college campuses, schoolyards open during non-school hours, urban plazas or other publicly accessible outdoor spaces throughout the City, by another 560 acres. *San Francisco is the only major U.S. city where every resident lives within a 10-minute walk of a city park. The City has five acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. The following public open spaces and privately owned public open spaces (POPOS), neighborhood parks, and other recreational facilities are located within the 0.25-mile radius of the project site, and all of them are accessible by walking, bicycling, or transit from the project site. POPOS are publicly accessible spaces in forms of plazas, terraces, atriums, small parks, and even snippets which are provided and maintained by private developers. * Willie "Woo Woo" Wong Playground (830 Sacramento Street) This recently renovated park features three levels: upper athletic courts, middle playground with restrooms, and a lower clubhouse. * Woh Hei</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Yuen Park (922 Jackson Street) The park includes a recreation center and kitchen, picnic tables, a playground, and restrooms. * Saint Mary's Square (651 California Street) The park includes benches and a playground. * Transamerica Redwood Park (600 Montgomery Street) is a POPOS that park includes bench seating and a fountain. * 343 Sansome Street includes two POPOS consisting of a terrace on the 15th floor of 343 Sansome Street and an open space on Leidesdorff Street. Both POPOS contain seating and tables. * 555 California Street includes a POPOS which includes a plaza with benches and landscaping at the corner of Kearny and California streets. * Empire Park (648 Commercial Street) is a POPOS with a garden courtyard and has tables and seating. * 456 Montgomery Plaza includes a POPOS with small terraces, tables, and seating. * Portsmouth Square is the oldest park in San Francisco and has recently been totally renovated. The City has accounted for this growth in demand resulting from development of new housing in its General Plan. Additionally, San Francisco voters recently passed three bond measures, in 2008, 2012, and 2020, to fund the acquisition, planning, and</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>renovation of City recreational resources. Access to the parks by the project residents would not increase demand to the extent that would cause substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. Nor would it be necessary to require the construction of additional recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Source Documents: 32</p>	
<p>Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Traffic The project site is located in an area of San Francisco where the existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the regional VMT thresholds (357). The proposed project would not cause an exceedance of the VMT, and vehicular parking map based screening criteria. There are no vehicular parking spaces proposed and it is expected that the seniors will have limited access to automobiles. The site's location in a transit rich area obviates the need for automobiles. Based on weekday trip rate of 0.19 trips per dwelling unit the project would generate 33 average daily trips. This minor increase in vehicle trips would incrementally increase traffic but would not adversely affect the local circulation system. It is expected that residents would</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>use public transportation available to the site, including the recently completed Central Subway and extensive network of MUNI bus lines. Transit The project area is well-served by public transit, and several on-street MUNI bus lines operate in the area, including Routes 1, 8, 30, 45 and the T Line Subway. These rail and bus lines connect to the larger regional BART and Caltrain systems, which provide rail transit to multiple Bay Area destinations. Pedestrian The project would replace and improve the sidewalk on Pacific Avenue frontage in accordance with the Better Streets Plan. Overall, the sidewalks and crosswalks in the area operate satisfactorily. Bicycles Development of the project may generate new bicycle trips. The area is well served by bicycle lanes on Broadway, Stockton and Kearney Streets. Bicycle parking is required as part of the San Francisco Planning Code. Class I bike parking spaces are in secure, weather-protected facilities, Class II bike parking spaces are bicycle racks located in a publicly accessible location. The San Francisco Planning Code, Section 155.2, specifies that new residential buildings must provide one Class I space for every 10 and one Class II bike parking space is required for</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>every 50 residential units as well as one for every 1,500 square feet of retail space. The proposed project would require 18 Class I bike parking spaces and five Class II bike parking spaces. Parking The project, a senior housing development, will not provide parking spaces. San Francisco General Plan policies encourage the use of public transit use in lieu of automobile use. The project is consistent with these policies. The increase in area residents would not the project would not significantly impact the local transportation network of bicycles, pedestrian facilities, or public transit. Source List: 5,21, 22, 33, 34, 59, 66,</p>	
<b>NATURAL FEATURES</b>			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	<p>The Site is approximately 11,450 square feet (0.26 acres) in size and is bound by Pacific Avenue to the south, commercial buildings to the east and west and mixed commercial and residential buildings to the north. The Site is currently developed with a two-story commercial building (772 Pacific Avenue) and a two-story mixed use commercial building with a residential unit on the second floor (758 Pacific Avenue). There are no unique natural features or water resources on the site including water courses, creeks, streams, seasonal wetlands, or other</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>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 not encountered during site investigations but is estimated to be 10 to 18 feet bgs. The groundwater level at the site is expected to fluctuate several 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 use a septic system but will connect to the wastewater disposal system. The project will not 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. Source</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Documentation: 8, 9, 11, 15, 36, 37, 41	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	2	<p>The project site is developed, paved, and lacks major landscaping or vegetation. Furthermore, the site is covered with impervious surfaces. Landscaping, including street trees and planters, is limited to the perimeter of the project site. The project site does not contain any wetland features, vernal pools, riparian habitat, or watercourses. The site is located in the highly urbanized Chinatown District of San Francisco, an area lacks habitat able to host wildlife other than birds passing through. Therefore, the development of residential uses on the project site would not have a substantial adverse effect on vegetation or wildlife Source Documentation: 8, 9, 11, 15, 36, 37, 41</p>	
Other Factors 1	2	<p>Greenhouse Gases: The projected annual GHG emissions generated by the project were quantified using CalEEMod 2020.4.0. According to the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, an efficiency threshold of 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population per year is appropriate for land use projects that include residential land uses. Although the BAAQMD has not yet quantified a threshold for 2030, a reduction of the 4.6 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>per service population per year threshold by 40 percent to 2.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population per year would be consistent with the State reduction target established in SB 32. As such, the adjusted service population threshold of 2.8 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population is the most appropriate threshold for the project. Project-related construction emissions are confined to a relatively short period in relation to the overall life of the project. Project construction in the year 2026 would result in a total of approximately 142 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e. Total project operational GHG emissions are presented in table below. Source Emissions (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year) Total 577 Service Population (Residents) 400 Emissions per Service Person 1.4425 Adjusted BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold (per Service Person) 2.8 Exceeds Threshold? No Operational GHG emissions for the project would be approximately 1.4425 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population year, which would not exceed the interpolated BAAQMD threshold of 2.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population per year. The project would not adversely affect climate change by excessive GHG emissions. Source Documents: 47</p>	
Other Factors 2			

