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

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

Project Information

Project Name: United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23

HEROS Number: 900000010340515

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

RE Preparer: Lorena Guadiana

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Eric D. Shaw

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): United Playaz

Point of Contact: Carolyn Caldwell

Consultant (if applicable): Environmental Science Associates

Point of Contact: Susan Yogi

Project Location: 1044 Howard St, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:
The approximately 3,240-square-foot project site (approximately 0.07 acres) is located at 1044 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA, 94103, at the northeast corner of Howard and Russ Streets (Assessor's Block 3726/Lot 019). The site is on the north side

of Howard Street between Sixth and Seventh Streets, in the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood. (In the SoMa area, streets that run in the northwest/southeast direction, such as Sixth and Seventh Streets, are generally considered north/south streets, whereas streets that run in the southwest/northeast direction, such as Howard Street, are generally considered east/west streets.)

Direct Comments to: 1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
Lorena.Guadiana@sfgov.org

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
United Playaz, a violence prevention and youth development organization based in San Francisco's South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood, proposes to renovate, seismically rehabilitate, and expand an existing building to develop a two-story community hall. The project would include three meeting rooms, staff offices, a kitchen, rest rooms, and utility and circulation space. Most of the second level would be devoted to an outdoor terrace that would include seating areas, landscaping, and a single-hoop basketball court. A new elevator would connect the building's two levels. The project would provide a total of about 4,400 square feet of interior space, while the second-story outdoor terrace would be nearly 2,050 square feet in size. The project would be a substantial rehabilitation of the existing building, demolishing the west, north, and east walls while retaining most of the existing Howard Street concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall. New, reinforced CMU west, north, and east walls would be constructed around a new steel structural frame. The existing floors and roof would be replaced with a concrete-over-metal deck system. The project would upgrade the existing concrete perimeter foundations, which would be tied to the new steel structural system. Mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems would also be replaced. The primary exterior finish would be a direct-applied exterior finish system (comparable to stucco) over the CMU walls on the south (Howard Street) and west (Russ Street) facades. On the second story, the outdoor terrace walls would include large expanses of decorative fencing consisting of a metal frame infilled with perforated aluminum panels of varying porosity. Portions of the fencing would be infilled with high-performance glass for greater light penetration and visibility. The project would have a height of approximately 30.5 feet to the roof, and a maximum height of about 35 feet to the top of the elevator penthouse, near the building's northeast corner. The overall massing would be comparable to that of the existing building, although the new walls around the second-floor terrace would give the appearance of two stories across the entire site, whereas the existing building is a single story except at the rear. The project's main entrance would be on Howard Street, as is the case with the existing building.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:
From its headquarters at 1038 Howard Street (two doors east of the project site), United Playaz provides a range of services to prepare vulnerable youth for higher education, employment, and healthy living within a safe, nurturing, and collaborative

environment. The organization works to prevent at-risk youth from entering or re-entering the justice system. After 27 years, United Playaz has outgrown its current youth center, the UP Clubhouse, at 1038 Howard Street, and has identified a need for additional program space. United Playaz intends that the new community hall at 1044 Howard Street to expand its family literacy and adult re-entry programs. As such, the new building will house Real Playaz Read--the literacy program that promotes increased individual reading levels through regular access to literacy learning curriculum and tools--and the adult re-entry program that serves individual who were formerly incarcerated or have been involved in the juvenile or adult justice systems, using both one-on-one and group support services and also provides referrals related to housing, training, workforce development, and socialization. In addition to the federal financial assistance of HUD Community Project Funding (CPF), the project has received funding from the City and County of San Francisco's Nonprofit Sustainability Initiative and from the State of California.

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

The proposed project involves an existing vacant building. It occupies the entirety of the 3,240-square-foot site. The existing building contains a full ground floor and a partial second story, with the upper level located at the rear (north) of the site. Adjacent to the project site on the east is a three-story multi-unit residential building (1040-1042 Howard Street) with ground-floor retail space (also vacant). The existing United Playaz building (1038 Howard Street) is one parcel further east. North of the project site is a three-story multi-family residential building (543-545 Natoma Street). The surrounding area contains a mix of older, smaller-scale multi-family residential buildings and newer larger residential structures, often with ground-floor retail space in both cases, along with older industrial buildings, many of which have been converted to other non-residential uses. There are also stand-alone single-story commercial buildings. Notably, most of the mid-block alleys in SoMa, such as Russ and Natoma Streets, are lined with primarily residential buildings. The project site is zoned MUG (Mixed Use-General) and has a height and bulk designation of 85-X (85-foot height limit; no bulk limit). The MUG zoning district is primarily occupied by low-scale, production, distribution, and repair (PDR) uses mixed with housing and small-scale retail (Planning Code Section 831). The district is intended to maintain and facilitate the growth and expansion of small-scale light manufacturing, wholesale distribution, arts production and performance/exhibition activities, general commercial and neighborhood-serving retail and personal service activities while protecting existing housing and encouraging the development of housing at a scale and density compatible with the existing neighborhood. Notably, Institutional Uses such as social service facilities are principally permitted use.

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:
Project_Location_Plans.pdf
1044 Howard St - Project Location.pdf
1044 Howard St - Google Maps.pdf
1044 Howard St - Google Maps.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:
United Playaz -1044 Howard St-EA-CPF Grant-sig page-complete.pdf
United Playaz_1044 Howard St_Publication Invoice.pdf
RE_ San Francisco CPF ER Question .msg
San Francsico United Playaz CPF Funds_RROF FONSI Checklist.docx
7015 16 AUGF San Francisco United Playaz.pdf

7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer on: 1/5/2024

7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer on: 1/23/2024

Funding Information

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
B-23-CP-CA-0190	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Project Funding (CPF) Grants	$4,000,000.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount: $4,000,000.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a)(5)]: $25,000,000.00

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	☐ Yes ☑ No	San Francisco International Airport is more than 11 miles south of the project site. The project site is well outside the boundaries of the San Francisco International Airport runway protection zones as depicted in Exhibit II-4, Airport Influence Area B (see attached CCAG 2012 p 51). The project site is outside all other defined safety zones, airspace protection zones, and Airport Influence Areas of the airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan. There are no military airfields in the City and County of San Francisco or the nearby vicinity; therefore, no military airfield Airport Protection Zone or Clear Zone would be implicated. 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.
Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	☐ Yes ☑ No	There are no Coastal Barrier Resource System (CBRS) Units, or CBRS buffer zones, as defined under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982 (PL 97-348), as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (PL 101-591) on the west coast of the United States. The project site is therefore not located within a CBRS Unit, or a CBRS buffer zone. 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.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of	☐ Yes ☑ No	The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is responsible for

1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]		delineating areas that are expected to be subject to flooding during a 100-year flood event. A 100-year flood event is defined as the area that is expected to be inundated by flood flows during a rainfall event that would have an annual probability of occurrence of one percent. FEMA refers to the portion of the floodplain or coastal area that is at risk from floods of this magnitude as Special Flood Hazard Areas. FEMA creates and maintains Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) which identify areas located within a 100-year floodplain boundary area. Based on FEMA flood hazard mapping and as shown on FEMA map number 0602980118A (effective 3/23/2021, not printed), the project site is within Zone X -- Area of Minimal Flood Hazard. Based on this designation, the project site is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. 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.
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5		
Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	☐ Yes ☑ No	Criteria Pollutants: Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2022.1.1.19. Comparison to Federal General Conformity De Minimis Levels: Results of the CalEEMod run indicate that maximum annual

		emissions of reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less, and carbon monoxide from both construction and operation would be below the federal General Conformity de minimis level of 100 tons per year pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act. Therefore, the proposed action is exempt from General Conformity regulations. Comparison to Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Thresholds: The modeling results indicate that the average daily emissions from construction, excluding fugitive dust, would be below the BAAQMD's average daily construction emission thresholds. Maximum annual and average daily emissions from the operation of the project would be below the BAAQMD's maximum annual and average daily operational emission thresholds. Consequently, criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation of the project would not exceed BAAQMD's thresholds of significance. Fugitive Dust: The City of San Francisco's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176?08) requires measures to control fugitive dust. The project would implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) in compliance with this ordinance and BAAQMD-recommended control measures for controlling fugitive dust and these measures would ensure that there would be no significant project related impacts. Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) from Construction: Construction-related activities could result in the generation of TACs, specifically diesel particulate matter (DPM), from diesel-fueled construction equipment and vehicles. Off-road equipment (including construction-

		related equipment) is a large contributor to DPM emissions in California. Newer and more refined emission inventories have substantially lowered the estimates of DPM emissions from off-road equipment. Additionally, federal and state regulations are requiring cleaner off-road equipment. Specifically, both the USEPA and California have set emissions standards for new off-road equipment engines, ranging from Tier 1 to Tier 4. The USEPA estimated that by implementing the federal Tier 4 standards, NOx and PM emissions will be reduced by more than 90 percent. The City's Clean Construction Ordinance applies to all publicly funded contracts advertised or initiated on or after September 7, 2015. The project site is not located within a designated Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Therefore, the project contractor would be required to use equipment with Tier 2 or higher engines or equipment. Tier 4 engines automatically meet this requirement. As of 2020, 47 percent of all construction equipment registered within the air basin have Tier 4 engines. Given (1) the project's construction-related exhaust emissions of PM10 would be substantially below the BAAQMD thresholds, (2) the existing proportion of the construction equipment fleet within the Bay Area with Tier 4 engines, and (3) the requirements of the Clean Construction Ordinance, the project would not result in significant adverse risks to community health from construction activities. Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under the Clean Air Act. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	☐ Yes ☑ No	The project site is not located within a Coastal Zone Management Area or a county or local area of jurisdiction, which includes the first 100 feet shoreward as defined by the Coastal Zone Management Act. 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.
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	☑ Yes ☐ No	Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA, Remediation or clean-up plan. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances were found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property. The adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated. Mitigation Measures: A Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) shall be submitted to San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) prior to the issuance of any permits in the event review of the work plan for analysis of sampled soils and subsurface analyses report indicates the presence of hazardous substances. The SMP shall contain contingency plans to be implemented during soil excavation activities and a dust management protocol. The SMP shall also contain details of the passive vapor mitigation system required (e.g., concrete cap across the footprint of the site) to alleviate soil vapor risk. In addition, the SMP shall include a site-specific HASP which will address hazards that may be encountered by on-site workers during remediation activities and will describe the steps necessary to minimize exposure of the public to potentially impacted soil and to physical hazards