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
<b>CLIMATE AND ENERGY</b>			
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. Wildfire risk may change as the length of dry spells changes, which are projected to have between a 51 day decrease and a 111 day increase. 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. 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). Ninety-nine percent of the census tract in which the site is located lacks tree canopy and 90 per cent of the census tract's surface is impervious. The NOAA National Center for Environmental Information</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>warns that Sea Level Rise (while not directly affecting the project area with inundation) may have an effect on stormwater infrastructure and effect the quality of drinking water supply because of by salt water 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 greenhouse gas emissions from construction and material fabrication. LEED 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: 58</p>	
Energy Efficiency	2	<p>Energy Consumption Project development 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</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>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 Silver. 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 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 a substantial adverse effect on energy consumption.</p>	

**Supporting documentation**

- [Phase I ESA New Asia.pdf](#)
- [Phase III ESA New Asia.pdf](#)
- [Phase II ESA New Asia.pdf report.pdf](#)
- [pERMITTED uSES crnd\(1\).pdf](#)
- [pERMITTED uSES crnd 2.pdf](#)
- [Land Use Index August 2011.pdf](#)
- [Executive Summary.pdf](#)
- [Housing Element 2022 Update.pdf](#)
- [Final RHNA Methodology Report 2023-2031 update 11-22.pdf](#)
- [SFMTA Traffic Count Data 1993-2015 with cover sheet\(1\).pdf](#)
- [Housing Element App H Noise\(1\).pdf](#)
- [Geotech Investigation 772 Pacific Ave.pdf](#)
- [Neighborhoods-At-Risk.pdf](#)
- [San Francisco Climate Action Plan\(1\).pdf](#)

[EJ Combine.pdf](#)

**Additional Studies Performed:**

See Source Document List

[Source Documents List.docx](#)

**Field Inspection [Optional]:** Date and completed

by:

Langan Engineering and Environmental Services

5/25/2023 12:00:00 AM

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

See Source Document List

**List of Permits Obtained:**

No Federal Permits were necessary.

**Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:**

A notice of availability of the EA and FONSI will be published in the San Francisco Examiner, a local and regional paper of general circulation. The notice of availability and EA will be posted on the MOHCD website (<https://sfmohcd.org/environmental-reviews>). Chinatown Community Development Center held community meetings in July 2023 regarding the height of the proposed structure and more community meetings are scheduled for August 2024.

[Copy of Notice - New Asia FONSI.pdf](#)

**Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:**

A cumulative impact is the impact on the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. No major construction activities or redevelopment is anticipated on adjacent or nearby parcels. 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 and impacts would be mitigated by an increased tax base and development fees (for public services, utilities and transportation) and by compliance with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (for noise). 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; federal, state and local regulations; and Mitigation Measures to 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. In sum, the project would not contribute significantly to an identified cumulative impact. Its development capacity falls within current programmatic plans to develop affordable housing stock in the City that have been adopted by the City and County of San Francisco in its General Plan and Housing Element as well as other plans and strategies. It also falls within local and regional projections for population and housing. Further cumulative impacts may occur as a result of other planned and pending development in the project site vicinity; however, as discussed in the Clean Air and Transportation and Accessibility sections, the project's air pollutant emissions would not exceed thresholds and the project would generate a nominal number of new vehicle trips.

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

A reduced action alternative was considered. However, after consideration of the financial difficulties inherent in a reduced density action, the overwhelming need for housing for very low income persons, and the fact that the reduced action alternative would have the same effects on the environment it was determined that the reduced action alternative carried no benefits and did not reduce environmental consequences. The Reduced Project Alternative would not support the City's goal of increasing the stock of affordable housing units for low income persons.

**No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]**

The site would remain under utilized. The No Action Alternative would not support the City's goals of providing housing opportunities for homeless persons and generally increasing the supply of affordable housing units for seniors. Housing opportunities for very low income seniors would be decreased and the City would be at risk at not meeting its RHNA.

**Summary of Findings and Conclusions:**

With applicable laws, authorities, factors or other enforceable measures and permit conditions all potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Toxic Contaminants Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts related to contamination and toxic substances to less than significant. Implementation of the archeological conditions would prevent adverse impacts to cultural resources. As such, 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
Contamination and Toxic Substances	<p>Because fill material exists beneath the site, a health and safety plan (HASP) should be prepared and implemented prior to construction. The HASP will outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to heavy metals, hydrocarbons, and volatile compounds during construction activities. The SMP provides recommended measures to mitigate the long-term environmental or health and safety (H&amp;S) risks caused by the presence of heavy metals in the soil.</p> <p>As a result of the concentrations</p>	N/A		

	<p>of PCE exceeding its RWQCB ESL in soil vapor, the installation of a vapor intrusion mitigation system (VIMS) should be included in future building design as a conservative vapor mitigation measure. The recommended passive vapor barrier would consist of a continuous, spray-applied vapor barrier membrane located immediately beneath the structural building slab. Below-grade utility conduits entering the building will be sealed to prevent VOC migration along the conduits from outside the building into the sub-slab space beneath the building. The proposed design of the vapor barrier will be performed by a professional engineer (PE) registered in the State of California. In addition, the design engineer will perform construction observation during the installation of the various components of the VIMS.</p> <p>The remaining fill material on-site (outside of the areas with concentrations exceeding hazardous waste thresholds) will most likely be disposed of as Class II non-hazardous material due to heavy metals concentrations. Final soil acceptance is dependent on the receiving landfill or facility's acceptance criteria.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	A Planning Code Amendment for the creation of Special Use District is required.	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	Ensure recommendations contained in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation (Report Number: 731764201) of March 6, 2023, are incorporated in the design and contract documents, and are implemented during construction.	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	Ensure recommendations contained in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation (Report Number: 731764201) of March 6, 2023, are incorporated in the design and contract documents, and are implemented during construction.	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	Preparation and implementation of a Relocation Plan as required by the URA/	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan	
Historic Preservation	RECOMMENDATIONS Based on the findings of the Archaeological Study, it is recommended that the following measures are taken to ensure the identification and appropriate treatment of archaeological and tribal cultural resources that may be encountered during Project-related ground-disturbing activities. The recommendations are provided pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1) and 14 CCR s. 15064.4 concerning the identification of historic	N/A	See attached Mitigation Plan	

	<p>properties/historical resources and the potential inadvertent discovery of buried archaeological resources. Cultural Resource Awareness Training. The Project applicant/contractor shall ensure that cultural and tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training is provided to Project supervisors, contractors, and equipment operators prior to construction and for the duration of ground-disturbing activities as part of the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). The cultural and tribal cultural resources WEAP training materials will be developed by a Secretary of Interior (SOI)-qualified Archaeologist. The training shall be conducted before any Project-related construction activities begin, and for the duration of the Project, to ensure that all workers involved in ground-disturbing activities have received training. The training shall include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations. The training shall also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources that could be located in the Project Area and shall outline what to do and who to contact if any</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>potential archaeological resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered. The training shall emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance to Native Americans and shall address appropriate behaviors and responsive actions, consistent with Native American tribal values.</p> <p>Archaeological Monitoring. Due to the high potential for historic period archaeological resources to be encountered within the Project Area, Archaeological monitoring of all Project-related ground-disturbing activities are recommended following the procedures outlined in the attached Archaeological Monitoring Plan (see Appendix B of Archeological Study). The treatment of any post-review archaeological discoveries, including the discovery of human remains within the Project Area during Project-related ground-disturbing activities shall follow the procedures outlined in the attached Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring Plan</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

**Project Mitigation Plan**

Please see attached Mitigation Plan

[New Asia 772+758 Pacific SMMA signed.pdf](#)  
[New Asia Mitigation Plan 003142024.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 any identified noise contour, any airport clear zones or accident potential zones from any nearby airport and is outside the Area of Influence for the San Francisco International Airport which is 11.55 miles south of the project site. Sources: (10) (11)

#### Supporting documentation

[SFO Area of Influence Map.pdf](#)

[Distance to SFO.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

758-Pacific-Avenue-  
Acquisition-and-  
Development

San Francisco, CA

900000010360715

### 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: 12

#### 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 772 Pacific Ave SF.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 structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. There are no Wetlands in the project area as it is in a fully developed urban setting. Project Site is in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (Zone X). FEMA Map Number 0602980116A effective 03/23/2021. 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. Source (13)