		originating from soil excavation and disposal activities. The HASP shall outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction. Compliance with the regulations described for the removal of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint would ensure that portions of the existing building proposed for demolition would not expose persons to hazardous materials. The proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Asbestos ACTM, which includes measures to control fugitive dust from construction activities. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.
Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	☐ Yes ☑ No	The project site is in a densely populated and urbanized area in central San Francisco. The project site is currently occupied by an existing, vacant building and is surrounded by an urban environment that contains ornamental landscaped vegetation which does not support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife. Implementation of the project would involve construction on an already developed site. No federally listed species or species proposed for listing or federally designated critical habitats are documented within the project area. No impacts on federally listed species or critical habitat would occur, as the project site is disturbed and planted with ornamental vegetation; it does not contain critical habitat or other suitable habitat for any federally listed species. This project will have No Effect on listed

		species due to the nature of the activities involved in the project. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	☐ Yes ☑ No	The project does not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations. During the Phase I ESA, there was no visual evidence or indication of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at or immediately adjacent to the project site. The nearest above-ground storage tanks (ASTs) are at: 300 7th St. (950 feet from the project site), 90 7th St. (1000 feet from the project site), and 415 Natoma St (1000 feet from the project site) The AST at 300 7th St. has a volume of 7,250 gallons, and based on the tank's contents and size, this AST has an Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) for thermal radiation of 631.27 feet if unobstructed. The AST at 90 7th St. has a volume of 8,060 feet, and an ASD for thermal radiation of 659.75 feet. The AST at 415 Natoma St. has an ASD of 276.57 feet. Because the project site is approximately 1,000 feet away from the nearest AST, and is separated by numerous buildings, it is located at an acceptable distance, and no explosive hazard to the project site would occur. Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	☐ Yes ☑ 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.

Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	☐ Yes ☑ No	As discussed under the Flood Insurance compliance factor, based on FEMA flood hazard mapping and as shown on FEMA map number 0602980118A (effective 3/23/2021, not printed), the project site is within Zone X -- Area of Minimal Flood Hazard. Based on this designation, the project site is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in impacts to floodplains and would not result in direct or indirect support of floodplain development. This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	☐ Yes ☑ No	Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. The project is in compliance with Section 106.
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	☐ Yes ☑ No	HUD Noise Standards: Noise exposure standards promulgated by HUD apply only to sensitive land uses. Recreation centers are not considered a sensitive use unless the use is combined with services such as childcare and/or senior services. Because these uses are not proposed, HUD standards do not apply to the proposed project and this analysis relies on the standards in the San Francisco General Plan. SF General Plan Noise Standards: The SF General Plan establishes land use compatibility categories for specific land uses proposed within the City. For playgrounds and parks, a noise level of 70 day-night average sound level (DNL) or less is considered satisfactory. ESA modeled noise levels at the project site using the HUD DNL Calculator, which requires assessing noise impacts from roadways up to 1,000 feet away and railways up to 3,000 feet away that

		could potentially affect noise at the project site. Roadways within 1,000 feet of the project site included in the analysis are 6th Street and 7th Street. Existing traffic volumes for these roadways were obtained from SF Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) traffic count data. Two airports are located within the preliminary 15-mile screening distance from the project site, SF International Airport and Oakland International Airport. The project site is several miles outside of the 60 dBA and 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level airport noise contours based on each airport's respective noise contour map. Consequently, airport noise would not contribute to the noise environment and was not included in the HUD DNL Calculator assessment. The DNL exterior noise from these sources was calculated to be 70 dBA DNL at the project site. This would fall within the City's ''satisfactory'' range for playgrounds and parks, which is 70 dBA DNL or less. Since the project site would not be exposed to noise levels exceeding 70 dBA DNL, attenuation measures would not be required to ensure interior noise standards are met. Construction Noise: Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code). Construction at the project site generally would be limited to daytime hours. No pile driving is proposed. Operational Noise: Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' trip generation rates (a conservative metric that does not account for nearby transit), a stand-alone recreation center of the size proposed would generate about 127 daily vehicle trips, of which about 8 would occur during the morning

		peak hour and about 10 during the afternoon peak hour. Based on existing traffic data for Howard Street compiled by SFMTA, the afternoon peak hour volume is approximately 1,030 vehicles. Therefore, the addition of project traffic during peak hours would lead to a less than one percent increase in traffic, assuming that all trips were to use the same roadways to reach the project site. In addition, the project's fixed noise sources, such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, would be subject to noise limits in Article 29 of the Police Code (section 2909, Noise Limits). The proposed project would not generate significant noise impacts. This project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project complies with HUD's Noise regulation.
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	☐ Yes ☑ No	The project site is not served by a U.S. EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer. The project site would be entirely served by the existing municipal water supply. Based on the project description, the project consists of activities that are unlikely to have an adverse impact on groundwater resources. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	☐ Yes ☑ No	The project site is not located within or adjacent to a wetland area, as shown in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory Mapper. The nearest wetland to the project site is the China Basin Water Channel, located approximately 0.81 mile southeast of the project site. The China Basin Water Channel is part of the estuarine and marine deep-water wetland connected to the adjacent San