#### **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:**

EPA Green Book de Minimis Standards

**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	3.22	ppm (parts per million)
Ozone	1.02	ppb (parts per million)
Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns	0.04	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: 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. The local Air Basin's, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), status is marginal nonattainment for ozone, moderate nonattainment for PM2.5, and maintenance for CO. Federal de minimis levels are 100 tons per year for each of these pollutants or their precursors: ROG, NOX, PM2.5, and CO. Construction and Operational emissions for the project (estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2020.4.0) are shown in the tables contained in the attached Air Quality Discussion. Emissions from both construction and operations are below the federal General Conformity de minimis levels and BAAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the Proposed Action is exempt from General Conformity regulations. 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. Air Pollutant Exposure Zone The project site, a residential facility, is in an area designated by the City and County of San Francisco as an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone due to elevated pollutant concentrations. As such it is subject to San Francisco Health Code Article 38. Article 38 protects residents from the effects of living in a poor air quality zone by requiring enhanced ventilation in new and renovated residential buildings. Projects located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone must: 1. Submit an application to DPH prior to the entitlement process with SF Planning, and 2. Submit a Ventilation Plan demonstrating compliance with Article 38 to DPH for approval before submitting plans to DBI for Mechanical Permit approval. The submission of a Ventilation Plan is a local condition of approval. Stationary Sources The project does not include any stationary permitted TAC sources. The project is within 1,000 feet of three stationary TAC sources (generators); evaluation for exposure for cancer and health risk was conducted for each source. The calculated risks are below the BAAQMD thresholds. # Facility Facility Address Details Adjusted Cancer Risk Adjusted Ha 1 13371 Chinese Hospital 845 Jackson Street Generator 0.1585 0.00012 2 16344 International Hotel 848 Kearny Street Generator 0.9888 0.00012 3 23736 Chinatown Community Development Centers Pacific Avenue Complex Generator 0.7432 0.00036 Vehicle trips are estimated to be 40 per day and would not result in substantial increases of traffic volume on nearby roads and would not result in substantial increases in TAC concentrations. Average Daily Trips on Broadway at Stockton at 343 feet distant are 27,000. According to BAAQMD Surface Street Screening Tables . The project's proximity to the roadway would create an excess cancer screening risk of less than 2.31 and a non-cancer acute hazard index of

less than 0.02. These values are below the BAAQMD thresholds. A mobile source TAC analysis need not be conducted. Source Documents: 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 64,

**Supporting documentation**

[Public BAAQMD Health Risk Calculator Beta 5 0.xlsx](#)

[Permitted Stationary Sources.pdf](#)

[New Asia Housing Detailed Report CalEEMOD.pdf](#)

[EPA Spreadsheet of nonconforming counties.xlsx](#)

[Details of Criteria Pollutant Nonattainment Area Summary Report Green Book US EPA.pdf](#)

[Article 38 New Requirements in Effect December 2014.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 San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has permit authority over San Francisco Bay and lands located within 100 feet of the Bay shoreline. BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan is the Coastal Zone Management Program for the San Francisco Bay Segment of the California Coastal Zone Management Program, pursuant to the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). Under the CZMA, projects requiring federal approval or funding must, to the maximum extent practicable, be consistent with a state's coastal management program if the project would affect the coastal zone. The project site is located more than 100 feet from the San Francisco Bay shoreline; therefore, no formal finding of consistency with the San Francisco Bay Plan is required. The project activity does not involve activity within a Coastal Zone Management Area (CZM) area. Source Documents: 14

758-Pacific-Avenue-  
Acquisition-and-  
Development

San Francisco, CA

900000010360715

**Supporting documentation**

[Distance to Coastal Zone.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

[Updated Phase II ESA New Asia.pdf](#)

[Updated Phase I ESA New Asia.pdf](#)

[Phase III ESA New Asia\(1\).pdf](#)

[Water Boards Letter re 1656 Powell St Approval and Requirement.pdf](#)

758-Pacific-Avenue-  
Acquisition-and-  
Development

San Francisco, CA

900000010360715

[UST Assessment 772 Pacific Ave Mar 15 2017.pdf](#)

[Soil Analytical Results.docx](#)

[Site Map.jpg](#)

[Phase II ESA SMP Report 772 Pacific.pdf](#)

[Phase I ESA 772 and 758 Pacific Ave San Francisco 0623.pdf](#)

**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 project activity involves a previously developed urban property and thus would have no effect on any natural habitats or federally protected species. The project site is entirely developed and therefore does not support these species' habitat requirements.. There are no critical habitats

on or proximate to the Site. Source Documents: 11, 36, 37,  
41

**Screen 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**

[San Francisco Property Information Map 758 Pacific.pdf](#)  
[772 Pacific 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. Source Documents: 9, 51, 52, 53

##### **Supporting documentation**

[SD Values.pdf](#)

[EDR.pdf](#)

[AST Discussion.docx](#)