		Francisco Bay. The proposed action would have no impact on wetlands or other water of the state. The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	☐ Yes ☑ No	The nearest classified Wild and Scenic River is a 23-mile segment of the American River, which is located over 80 miles northeast of the project site. The project would therefore not affect a wild and scenic river. Implementation of the project would not conflict with the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	☐ Yes ☑ No	Adverse environmental impacts are not disproportionately high for low-income and/or minority communities. 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
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning		The project is located within the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood in San Francisco, California. The project site is	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
/ Scale and Urban Design		zoned MUG (Mixed Use-General) and has a height and bulk designation of 85-X (85-foot height limit; no bulk limit). According to the San Francisco Planning Code, the MUG (Mixed-Use General) is largely comprised of low-scale, production, and repair (PDR) uses mixed with housing and small-scale retail. The district is intended to maintain and facilitate the growth and expansion of small-scale light manufacturing, wholesale distribution, arts production and performance/exhibition activities, general commercial and neighborhood-serving retail and personal service activities while protecting existing housing and encouraging the development of housing at a scale and density compatible with the existing neighborhood. Conformance with Plans The project site lies in the Western SoMa Area Plan which contains objectives and policies relevant to the proposed project, including the following: * Objective 9.1: Provide essential community services and facilities * Policy 9.1.1: Support the siting of new facilities to meet the needs of a growing community and to provide opportunities for residents of all age levels. * Policy 9.1.4: Support existing and encourage new community serving social and cultural facilities in Western SoMa that support low-income and immigrant communities by creating new spaces that house services such as English as a Second Language, employment, art, education and youth programming. The General Plan Community Facilities Element contains objectives and policies relevant to neighborhood facilities, including the following: * Objective 3: Assure that neighborhood residents have access to needed services and a focus for neighborhood activities. * Policy 3.1: Provide neighborhood centers in areas	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		lacking adequate community facilities. * Policy 3.2: Assure that neighborhood centers complement and do not duplicate existing public and private facilities. * Policy 3.3: Develop centers to serve an identifiable neighborhood. * Policy 3.4: Locate neighborhood centers so they are easily accessible and near the natural center of activity. * Policy 3.5: Develop neighborhood centers that are multipurpose in character, attractive in design, secure and comfortable, and inherently flexible in meeting the current and changing needs of the neighborhood served. * Policy 3.6: Base priority for the development of neighborhood centers on relative need. * Policy 3.7: Program the centers to fill gaps in needed services and provide adequate facilities for ill-housed existing services. In general, the proposed project would respond to and be consistent with the above policies. Conclusion: The proposed project would develop a two-story community hall. The project does not propose to change the zone designation on the site. The new 35-foot-tall community hall would be located at the northern corner of Howard Street and Russ Street. The project is compatible within the setting, organization, and pattern of development of its vicinity but would be built with a modern, new design. The proposed building's two -story height would be similar to those in the immediately surrounding development, which ranges from one to five stories in height. Therefore, the building's scale would be compatible with other buildings in the SoMa area, which includes a variety of styles of architecture. The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations. Therefore, the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans, land use designations, zoning, scale, and urban design.	
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design		The project is located within the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood in San Francisco, California. The project site is zoned MUG (Mixed Use-General) and has a height and bulk designation of 85-X (85-foot height limit; no bulk limit). According to the San Francisco Planning Code, the MUG (Mixed-Use General) is largely comprised of low-scale, production, and repair (PDR) uses mixed with housing and small-scale retail. The district is intended to maintain and facilitate the growth and expansion of small-scale light manufacturing, wholesale distribution, arts production and performance/exhibition activities, general commercial and neighborhood-serving retail and personal service activities while protecting existing housing and encouraging the development of housing at a scale and density compatible with the existing neighborhood. Conformance with Plans The project site lies in the Western SoMa Area Plan which contains objectives and policies relevant to the proposed project, including the following: * Objective 9.1: Provide essential community services and facilities * Policy 9.1.1: Support the siting of new facilities to meet the needs of a growing community and to provide opportunities for residents of all age levels. * Policy 9.1.4: Support existing and encourage new community serving social and cultural facilities in Western SoMa that support low-income and immigrant communities by creating new spaces that house services such as English as a Second Language, employment, art, education and youth programming. The General Plan Community Facilities Element contains objectives and	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		policies relevant to neighborhood facilities, including the following: * Objective 3: Assure that neighborhood residents have access to needed services and a focus for neighborhood activities. * Policy 3.1: Provide neighborhood centers in areas lacking adequate community facilities. * Policy 3.2: Assure that neighborhood centers complement and do not duplicate existing public and private facilities. * Policy 3.3: Develop centers to serve an identifiable neighborhood. * Policy 3.4: Locate neighborhood centers so they are easily accessible and near the natural center of activity. * Policy 3.5: Develop neighborhood centers that are multipurpose in character, attractive in design, secure and comfortable, and inherently flexible in meeting the current and changing needs of the neighborhood served. * Policy 3.6: Base priority for the development of neighborhood centers on relative need. * Policy 3.7: Program the centers to fill gaps in needed services and provide adequate facilities for ill-housed existing services. In general, the proposed project would respond to and be consistent with the above policies. Conclusion: The proposed project would develop a two-story community hall. The project does not propose to change the zone designation on the site. The new 35-foot-tall community hall would be located at the northern corner of Howard Street and Russ Street. The project is compatible within the setting, organization, and pattern of development of its vicinity but would be built with a modern, new design. The proposed building's two -story height would be similar to those in the immediately surrounding development, which ranges from one to five stories in height. Therefore, the building's scale would be compatible with other	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		buildings in the SoMa area, which includes a variety of styles of architecture. The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans, land use designations, zoning, scale, and urban design.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff		Geologic Hazards 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, there is no risk of fault offset at the site from a known active fault. 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 from previously unknown faults is also very low. The site is located within a zone of liquefaction potential. The project geotechnical report identified the potential for liquefaction-induced ground settlement of 4 to 5 inches and differential settlement of up to 2 to 2-1/2 inches across a horizontal distance of 30 feet. There is also a risk of lateral spreading of about 6 feet. The project geotechnical report recommends strengthening, if necessary, based on structural engineering analysis, the existing mat foundation. The report also sets forth other measures, including soil compaction during ground-disturbing work and use of properly select fill, where used. The project would comply with the recommendations of the geotechnical report. The San Francisco Building Code (SFBC) derives from the adopted current version of the California Building Code. Throughout the permitting, design, and construction phases of a building	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		project, Planning Department staff, and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) engineers and building inspectors would confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations. Stormwater The project site is currently an impervious area that includes structures that will be upgraded for the project. Stormwater is expected to travel through rain gutters and to the street where stormwater basins are located. Pursuant to the San Francisco Public Works Code, the Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance, and the San Francisco Green Building Code, the project sponsor would be required to implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth BMP measures to reduce potential runoff and erosion impacts during construction. The proposed project would construct all improvements according to the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance, which requires, for areas of less than 50 percent pervious surfaces (such as the project site), that the stormwater runoff rate and volume not exceed pre-development conditions for the 1-and 2 year, 24-hour design storm. The project would provide pre-treatment of a share of the stormwater runoff prior to leaving the site, while stormwater running off the roof of the new recreation center would be piped directly to the combined sewer system. The proposed stormwater management system for the project would collect, detain and potentially retain some stormwater within the project site such that the rate and amount of stormwater runoff from the site does not negatively impact the City's treatment facilities, and in a manner that is consistent with the San Francisco Public	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Utilities Commission's Stormwater Design Guidelines. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality during either construction or operation.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff		Geologic Hazards 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, there is no risk of fault offset at the site from a known active fault. 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 from previously unknown faults is also very low. The site is located within a zone of liquefaction potential. The project geotechnical report identified the potential for liquefaction-induced ground settlement of 4 to 5 inches and differential settlement of up to 2 to 2-1/2 inches across a horizontal distance of 30 feet. There is also a risk of lateral spreading of about 6 feet. The project geotechnical report recommends strengthening, if necessary, based on structural engineering analysis, the existing mat foundation. The report also sets forth other measures, including soil compaction during ground-disturbing work and use of properly select fill, where used. The project would comply with the recommendations of the geotechnical report. The San Francisco Building Code (SFBC) derives from the adopted current version of the California Building Code. Throughout the permitting, design, and construction phases of a building project, Planning Department staff, and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) engineers and building inspectors would	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations. Stormwater The project site is currently an impervious area that includes structures that will be upgraded for the project. Stormwater is expected to travel through rain gutters and to the street where stormwater basins are located. Pursuant to the San Francisco Public Works Code, the Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance, and the San Francisco Green Building Code, the project sponsor would be required to implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth BMP measures to reduce potential runoff and erosion impacts during construction. The proposed project would construct all improvements according to the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance, which requires, for areas of less than 50 percent pervious surfaces (such as the project site), that the stormwater runoff rate and volume not exceed pre-development conditions for the 1-and 2 year, 24-hour design storm. The project would provide pre-treatment of a share of the stormwater runoff prior to leaving the site, while stormwater running off the roof of the new recreation center would be piped directly to the combined sewer system. The proposed stormwater management system for the project would collect, detain and potentially retain some stormwater within the project site such that the rate and amount of stormwater runoff from the site does not negatively impact the City's treatment facilities, and in a manner that is consistent with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's Stormwater Design Guidelines. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality during either construction or operation.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise		Site Safety Development of the project site with the community hall would not create a risk of natural hazards, explosion, release of hazardous substances, or other dangers to public health. The project site is located in an urban setting and development on the site would be compatible with surrounding uses. While soil contamination may exist on-site, the implementation of a mitigation measure is required, detailing site-specific procedures to be followed which would prevent safety hazards for construction workers on-site (refer to the ''Contamination and Toxic Substances'' factor). On-site construction would be required to comply with the requirements of the latest California Building Code, which includes compliance with earthquake standards and fire codes and regulations. However, as discussed in Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/Storm Water Runoff above, the implementation of a mitigation measure is required, detailing site-specific geotechnical recommendations. Therefore, the proposed action would not have a substantive adverse effect on site safety. Construction Noise Construction noise as discussed above ''Noise Abatement and Control'' would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. Community Noise As discussed above under ''Noise Abatement and Control,'' the proposed project would place a new recreation center in the park. DNL exterior noise from was calculated to be 70 dBA DNL at the project site, which would fall within the City and County of San Francisco's ''satisfactory'' range for playgrounds and parks of less than 70 dBA DNL. Air Quality As discussed under	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		''Clean Air'' above, the operational emission from the project would be well below the federal de minimis levels for ROG, NOx, PM2.5, and CO. Uses surrounding the project site are residential and mixed-use in nature; as such, these uses would not generate air pollution impacts that could affect the community hall users.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise		Site Safety Development of the project site with the community hall would not create a risk of natural hazards, explosion, release of hazardous substances, or other dangers to public health. The project site is located in an urban setting and development on the site would be compatible with surrounding uses. While soil contamination may exist on-site, the implementation of a mitigation measure is required, detailing site-specific procedures to be followed which would prevent safety hazards for construction workers on-site (refer to the ''Contamination and Toxic Substances'' factor). On-site construction would be required to comply with the requirements of the latest California Building Code, which includes compliance with earthquake standards and fire codes and regulations. However, as discussed in Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/Storm Water Runoff above, the implementation of a mitigation measure is required, detailing site-specific geotechnical recommendations. Therefore, the proposed action would not have a substantive adverse effect on site safety. Construction Noise Construction noise as discussed above ''Noise Abatement and Control'' would be temporary and mitigated by compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. Community Noise As discussed above under ''Noise Abatement and Control,'' the proposed project would place a new recreation center in the park. DNL exterior noise from was calculated to be	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		70 dBA DNL at the project site, which would fall within the City and County of San Francisco's ''satisfactory'' range for playgrounds and parks of less than 70 dBA DNL. Air Quality As discussed under ''Clean Air'' above, the operational emission from the project would be well below the federal de minimis levels for ROG, NOx, PM2.5, and CO. Uses surrounding the project site are residential and mixed-use in nature; as such, these uses would not generate air pollution impacts that could affect the community hall users.	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns		Construction of the project site would not displace existing developments as the project site is currently vacant. Construction on the project site would provide temporary full-time construction jobs and eight full-time employees but is not expected to affect employment in the long-term. Therefore, the proposed action would have a net beneficial effect on employment and income patterns.	
Employment and Income Patterns		Construction of the project site would not displace existing developments as the project site is currently vacant. Construction on the project site would provide temporary full-time construction jobs and eight full-time employees but is not expected to affect employment in the long-term. Therefore, the proposed action would have a net beneficial effect on employment and income patterns.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement		Demographics The proposed project would not result in physical barriers or reduced access that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group. Construction would result in temporary, construction job growth at the project site as a result of the project, and operation would result in a few permanent jobs. This increase in employment is anticipated to be accommodated by the existing employment	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		pool. As the proposed project is consistent with the planned use of the site, no adverse demographic changes are anticipated. Displacement Construction of the proposed community hall would not displace existing residents as the project site is currently an existing building that has been vacant since May 2021. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse impacts from displacement of people or businesses.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement		Demographics The proposed project would not result in physical barriers or reduced access that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group. Construction would result in temporary, construction job growth at the project site as a result of the project, and operation would result in a few permanent jobs. This increase in employment is anticipated to be accommodated by the existing employment pool. As the proposed project is consistent with the planned use of the site, no adverse demographic changes are anticipated. Displacement Construction of the proposed community hall would not displace existing residents as the project site is currently an existing building that has been vacant since May 2021. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse impacts from displacement of people or businesses.	
Environmental Justice EA Factor		The project would provide a new community hall for use by the community, thus providing benefits to an environmental justice population. As analyzed in this EA, the project does not anticipate resulting in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area. This Environmental Justice analysis further considers project impacts and their potential to disproportionately affect the project's introduced environmental justice population. Several environmental topics	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		were identified to generate potential effects requiring mitigation. However, impacts would be shared by neighboring non-environmental justice populations, thus the do not represent impacts with the potential to disproportionately affect an environmental justice population. Overall, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area to an environmental justice population. Construction of a community hall would result in a beneficial impact for a predominantly minority and low-income population.	
Environmental Justice EA Factor		The project would provide a new community hall for use by the community, thus providing benefits to an environmental justice population. As analyzed in this EA, the project does not anticipate resulting in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area. This Environmental Justice analysis further considers project impacts and their potential to disproportionately affect the project's introduced environmental justice population. Several environmental topics were identified to generate potential effects requiring mitigation. However, impacts would be shared by neighboring non-environmental justice populations, thus the do not represent impacts with the potential to disproportionately affect an environmental justice population. Overall, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area to an environmental justice population. Construction of a community hall would result in a beneficial impact for a predominantly minority and low-income population.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)		The proposed project would not include any residential units and, thus, would not directly contribute to school-aged children or the demand for educational facilities. The project site does not contain cultural facilities and the proposed action would not affect existing cultural facilities by its operation. Many cultural facilities are located within walking distance of the project site or accessible from the project site via public transportation and would be available to future project residents. Cultural facilities in the vicinity of the project include the Market Street theatre and Loft Historic District, located approximately 0.25 mile northwest of the site; the Golden gate Theatre, located approximately 0.27 mile northwest of the site; the Asian Art Museum, located approximately 0.42 mile west of the site; the Children's Creativity Museum, located approximately 0.44 mile northeast of the site; the Contemporary Jewish Museum, located approximately 0.53 mile northeast of the site; and the San Fransisco Museum of Modern Art, located approximately 0.60 mile northeast of the site. As no permanent population would be generated by the proposed project, the project would have no impact on educational and cultural facilities.	
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)		The proposed project would not include any residential units and, thus, would not directly contribute to school-aged children or the demand for educational facilities. The project site does not contain cultural facilities and the proposed action would not affect existing cultural facilities by its operation. Many cultural facilities are located within walking distance of the project site or accessible from the project site via public transportation and would be available to future project residents. Cultural	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		facilities in the vicinity of the project include the Market Street theatre and Loft Historic District, located approximately 0.25 mile northwest of the site; the Golden gate Theatre, located approximately 0.27 mile northwest of the site; the Asian Art Museum, located approximately 0.42 mile west of the site; the Children's Creativity Museum, located approximately 0.44 mile northeast of the site; the Contemporary Jewish Museum, located approximately 0.53 mile northeast of the site; and the San Fransisco Museum of Modern Art, located approximately 0.60 mile northeast of the site. As no permanent population would be generated by the proposed project, the project would have no impact on educational and cultural facilities.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)		The project site is within adequate and convenient distance to retail services that provide essential items such as food, medicine, banks and other convenience shopping. The following Muni routes are within 0.25-mile of the project site: 12-Folsom/Pacific, 14-Mission, and 27-Bryant. Additionally, the Civic Center BART station is located approximately 0.28-mile west of the project site. The project site is in a commercially vibrant area of San Francisco and numerous coffee shops, restaurants, clothing stores, and drugstores are located within a few blocks of the project site. Existing nearby retail and commercial services (e.g., on Howard Street, Mission Street, and Market Street) would not be adversely impacted or displaced by the proposed project.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)		The project site is within adequate and convenient distance to retail services that provide essential items such as food, medicine, banks and other convenience shopping. The following Muni routes are within 0.25-mile of the project site: 12-	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Folsom/Pacific, 14-Mission, and 27-Bryant. Additionally, the Civic Center BART station is located approximately 0.28-mile west of the project site. The project site is in a commercially vibrant area of San Francisco and numerous coffee shops, restaurants, clothing stores, and drugstores are located within a few blocks of the project site. Existing nearby retail and commercial services (e.g., on Howard Street, Mission Street, and Market Street) would not be adversely impacted or displaced by the proposed project.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)		The project will not impact any health care or social service facilities. The nearest major hospitals are the St. Francis Memorial Hospital located approximately 1.2-miles northwest of the project site, the CPMC Van Ness Campus located approximately 1.3-miles northwest of the project site, and the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay located approximately 1.7 miles southeast of the project site. Several social services are located within the vicinity of the project site, including the Supportive Housing employment, San Francisco Human Services Network, Family Service Agency of San Francisco, Alexis Social Department, and Lutheran Social Services. Therefore, health care and social services are within a convenient and reasonable distance to the project site and are accessible via public transportation available near the project site. The proposed project would not include any residential units and, thus, would not directly result in undue burdens on existing health care or social service facilities or create substantial demand for new health care or social service facilities.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)		The project will not impact any health care or social service facilities. The nearest major hospitals are the St. Francis Memorial	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Hospital located approximately 1.2-miles northwest of the project site, the CPMC Van Ness Campus located approximately 1.3-miles northwest of the project site, and the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay located approximately 1.7 miles southeast of the project site. Several social services are located within the vicinity of the project site, including the Supportive Housing employment, San Francisco Human Services Network, Family Service Agency of San Francisco, Alexis Social Department, and Lutheran Social Services. Therefore, health care and social services are within a convenient and reasonable distance to the project site and are accessible via public transportation available near the project site. The proposed project would not include any residential units and, thus, would not directly result in undue burdens on existing health care or social service facilities or create substantial demand for new health care or social service facilities.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)		Recology, Inc. provides residential and commercial solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services for the City and County of San Francisco. Recyclable materials are taken to Recology's Pier 96 facility, where they are separated into commodities (e.g., aluminum, glass, and paper) and transported to other users for reprocessing. Compostables (e.g., food waste, plant trimmings, soiled paper) are transferred to a Recology composting facility in Solano County, where they are converted to soil amendment and compost. The remaining material is transported to a landfill. In September 2015, the City entered into a landfill disposal agreement with Recology, Inc. for disposal of all solid waste collected in San Francisco, at the Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. The Recology Hay	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Road Landfill has a permitted remaining capacity of 30,433,000 cubic yards and is expected to continue to receive waste approximately through the year 2077. The City's contract with the Recology Hay Road Landfill will extend until 2031 or when the City has disposed 5 million tons of solid waste, whichever occurs first. At that point, the City would either further extend the landfill contract or find and entitle an alternative landfill site. Construction and demolition (C&D) debris in the City must be transported by a registered transporter to a registered facility that can process mixed C&D debris pursuant to the City and County of San Francisco C&D Ordinance. The Ordinance requires that at least 65 percent of C&D debris from a site go to a registered C&D recycling facility. This requirement has been augmented by the Green Building Ordinance, which requires that at least 75 percent of C&D debris be diverted from landfills. Compliance with this regulation would ensure any impact from construction debris is appropriately minimized. During operation, the project would be subject to the City's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires the separation of refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, thereby minimizing solid waste disposal and maximizing recycling and composting. Although the project could incrementally increase total waste generation from the City by increasing the activity on the currently vacant project site, the increasing rate of diversion through recycling and other methods would result in a decreasing share of total waste that requires deposition into the landfill. Therefore, the Recology Hay Road Landfill is expected to be able to provide services to the City, including the proposed project,	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		without the need for new expansion beyond that already planned, until the year 2077. The proposed project would not be expected to result in significant and adverse effects to solid waste services.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)		Recology, Inc. provides residential and commercial solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services for the City and County of San Francisco. Recyclable materials are taken to Recology's Pier 96 facility, where they are separated into commodities (e.g., aluminum, glass, and paper) and transported to other users for reprocessing. Compostables (e.g., food waste, plant trimmings, soiled paper) are transferred to a Recology composting facility in Solano County, where they are converted to soil amendment and compost. The remaining material is transported to a landfill. In September 2015, the City entered into a landfill disposal agreement with Recology, Inc. for disposal of all solid waste collected in San Francisco, at the Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. The Recology Hay Road Landfill has a permitted remaining capacity of 30,433,000 cubic yards and is expected to continue to receive waste approximately through the year 2077. The City's contract with the Recology Hay Road Landfill will extend until 2031 or when the City has disposed 5 million tons of solid waste, whichever occurs first. At that point, the City would either further extend the landfill contract or find and entitle an alternative landfill site. Construction and demolition (C&D) debris in the City must be transported by a registered transporter to a registered facility that can process mixed C&D debris pursuant to the City and County of San Francisco C&D Ordinance. The Ordinance requires that at least 65 percent of C&D debris from a site go to a registered	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		C&D recycling facility. This requirement has been augmented by the Green Building Ordinance, which requires that at least 75 percent of C&D debris be diverted from landfills. Compliance with this regulation would ensure any impact from construction debris is appropriately minimized. During operation, the project would be subject to the City's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires the separation of refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, thereby minimizing solid waste disposal and maximizing recycling and composting. Although the project could incrementally increase total waste generation from the City by increasing the activity on the currently vacant project site, the increasing rate of diversion through recycling and other methods would result in a decreasing share of total waste that requires deposition into the landfill. Therefore, the Recology Hay Road Landfill is expected to be able to provide services to the City, including the proposed project, without the need for new expansion beyond that already planned, until the year 2077. The proposed project would not be expected to result in significant and adverse effects to solid waste services.