**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.)	<a href="#">7 CFR Part 658</a>

**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:

The project site consists of urban land; therefore, the project would not affect farmlands. There are no protected farmlands in the City and County of San Francisco. The City and County of San Francisco was classified as a urbanized area by the 2020 Census. Source Documents: 1. United States Department of Agriculture. 7 CFR Part 658.2(a) Farmland Protection Policy Act 2. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Services. Web Soil Survey. Internet Web Site: <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed on 3. United States Census 2020 [https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/reference/ua/Defining\\_Rural.pdf](https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/reference/ua/Defining_Rural.pdf) 4. DLRP Important Farmland Finder (ca.gov) California Department of Conservation

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. Source Documents: 48

758-Pacific-Avenue-  
Acquisition-and-  
Development

San Francisco, CA

900000010360715

**Supporting documentation**

[Defining Rural.pdf](#)

[Web Soil Survey.pdf](#)

[DLRP Important Farmland Finder.pdf](#)

**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 772 Pacific Ave SF.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. Source Document: 13

**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" <a href="https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf">https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf</a>

### **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) Response Period Elapsed

- ✓ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Response Period Elapsed

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

- ✓ Amah Mutsun Tribal Band Response Period Elapsed

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| ✓ Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe                     | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Indian Canyon Mutsen Band of<br>Costanoan         | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the<br>SF Bay Area | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ The Ohlone Indian Tribe                           | Completed               |
| ✓ Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley<br>Band        | Response Period Elapsed |

Other Consulting Parties

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

ETFenvironmental contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission on January 15, 2023 requesting a Sacred lands File Search and a list of contacts for Native American Tribes in the project area. Representatives of the tribes listed above were contacted by ETFenvironmental on January 15, 2023. The SHPO was contacted on January 24, 2024 by email requesting concurrence regarding eligibility and the Agency Official's finding that No Historic Properties were affected by the Undertaking. As of March 14, 2024 there has been no response. The ACHP was contacted on February 5, 2024 by the City to determine if the ACHP wished to participate in the Consultation process. The initial e-mail was encrypted and ACHP was unable to access it. On February 6, 2024, the same consultation request was sent again, this time without any additional encryption. There was no response to this request for consultation. On February 26, 2024, MOHCD again reached out, following up on the February 6 thread requesting consultation, to provide the ACHP with our SSPA. We did not receive a response to that email, either. On March 18, 2024 a representative from the ACHP contacted MOHCD about our consultation request. All of the materials were resent. We again did not receive a response to our request for consultation. After consultation with SHPO, it was agreed upon that the properties which were initially labeled as potentially historic within the APEA?were not, in fact, eligible for listing on the National Registry. Ultimately, after consulting with a representative from the SHPO, it was decided upon that we would utilize the option, which is embodied in our 2006 Programmatic Agreement, to create a Standard Mitigation Measures Agreement to address our handling of any potential subsurface resources. This would be lieu of the Site-Specific Programmatic Agreement. On May 5th, the Director of MOHCD and the SHPO signed an SMMA which addresses NWIC's determination that there is a moderate chance for subsurface/archeological resources. The SMMA is attached below and will be attached along with the other mitigation measures.

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:**

The Direct APE (Project Area; EDS-01a and EDS-01) consists of a 0.21-acre property at 772 Pacific Avenue (EDS-01a) within Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 016-101-5 containing a 1919 building, and adjacent 0.04-acre APN 016-101-4 at 756 - 758 Pacific Avenue (EDS-01b) that contains a 1926 building. The Indirect APE includes 11 adjacent properties (EDS-02 - EDS-12) containing 11 buildings and one parking lot, at least 50 years of age, documented and evaluated as part of the HRE. Please see attached maps.

**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
1208 - 1214 Stockton Street	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
1216 - 1218 Stockton Street	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
1220 - 1222 Stockton Street	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
1224 - 1226 Stockton Street	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
1230 Stockton Street	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
711 -799 Pacific Avenue	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
750 - 754 Pacific Avenue	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
759 Pacific Avenue	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
772 Pacific Avenue	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
774 Pacific Avenue	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive

**Additional Notes:**

APE Also includes 1238 Stockton (eligible) , 1 Stark Street and 661 Broadway (Eligible)

**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:

Yes, please see uploaded HRE and Archeological Study.