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)		The project site is within an urban area that is well served by the combined sewer/stormwater collection, storage and treatment facilities operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Wastewater generated at the project site would be treated by the SFPUC, which provides wastewater collection and transfer service in the City. The SFPUC has a combined sewer and wastewater system, which collects sewage and stormwater in the same pipe network. San Francisco comprises two drainage basins: Bayside and Westside	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		drainage basins, which collect wastewater and stormwater from the east and west sides of the City, respectively, which are further divided into five distinct urban watersheds. The project site is in the Channel Watershed portion of the Bayside Watershed. Combined wastewater and stormwater from the project area are transported for treatment to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. Treated wastewater is discharged to San Francisco Bay through outfalls at Pier 80 (dry and wet weather), and in Islais Creek (wet weather). During dry weather, the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (SEP) has a dry weather capacity of 84.5 million gallons per day (mgd). During wet weather, the plant processes up to 250 mgd. of combined wastewater. The combined sewer and wastewater system currently operates under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits. The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant is currently operating under the 2008 NPDES Permit No. CA0037664 (Order No. R2-2008-0007) issued and enforced by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, which monitors discharge prohibitions, dry-weather effluent limitations, wet-weather effluent performance criteria, receiving water limitations, sludge management practices, and monitoring and reporting requirements. The permits prohibit overflows from the combined sewer and wastewater system structures during dry weather and require wet-weather overflows to comply with the nine minimum controls specified in the federal combined sewer and wastewater system Control Policy. Implementation of the proposed project would incrementally increase wastewater flows from the project site relative to its current vacant status. The proposed building would incorporate water-	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		efficient fixtures, as required by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The proposed project would not contribute to a citywide increase in sanitary flows that could affect wastewater treatment at SEP and the proposed project would comply with existing and future regulations and citywide planning efforts. The proposed project would incrementally increase demand for and use of wastewater and sanitary sewer services, but not in excess of existing capacity.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)		The project site is within an urban area that is well served by the combined sewer/stormwater collection, storage and treatment facilities operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Wastewater generated at the project site would be treated by the SFPUC, which provides wastewater collection and transfer service in the City. The SFPUC has a combined sewer and wastewater system, which collects sewage and stormwater in the same pipe network. San Francisco comprises two drainage basins: Bayside and Westside drainage basins, which collect wastewater and stormwater from the east and west sides of the City, respectively, which are further divided into five distinct urban watersheds. The project site is in the Channel Watershed portion of the Bayside Watershed. Combined wastewater and stormwater from the project area are transported for treatment to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. Treated wastewater is discharged to San Francisco Bay through outfalls at Pier 80 (dry and wet weather), and in Islais Creek (wet weather). During dry weather, the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (SEP) has a dry weather capacity of 84.5 million gallons per day (mgd). During wet weather, the plant processes up to 250 mgd. of combined wastewater. The combined	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		sewer and wastewater system currently operates under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits. The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant is currently operating under the 2008 NPDES Permit No. CA0037664 (Order No. R2-2008-0007) issued and enforced by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, which monitors discharge prohibitions, dry-weather effluent limitations, wet-weather effluent performance criteria, receiving water limitations, sludge management practices, and monitoring and reporting requirements. The permits prohibit overflows from the combined sewer and wastewater system structures during dry weather and require wet-weather overflows to comply with the nine minimum controls specified in the federal combined sewer and wastewater system Control Policy. Implementation of the proposed project would incrementally increase wastewater flows from the project site relative to its current vacant status. The proposed building would incorporate water-efficient fixtures, as required by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The proposed project would not contribute to a citywide increase in sanitary flows that could affect wastewater treatment at SEP and the proposed project would comply with existing and future regulations and citywide planning efforts. The proposed project would incrementally increase demand for and use of wastewater and sanitary sewer services, but not in excess of existing capacity.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)		Development of the project site with a community hall would increase demand for water. Water would be supplied to the project from SFPUC. The SFPUC estimates that a typical development project in San Francisco comprised of either 100 dwelling units, 100,000 square feet of commercial	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		use, 50,000 square feet of office, 100 hotel rooms, or 130,000 square feet of production, distribution, and repair use would generate demand for approximately 10,000 gallons of water per day, which is the equivalent of 0.011 percent of the total water demand of 89.9 million gallons per day anticipated for San Francisco in 2040. The proposed project includes a kitchen and new restrooms. Conservatively assuming the proposed project would generate water demand less than or equal to an equivalent size office facility, the proposed project would generate less than 0.0017 percent of water demand for the city as a whole in 2040, constituting a negligible increase in anticipated water demand (7,526-square-foot community hall/50,000-square-foot office = 0.15 (15 percent of the water demand of a typical size office); 10,000 gallons of water per day for a typical size office x 0.15 = 1,500 gallons of water per day for the proposed project/89,900,900 gallons of water per day anticipated in San Francisco in 2040). The SFPUC uses population growth projections provided by the planning department to develop the water demand projections contained in the urban water management plan. The proposed project would be encompassed within planned growth in San Francisco; therefore, it is accounted for in the water demand projections contained in the urban water management plan. Because the proposed project would comprise a small fraction of future water demand that has been accounted for in the City's urban water management plan, sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the project in normal, dry, and multiple dry years and would not require new water supply entitlements and water resources.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)		Development of the project site with a community hall would increase demand for water. Water would be supplied to the project from SFPUC. The SFPUC estimates that a typical development project in San Francisco comprised of either 100 dwelling units, 100,000 square feet of commercial use, 50,000 square feet of office, 100 hotel rooms, or 130,000 square feet of production, distribution, and repair use would generate demand for approximately 10,000 gallons of water per day, which is the equivalent of 0.011 percent of the total water demand of 89.9 million gallons per day anticipated for San Francisco in 2040. The proposed project includes a kitchen and new restrooms. Conservatively assuming the proposed project would generate water demand less than or equal to an equivalent size office facility, the proposed project would generate less than 0.0017 percent of water demand for the city as a whole in 2040, constituting a negligible increase in anticipated water demand (7,526-square-foot community hall/50,000-square-foot office = 0.15 (15 percent of the water demand of a typical size office); 10,000 gallons of water per day for a typical size office x 0.15 = 1,500 gallons of water per day for the proposed project/89,900,900 gallons of water per day anticipated in San Francisco in 2040). The SFPUC uses population growth projections provided by the planning department to develop the water demand projections contained in the urban water management plan. The proposed project would be encompassed within planned growth in San Francisco; therefore, it is accounted for in the water demand projections contained in the urban water management plan. Because the proposed project would comprise a small fraction of future water demand that has	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		been accounted for in the City's urban water management plan, sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the project in normal, dry, and multiple dry years and would not require new water supply entitlements and water resources.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical		The project site is served by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the nearest station to the project site is the Tenderloin Station at 301 Eddy Street, approximately 0.41-mile northwest of the project site. However, the project site is in the service district of the Southern Station at 1251 3rd Street, approximately 1.1 miles southeast of the project site. The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) provides fire suppression services and unified emergency medical services (EMS) and transport, including basic life support and advanced life support services, in the City and County of San Francisco. The nearest stations are Station 1 at 935 Folsom Street (approximately 0.22 mile to the east), Station 8 at 36 Bluxome Street (approximately 0.65 mile to the east), and Station 36 at 109 Oak Street (approximately 0.75 mile to the southwest). If one or more of the engine or truck companies were to be out of service at the time of an alarm, the next closest available unit would respond. Emergency medical transportation to San Francisco hospitals is provided by a dynamically deployed fleet of both public and private ambulance services. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes. Implementation of the proposed project could increase the demand for fire protection, emergency medical and police protection services. However, the increase would be incremental, funded largely	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		through project-related increases to the City's tax base, and would not be substantial given the overall demand for such services on a citywide basis. Fire protection, emergency medical, and police protection resources are regularly redeployed based on need in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. Furthermore, the fire and police departments conduct ongoing assessments of their respective service capacities and response times to maintain acceptable service levels, given the demand resulting from changes in population.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical		The project site is served by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the nearest station to the project site is the Tenderloin Station at 301 Eddy Street, approximately 0.41-mile northwest of the project site. However, the project site is in the service district of the Southern Station at 1251 3rd Street, approximately 1.1 miles southeast of the project site. The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) provides fire suppression services and unified emergency medical services (EMS) and transport, including basic life support and advanced life support services, in the City and County of San Francisco. The nearest stations are Station 1 at 935 Folsom Street (approximately 0.22 mile to the east), Station 8 at 36 Bluxome Street (approximately 0.65 mile to the east), and Station 36 at 109 Oak Street (approximately 0.75 mile to the southwest). If one or more of the engine or truck companies were to be out of service at the time of an alarm, the next closest available unit would respond. Emergency medical transportation to San Francisco hospitals is provided by a dynamically deployed fleet of both public and private ambulance services. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes. Implementation of the proposed project could increase the demand for fire protection, emergency medical and police protection services. However, the increase would be incremental, funded largely through project-related increases to the City's tax base, and would not be substantial given the overall demand for such services on a citywide basis. Fire protection, emergency medical, and police protection resources are regularly redeployed based on need in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. Furthermore, the fire and police departments conduct ongoing assessments of their respective service capacities and response times to maintain acceptable service levels, given the demand resulting from changes in population.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)		There are several parks, open spaces, and recreation facilities within close vicinity of the project site. Gene Friend Recreation Center is located 0.12-mile to the southeast, Victoria Manalo Draves Park is located 0.14-mile to the southeast, Father Alfred E. Boeddeker Park is located 0.43-mile to the northwest, Yerba Buena Gardens is located 0.47-mile to the northeast, tenderloin Children's Playground is 0.55-mile to the northwest, Alice Street Community Gardens is located 0.56-mile to the northeast, Mission Creek Park is located 0.89-mile to the southeast, and Jefferson Square Park, Margaret S. Hayward Playground, and the James P. Lang Athletic Fields are located 0.94-mile to the west of the project site.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)		There are several parks, open spaces, and recreation facilities within close vicinity of the project site. Gene Friend Recreation Center is located 0.12-mile to the southeast, Victoria Manalo Draves Park is located 0.14-	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		mile to the southeast, Father Alfred E. Boeddeker Park is located 0.43-mile to the northwest, Yerba Buena Gardens is located 0.47-mile to the northeast, tenderloin Children's Playground is 0.55-mile to the northwest, Alice Street Community Gardens is located 0.56-mile to the northeast, Mission Creek Park is located 0.89-mile to the southeast, and Jefferson Square Park, Margaret S. Hayward Playground, and the James P. Lang Athletic Fields are located 0.94-mile to the west of the project site.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)		Traffic The San Francisco Planning Department does not have a standard trip generation rate for community center facilities. Conservatively relying on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' trip generation rate for a ''recreational community center,'' a facility of the size proposed would generate about 125 weekday daily vehicle trips, of which about 8 would occur during the morning peak hour and about 10 during the afternoon peak hour. This minor volume of traffic would not adversely affect circulation on nearby streets and therefore would have no adverse effect on traffic operations. In terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the project's modest trip generation and the likelihood that a number of project visitors would travel by non-automobile modes means that the project would not substantially increase VMT. Furthermore, according to the City's Transportation Information Map, the existing average daily VMT for office and retail employee is well below the VMT analysis threshold for both existing and future conditions in the transportation analysis zone (TAZ) in which the project site is located (TAZ 669). Therefore, the project would not generate a substantial increase in VMT and is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		related to VMT. Transit The project site and vicinity are served by numerous San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) lines, with more than 15 routes, plus additional rapid and express service, located within 0.25 miles. Additionally, BART and Muni Metro are located underground at 5th and Market Streets and numerous Muni lines operate on the surface of Market Street. The project could incrementally increase ridership on one or more of the above Muni lines but the volume of new riders on any line or individual bus would be relatively minimal. Accordingly, the project would result in no adverse effects related to transit. Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation Both Howard Street and Russ Street have sidewalks on both sides of the streets that meet the City's minimum standard. The project would reconstruct the existing sidewalks, including curb and gutter, along the project site frontage. The project would generate new pedestrian trips, but these additional trips would not result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians or cause crowding on nearby sidewalks, considering the existing urban setting of the project site and the relatively low existing pedestrian volumes. Accordingly, the project would result in no adverse effect on pedestrian circulation or facilities and would instead improve pedestrian conditions. Howard, Folsom, and 7th Streets each has a buffered bike lane, located between the auto parking lane and the sidewalk to protect bicyclists. There is an existing bicycle rack on Howard Street in front of the existing 1044 Howard Street building, and the project would retain or replace this rack. The project would generate new bicycle trips, but these additional trips would not result in unsafe conditions for cyclists, given the existing bike	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		facilities in the project site vicinity. Bicycle parking is required by the San Francisco Planning Code, and the project would provide two Class 1 long-term bicycle parking spaces in lockers on the ground floor and a new sidewalk bicycle rack with two Class II bicycle parking space. Given the foregoing, the project would not adversely affect bicycle facilities. Loading The project is not anticipated to generate substantial demand for freight loading, given that the proposed facility would be a provider of services, not goods. Passenger loading demand is also anticipated to be relatively limited. No project impacts are identified. Parking The project would not provide any new off-street parking spaces. San Francisco General Plan policies emphasize the importance of public transit use and discourage facilities that encourage automobile uses. Therefore, parking demand is not considered to be a significant effect on the environment.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)		Traffic The San Francisco Planning Department does not have a standard trip generation rate for community center facilities. Conservatively relying on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' trip generation rate for a ''recreational community center,'' a facility of the size proposed would generate about 125 weekday daily vehicle trips, of which about 8 would occur during the morning peak hour and about 10 during the afternoon peak hour. This minor volume of traffic would not adversely affect circulation on nearby streets and therefore would have no adverse effect on traffic operations. In terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the project's modest trip generation and the likelihood that a number of project visitors would travel by non-automobile modes means that the project would not substantially increase	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		VMT. Furthermore, according to the City's Transportation Information Map, the existing average daily VMT for office and retail employee is well below the VMT analysis threshold for both existing and future conditions in the transportation analysis zone (TAZ) in which the project site is located (TAZ 669). Therefore, the project would not generate a substantial increase in VMT and is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts related to VMT. Transit The project site and vicinity are served by numerous San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) lines, with more than 15 routes, plus additional rapid and express service, located within 0.25 miles. Additionally, BART and Muni Metro are located underground at 5th and Market Streets and numerous Muni lines operate on the surface of Market Street. The project could incrementally increase ridership on one or more of the above Muni lines but the volume of new riders on any line or individual bus would be relatively minimal. Accordingly, the project would result in no adverse effects related to transit. Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation Both Howard Street and Russ Street have sidewalks on both sides of the streets that meet the City's minimum standard. The project would reconstruct the existing sidewalks, including curb and gutter, along the project site frontage. The project would generate new pedestrian trips, but these additional trips would not result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians or cause crowding on nearby sidewalks, considering the existing urban setting of the project site and the relatively low existing pedestrian volumes. Accordingly, the project would result in no adverse effect on pedestrian circulation or facilities and would instead improve pedestrian conditions. Howard, Folsom,	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		and 7th Streets each has a buffered bike lane, located between the auto parking lane and the sidewalk to protect bicyclists. There is an existing bicycle rack on Howard Street in front of the existing 1044 Howard Street building, and the project would retain or replace this rack. The project would generate new bicycle trips, but these additional trips would not result in unsafe conditions for cyclists, given the existing bike facilities in the project site vicinity. Bicycle parking is required by the San Francisco Planning Code, and the project would provide two Class 1 long-term bicycle parking spaces in lockers on the ground floor and a new sidewalk bicycle rack with two Class II bicycle parking space. Given the foregoing, the project would not adversely affect bicycle facilities. Loading The project is not anticipated to generate substantial demand for freight loading, given that the proposed facility would be a provider of services, not goods. Passenger loading demand is also anticipated to be relatively limited. No project impacts are identified. Parking The project would not provide any new off-street parking spaces. San Francisco General Plan policies emphasize the importance of public transit use and discourage facilities that encourage automobile uses. Therefore, parking demand is not considered to be a significant effect on the environment.	
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources		No known unique natural or water features are present on the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect water resources, nor would it increase demand for groundwater resources. As noted above, water service would be provided by SFPUC. The proposed project would not discharge effluent into surface water or groundwater. No surface	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site. The San Francisco Bay is located 1.15 miles east of the project site. Wastewater at the project site would be collected and treated by the combined sewage and stormwater system.	
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources		No known unique natural or water features are present on the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect water resources, nor would it increase demand for groundwater resources. As noted above, water service would be provided by SFPUC. The proposed project would not discharge effluent into surface water or groundwater. No surface waters (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds) are located on or adjacent to the project site. The San Francisco Bay is located 1.15 miles east of the project site. Wastewater at the project site would be collected and treated by the combined sewage and stormwater system.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)		The project site is relatively flat and located in a developed, urban setting. No federally designated critical habitats are documented within the proposed project site. No impacts on federally listed species or critical habitat are anticipated from the project. The project site does not have any existing street trees along the project frontage, nor does it have any landscaped vegetation. Common migratory birds may nest and forage on the property. Therefore, the project site does not support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife species.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)		The project site is relatively flat and located in a developed, urban setting. No federally designated critical habitats are documented within the proposed project site. No impacts on federally listed species or critical habitat are anticipated from the project. The project site does not have any existing street trees along the project frontage, nor does it have	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		any landscaped vegetation. Common migratory birds may nest and forage on the property. Therefore, the project site does not support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife species.	
Other Factors 1		Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions The analysis of GHG emissions is based on BAAQMD's 2022 significance thresholds, summarized below: * No natural gas use or plumbing * No wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary building energy use * Reduce VMT consistent with the state's Scoping Plan The project would not include any new natural gas hookups to the project site. Additionally, the project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption. With respect to transportation, the project is located within an area of the City where the existing and future VMT per employee is more than 15 percent below the regional VMT thresholds; therefore, the project would not generate a substantial increase in VMT and is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts related to VMT. Based on the foregoing, the proposed project would beet all of the conditions of the BAAQMD's CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating Significance of Climate Impacts And therefore would have a less than significant impact with respect to generation of GHG emissions. Additionally, GHG emissions would occur in the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco. San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions identifies the City's actions to pursue cleaner energy, energy conservation, alternative transportation, and solid waste policies, and concludes that the City's policies have resulted in a reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels. As stated in the GHG checklist prepared for this project, the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		proposed project would also be consistent with San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy. Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2022.1.1.19. Total operational GHG emissions estimated for the proposed project total 73 metric tons or eCO2/year. Social costs can be estimated using tables from the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases (IWGSC) report established by Executive Order 13990 to provide interim updated social cost values. Using the 2025 value with a 3% discount rate, the project's operational social costs would be on the order of $6,100 per year.	
Other Factors 1		Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions The analysis of GHG emissions is based on BAAQMD's 2022 significance thresholds, summarized below: * No natural gas use or plumbing * No wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary building energy use * Reduce VMT consistent with the state's Scoping Plan The project would not include any new natural gas hookups to the project site. Additionally, the project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption. With respect to transportation, the project is located within an area of the City where the existing and future VMT per employee is more than 15 percent below the regional VMT thresholds; therefore, the project would not generate a substantial increase in VMT and is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts related to VMT. Based on the foregoing, the proposed project would beet all of the conditions of the BAAQMD's CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating Significance of Climate Impacts And therefore would have a less than significant impact with respect to	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		generation of GHG emissions. Additionally, GHG emissions would occur in the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco. San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions identifies the City's actions to pursue cleaner energy, energy conservation, alternative transportation, and solid waste policies, and concludes that the City's policies have resulted in a reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels. As stated in the GHG checklist prepared for this project, the proposed project would also be consistent with San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy. Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2022.1.1.19. Total operational GHG emissions estimated for the proposed project total 73 metric tons or eCO2/year. Social costs can be estimated using tables from the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases (IWGSC) report established by Executive Order 13990 to provide interim updated social cost values. Using the 2025 value with a 3% discount rate, the project's operational social costs would be on the order of $6,100 per year.	
Other Factors 2			
Other Factors 2			
CLIMATE AND ENERGY			
Climate Change		The proposed project would not substantially impact climate change by way of generated greenhouse gas emissions. On January 9, 2023, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released National Environmental Policy Act Guidance on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change (GHG Guidance) (CEQ 2023). This guidance provides details for how federal agencies can incorporate GHG and climate	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		change considerations into the NEPA process. Although the GHG guidance is considered ''interim,'' it is effective immediately, while CEQ seeks public comment on the guidance. The guidance recommends agencies consider the potential effects of a proposed action on climate change, including by assessing both direct and indirect GHG emissions and reductions from the proposed action, quantifying the baseline (no-action) emissions, and the effects of climate change on a proposed action and that action's impacts. The GHG guidance further recommends that GHG emissions should be quantified for the gross and net emissions for each chemical compound (i.e., methane, nitrous oxide, etc.) and summarized as carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) and social cost of greenhouse gases. The GHG guidance recommends the social cost of greenhouse gas (SC-GHG) be included in NEPA studies to disclose the potential future costs to society stemming from the carbon emitted by a proposed action.	
Climate Change		The proposed project would not substantially impact climate change by way of generated greenhouse gas emissions. On January 9, 2023, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released National Environmental Policy Act Guidance on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change (GHG Guidance) (CEQ 2023). This guidance provides details for how federal agencies can incorporate GHG and climate change considerations into the NEPA process. Although the GHG guidance is considered ''interim,'' it is effective immediately, while CEQ seeks public comment on the guidance. The guidance recommends agencies consider the potential effects of a proposed action on climate	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		change, including by assessing both direct and indirect GHG emissions and reductions from the proposed action, quantifying the baseline (no-action) emissions, and the effects of climate change on a proposed action and that action's impacts. The GHG guidance further recommends that GHG emissions should be quantified for the gross and net emissions for each chemical compound (i.e., methane, nitrous oxide, etc.) and summarized as carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) and social cost of greenhouse gases. The GHG guidance recommends the social cost of greenhouse gas (SC-GHG) be included in NEPA studies to disclose the potential future costs to society stemming from the carbon emitted by a proposed action.	
Energy Efficiency		The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. In addition, San Francisco's Green Building Code places more stringent energy, materials, and construction debris management requirements on new City buildings than does Title 24. The project would be GreenPoint rated and would comply with the California Green Building Code (CALGreen), the California Energy Code, and San Francisco Building, Green Building, and Planning Code sustainability features. In addition, the project would provide a designated solar ready zone of approximately 140 square feet (not less than 15 percent of the roof area) for potential future installation of solar panels. The project would not have a substantial effect on the use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource.	
Energy Efficiency		The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Regulations. In addition, San Francisco's Green Building Code places more stringent energy, materials, and construction debris management requirements on new City buildings than does Title 24. The project would be GreenPoint rated and would comply with the California Green Building Code (CALGreen), the California Energy Code, and San Francisco Building, Green Building, and Planning Code sustainability features. In addition, the project would provide a designated solar ready zone of approximately 140 square feet (not less than 15 percent of the roof area) for potential future installation of solar panels. The project would not have a substantial effect on the use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource.	

Supporting documentation

5_Geotechnical Investigation.pdf
4_Noise Calculator Results(1).pdf
3_Historic and Cultural Resources Documentation(1).pdf
2_Phase I ESA(2).pdf
1_Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Supporting Documents(1).pdf
1044 Howard St - Coastal Zone(1).pdf
1044 Howard St - Ntl Wild and Scenic Rivers(1).pdf
43_InstituteforPolicyIntegrity_CostofClimatePollution.pdf
42_CEQ_NEPAGuidanceonConsiderationofGHG.pdf
41_BAAQMD_2022_CEQAThresholdsforEvaluatingSignificanceofClimateImpacts.pdf
40_GoogleEarth_1044HowardSt.pdf
39_SFMTA_2023_SFBikeNetworkMap.pdf
38_SFDPW_2023_GradeMap.pdf
37_SFPlanning_2023_SFTIM.pdf
36_SFRecreationandParks_SFParkFinder.pdf
35_SFPD_2023_StationFinder.pdf
34_SFFD_2023_FireStationLocations.pdf
33_CRWQCB_2019_OrderNoR2-2019-0017.pdf
32_SFPUC_2021_DiscoverYourWatershed.pdf
31_SFPUC_2021_UWMP.pdf
30_CalRecycle_2019_SWISRecologyHayRoad.pdf
29_SFPlanning_2015_AgreementfortheDisposalofSFMunicipalSolidWaste.pdf

28_SFMTA_2023_MuniMap.pdf
27_SFPlanning_2023_HeightBulkDistrictMap.pdf
26_SFPlanning_2020_ZoningMap.pdf
25_CensusReporter_2021_CensusTract176_02(1).pdf
24_NPS_2023_ScenicRivers(1).pdf
23_USFWS_2023_NationalWetlandsInventory(1).pdf
22_EPA_2023_SoleSource(1).pdf
21_CACOSF_2023_Article29RegulationofNoiseGuidelines(1).pdf
20_SFMTA_2023_2014-2018TrafficCountData(1).pdf
19_CACOSF_2023_EnvironmentalProtectionElement(1).pdf
18_DOC_2022_CAImportantFarmlandFinder(1).pdf
17_HUD_415Natoma(1).pdf
16_HUD_90_7thSt(1).pdf
15_HUD_300_7thST(1).pdf
14_2023_APSFacilities(1).pdf
13_USFWS_2023_CriticalHabitatforThreatenedSpeciesMapper(1).pdf
12_SWRCB-DTSC_2023_GeoTracker-Envirostor(1).pdf
11_CCC_2019_CoastalZoneBoundaryMapofSF(1).pdf
10_USEPA_2004_CleanAirNonroadDieselRule(1).pdf
9_ARB_2012_InUseOffRoadEquipment(1).pdf
8_CACOSF_2008_ConstructionDustControlOrdinanceSF(1).pdf
7_BAAQMD_2017_AQStandardsandAttainmentStatus(1).pdf
6_USEPA_2021_DeMinimisTables(1).pdf
5_BAAQMD_2022_CEQAAQGuidelines(1).pdf
4_FEMA_2023_FIRM(2).pdf
3_USFWS_2023_CBRSMapper(1).pdf
2_CCAG_2012_CALUP(1).pdf
1_Arquitectonica_2023_Building Permit Drawings.pdf

Additional Studies Performed:

1. October 31, 2023, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, completed by Essel Environmental. 2. February 1, 2023, Geotechnical Investigation, completed by Rockridge Geotechnical.

5_Geotechnical Investigation(1).pdf
2_Phase I ESA(3).pdf

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed by:

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

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

See attachment.

United Playaz - Source List Agencies and Persons Consulted.docx

List of Permits Obtained:

Building permits issued by the City and County of San Francisco are anticipated to be obtained by or before January 2024.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

United Playaz has conducted numerous community outreach sessions and meetings to elicit feedback from the community. Community meetings were conducted the following dates: * Public Meeting (January 2023) * Public Meetings (February 8 and 22, 2023) * Public Meetings (March 8 and 22, 2023) * Public Meetings (April 5 and 19, 2023) * Public Meetings (May 3 and 17, 2023) * Public Meetings (June 7 and 21, 2023) * Public Meetings (July 5 and 19, 2023) * Public Meetings (August 2, 16, and 30, 2023) * Public Meetings (September 13, 2023) * Meetings with adjacent neighbors

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The proposed project is a stand-alone action on the project site and is not part of a series of activities. Furthermore, the environmental and social impacts of potential future development on-site have been evaluated as part of the project. Therefore, the project would not result in additional cumulative impacts from future related actions.

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

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

The no action alternative would mean that the project site would not be developed and remain as a vacant building. Because there would be no construction and no operational changes under the no action alternative, it would have no new adverse environmental effects. However, the no action alternative would not provide additional program space for United Playaz to provide a community hall to expand its family literacy and adult re-entry programs.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

With adherence to applicable laws, authorities, and other enforceable measures, all potentially adverse effects of the proposed project would be reduced to levels below established significance thresholds or avoided completely. The project would not have any potentially significant to the extent that an Environmental Impact Statement

would be required. For two environmental issues, the proposed action would result in minor adverse but mitigable impacts. Subsurface testing found that lead, arsenic, and PCE levels exceeded the commercial ESLs. Disturbance during construction could result in exposure to these contaminants. Therefore, preparation and implementation of a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) and Health and Safety Plan (HASP) is required to ensure the proper disposal of any soil-based contaminants or hazardous materials, as well as installation of a passive vapor management system. The project site is suitable from a geotechnical standpoint. However, site specific recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation are necessary prior to development. These recommendations pertain to the site's geotechnical concerns which include but are not limited to: site preparation, fill import, and fill placement. These recommendations are required as mitigation. 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	Sites known to contain hazardous soils or groundwater conditions in San Francisco are governed by San Francisco Health Code Article 22A, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The site is within the Maher Area. Essel Environmental conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) at the project site (see Attachment 2 - Phase I	N/A	Site Mitigation Plan (SMP): An SMP shall be submitted to SFPDH prior to the issuance of any permits in the event review of the work plan for analysis of sampled soils and subsurface analyses report indicates the presence of hazardous substances. The SMP shall contain contingency plans to	

	ESA). Hazardous Conditions On-Site: Based on the Phase I ESA, two recognized environmental conditions (RECs) were identified. A Maher Ordinance-required subsurface investigation consisted of soil borings and air samples. The soil sampling found that lead and arsenic levels exceeded the commercial environmental screening levels (ESLs). This would require soil removed from the top 3.5 feet of excavation to be properly disposed of. One of the sub-slab air samples exceeded the commercial ''cancer risk'' ESL for tetrachloroethene (PCE), a common dry-cleaning solvent. Consequently, mitigation is required. Asbestos-Containing Materials and Lead-Based Paint: The existing building was constructed in 1964; therefore asbestos-containing materials (ACM) are potentially present. The building materials within the subject property building were observed to be in poor condition.		be implemented during soil excavation activities and a dust management protocol. The SMP shall also contain details of the passive vapor mitigation system required (e.g., concrete cap across the footprint of the site) to alleviate soil vapor risk. In addition, the SMP shall include a site-specific HASP which will address hazards that may be encountered by on-site workers during remediation activities and will describe the steps necessary to minimize exposure of the public to potentially impacted soil and to physical hazards originating from soil excavation and disposal activities. The HASP shall outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction. San Francisco Construction Dust	

	State agencies, in conjunction with the US EPA and OSHA, regulate removal, abatement, and transport procedures for ACM. Additionally, the regulations include warnings that must be heeded and practices that must be followed to reduce the risk for asbestos emissions and exposure. Finally, BAAQMD must be notified prior to the onset of demolition or construction activities with the potential to release asbestos. The building was constructed prior to the 1978 prohibition on lead-based paint; therefore, such paint is potentially present. It is recommended that suspect paints and coatings be tested for lead prior to any additional disturbance and disposal. Old peeling paint can contaminate near surface soil, and exposure to residual lead can have adverse health effects, especially in children. Federal, state, BAAQMD, and City laws and regulations govern lead-based paint abatement. Conclusion:		Control Ordinance (San Francisco Health Code Article 22B, and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.3.2.6): All site preparation work, demolition, or other construction in San Francisco that could create dust or expose or disturb more than 10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of soil, must comply with specified dust control measures. California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93105: The project would be subject to the California Air Resources Board's Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations. The requirements established by the Asbestos ATCM are contained in the California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93105, and are enforced by BAAAQMD.	