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

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload concurrence(s) or objection(s) below.

**Document reason for finding:**

✓ No historic properties present.

Historic properties present, but project will have no effect upon them.

No Adverse Effect

Adverse Effect

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. Upon reviewing the attached Historic and Cultural Resources Evaluation completed by Evans & DeShazo (June 2019), MOHCD, as the Responsible Entity, maintained concurrence with the description of the undertaking and the identified Areas of Potential Effects (APE). However, MOHCD ultimately did not agree with the determination of eligibility for the four properties identified as eligible for listing in the evaluation. Accordingly, MOHCD withdrew its request for concurrence in these determinations. As such, the Undertaking results in a Finding of No Historic Properties affected for Historic Architectural resources, and a finding of No Historic Properties adversely affected for archeological resources. Thus, this project is in compliance with Section 106.

**Supporting documentation**

[Withdrawal of Determination of Eligibility - Signed.pdf](#)  
[ACHP Correspondances.pdf](#)  
[File Closing Memo SHPO.docx](#)  
[Attachment D.pdf](#)  
[Attachment C.pdf](#)  
[Attachment B.pdf](#)  
[Attachment A.pdf](#)  
[Eligibility Letter to SHPO New Asia.pdf](#)  
[TDAT\(1\).pdf](#)  
[Native American Contact List\(1\).pdf](#)  
[Letter Re NWIC Record Search\\_New Asia \(1\).pdf](#)  
[Mail - Eugene Flannery - Outlook 2.pdf](#)  
[Mail - Eugene Flannery - Outlook 4.pdf](#)  
[Mail - Eugene Flannery - Outlook 6.pdf](#)  
[Galvan 1.pdf](#)  
[Galvan 3.pdf](#)  
[NWIC File 23 1002 New Asia Project Results.pdf](#)  
[Sacred Lands Filre Response LF No New Asia Affordable Housing Development Project 1312024.pdf](#)  
[HRE Pacific Ave San Francisco and DPRs.pdf](#)  
[Archaeological Study New Asia.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

758-Pacific-Avenue-  
Acquisition-and-  
Development

San Francisco, CA

900000010360715

## 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: 62

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: 62

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: 62.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. A Noise

Assessment was conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 62.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. Construction Noise Reduction. Construction activity shall be limited to the period between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and to the period 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends. Construction outside of these hours would require a permit from the City. Furthermore, construction contractors for development on the project site shall implement appropriate noise reduction measures as determined by the City during the construction permit approval process. Required noise reduction measures shall be subject to San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) and may include: \* Maintaining proper mufflers on equipment; \* Relocating equipment away from noise-sensitive receptors where possible; and \* Shutting off idling equipment. Source Documents:1, 8, 37, 59, 63,

**Supporting documentation**

[sfmta\\_corridor\\_counts\\_2014-2018\(1\).csv](#)  
[SFMTA Traffic Count Data 1993-2015 with cover sheet.pdf](#)  
[Housing Element App H Noise.pdf](#)  
[DNL Calculator Pacific Avenue.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Sole Source Aquifers

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
<b>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.</b>	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. Source Document: 11

758-Pacific-Avenue-  
Acquisition-and-  
Development

San Francisco, CA

900000010360715

**Supporting documentation**

[Sole Source Aquifers.pdf](#)

[Distance to SSA 54 miles.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. Source Document: 36

**Supporting documentation**

[Nepassist Waterbodies.pdf](#)

[772 Pacific Avenue Wetlands Mapper.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. Source Document: 56

#### **Supporting documentation**

[California.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

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

### **Screen Summary**

#### **Compliance Determination**

No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[San Francisco Climate Action Plan.pdf](#)

[Environmental Justice Discussion.docx](#)

[EJ Map Final.pdf](#)

[EJ Discussion Housing Element Update.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

758-Pacific-Avenue-  
Acquisition-and-  
Development

San Francisco, CA

900000010360715