	Implementation of the mitigation measure and compliance with regulations described above (Maher Ordinance; federal and state regulations for the removal of ACM and lead-based paint) and all applicable federal and state Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) regulations would prevent adverse impacts with respect to contamination and toxic substances.			
Air Quality	San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance (San Francisco Health Code Article 22B, and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.3.2.6): All site preparation work, demolition, or other construction in San Francisco that could create dust or expose or disturb more than 10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of soil, must comply with specified dust control measures.	N/A	Comply with the SF ordinance dust control measures. San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance (San Francisco Health Code Article 22B, and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.3.2.6): All site preparation work, demolition, or other construction in San Francisco that could create dust or expose or disturb more than 10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of soil, must comply with specified dust control measures.	

Historic Preservation	Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources: If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work shall be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context. Native American resources include chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, and pestles; and dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials. Historic-period resources include stone or adobe foundations or walls; structures and remains with square nails; and refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often located in old wells or privies.	N/A	If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work shall be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context. A Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery and provide recommendations on the treatment of the discovered materials.	
Land Development	San Francisco Building Code: The San Francisco Building Code derives from the adopted 2022 California Building Code. This code is administered and enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI), and compliance with all provisions is mandatory for all new development and redevelopment in the City. Throughout the	N/A	These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents.	

	permitting, design, and construction phases of a building project, Planning Department staff, DBI engineers, and DBI building inspectors confirm that the SFBC is being implemented by project architects, engineers, and contractors, including seismic and soil investigations and recommendations. San Francisco Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance (Article 4.2 of the Public Works Code): Under the ordinance, any construction project that disturbs 5,000 square feet or more of land must apply to the SFPUC for a Construction Site Runoff Control Permit prior to the start of work and submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that sets forth best management practices (BMPs) intended to control erosion control and sediment.			
Noise Abatement and Control	24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B: It is a HUD goal that the interior auditory environment shall not exceed a day-night average sound level of 45 decibels.	N/A	The project must comply with all the requirements stipulated in the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code). The ordinance established	

			acceptable noise levels for construction activities unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works.	

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

Project Mitigation Plan

Contamination and Toxic Substances: A Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) shall be submitted to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) prior to the issuance of any permits given the results from the analysis of sampled soils and subsurface investigation report indicates the presence of hazardous substances. The project grantee, United Playaz, will be responsible for submitting the SMP to SFDPH and will provide MOHCD a copy and/or verification of such submission. The project would be subject to the California Air Resources Board's Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations. More details are found by visiting: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/asbesto2/fro.pdf (California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93105). The requirements established by the Asbestos ACTM are enforced by BAAAQMD. Asbestos-Containing Materials and Lead-Based Paint: The existing building was constructed in 1964; therefore asbestos-containing materials (ACM) are potentially present. The building materials within the subject property building were observed to be in poor condition. The building was constructed prior to the 1978 prohibition on lead-based paint; therefore, such paint is potentially present. It is recommended that suspect paints and coatings be tested for lead prior to any additional disturbance and disposal. Old peeling paint can contaminate near surface soil, and exposure to residual lead can have adverse health effects, especially in children. Federal, State, BAAQMD, and City laws and regulations govern lead-based paint abatement. Compliance with the regulations for the removal of ACM and lead-based paint would ensure that portions of the existing building proposed for demolition would not expose persons to hazardous materials. The proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Asbestos ACTM, which includes measures to control fugitive dust from construction activities. State agencies, in conjunction with the US EPA and OSHA, regulate removal, abatement, and transport procedures for ACM. Additionally, the regulations include warnings that must be heeded and practices that must be followed to reduce the risk for asbestos emissions and exposure. Finally, BAAQMD must be notified prior to the onset of demolition or construction activities with the potential to release asbestos. Historic Preservation - Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources: A Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist shall inspect any findings within 24 hours of discovery and provide recommendations on the treatment of the discovered materials, should any resources be discovered during construction of the project. The project grantee, United Playaz, will be responsible for compliance of this condition and will be responsible for hiring a qualified Secretary of the Interior archeologist to properly handle and investigate any resources that could be encountered during construction. The project grantee must also ensure the project complies with the following Federal, State, and Local laws as applicable: San Francisco Noise Ordinance San Francisco Building Code San Francisco Construction Site Runoff Control Ordinance San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

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

San Francisco International Airport is more than 11 miles south of the project site. The project site is well outside the boundaries of the San Francisco International Airport runway protection zones as depicted in Exhibit II-4, Airport Influence Area B (see attached CCAG 2012 p 51). The project site is outside all other defined safety zones, airspace protection zones, and Airport Influence Areas of the airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan. There are no military airfields in the City and County of San Francisco or the nearby vicinity; therefore, no military airfield Airport Protection Zone or Clear Zone would be implicated. 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.

Supporting documentation

2_CCAG_2012_CALUP.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Barrier Resources

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

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

Compliance Determination

There are no Coastal Barrier Resource System (CBRS) Units, or CBRS buffer zones, as defined under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982 (PL 97-348), as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (PL 101-591) on the west coast of the United States. The project site is therefore not located within a CBRS Unit, or a CBRS buffer zone. 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.

Supporting documentation

3_USFWS_2023_CBRSMapper.pdf

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.

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 Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is responsible for delineating areas that are expected to be subject to flooding during a 100-year flood event. A 100-year flood event is defined as the area that is expected to be inundated by flood flows during a rainfall event that would have an annual probability of occurrence of one percent. FEMA refers to the portion of the floodplain or coastal area that is at risk from floods of this magnitude as Special Flood Hazard Areas. FEMA creates and maintains Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) which identify areas located within a 100-year floodplain boundary area. Based on FEMA flood hazard mapping and as shown on FEMA map number 0602980118A (effective 3/23/2021, not printed), the project site is within Zone X -- Area of Minimal Flood Hazard. Based on this designation, the project site is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further

evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. 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.

Supporting documentation

4_FEMA_2023_FIRM.pdf

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Criteria Pollutants: Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2022.1.1.19. Comparison to Federal General Conformity De Minimis Levels: Results of the CalEEMod run indicate that maximum annual emissions of reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less, and carbon monoxide from both construction and operation would be below the federal General Conformity de minimis level of 100 tons per year pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act. Therefore, the proposed action is exempt from General Conformity regulations. Comparison to Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Thresholds: The modeling results indicate that the average daily emissions from construction, excluding fugitive dust, would be below the BAAQMD's average daily construction emission thresholds. Maximum annual and average daily emissions from the operation of the project would be below the BAAQMD's maximum annual and average daily operational emission thresholds. Consequently, criteria pollutant

emissions from construction and operation of the project would not exceed BAAQMD's thresholds of significance. Fugitive Dust: The City of San Francisco's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176?08) requires measures to control fugitive dust. The project would implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) in compliance with this ordinance and BAAQMD-recommended control measures for controlling fugitive dust and these measures would ensure that there would be no significant project related impacts. Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) from Construction: Construction-related activities could result in the generation of TACs, specifically diesel particulate matter (DPM), from diesel-fueled construction equipment and vehicles. Off-road equipment (including construction-related equipment) is a large contributor to DPM emissions in California. Newer and more refined emission inventories have substantially lowered the estimates of DPM emissions from off-road equipment. Additionally, federal and state regulations are requiring cleaner off-road equipment. Specifically, both the USEPA and California have set emissions standards for new off-road equipment engines, ranging from Tier 1 to Tier 4. The USEPA estimated that by implementing the federal Tier 4 standards, NOx and PM emissions will be reduced by more than 90 percent. The City's Clean Construction Ordinance applies to all publicly funded contracts advertised or initiated on or after September 7, 2015. The project site is not located within a designated Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Therefore, the project contractor would be required to use equipment with Tier 2 or higher engines or equipment. Tier 4 engines automatically meet this requirement. As of 2020, 47 percent of all construction equipment registered within the air basin have Tier 4 engines. Given (1) the project's construction-related exhaust emissions of PM10 would be substantially below the BAAQMD thresholds, (2) the existing proportion of the construction equipment fleet within the Bay Area with Tier 4 engines, and (3) the requirements of the Clean Construction Ordinance, the project would not result in significant adverse risks to community health from construction activities. Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under the Clean Air Act. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

Supporting documentation

1_Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Supporting Documents.pdf
10_USEPA_2004_CleanAirNonroadDieselRule.pdf
9_ARB_2012_InUseOffRoadEquipment.pdf
8_CACOSF_2008_ConstructionDustControlOrdinanceSF.pdf
7_BAAQMD_2017_AQStandardsandAttainmentStatus.pdf
6_USEPA_2021_DeMinimisTables.pdf
5_BAAQMD_2022_CEQAAQGuidelines.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

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

The project site is not located within a Coastal Zone Management Area or a county or local area of jurisdiction, which includes the first 100 feet shoreward as defined by the Coastal Zone Management Act. 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.

Supporting documentation

1044 Howard St - Coastal Zone.pdf
11_CCC_2019_CoastalZoneBoundaryMapofSF.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

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

3. Mitigation

Document and upload the mitigation needed according to the requirements of the appropriate federal, state, tribal, or local oversight agency. If the adverse environmental effects cannot be mitigated, then HUD assistance may not be used for the project at this site.

Can adverse environmental impacts be mitigated?

Adverse environmental impacts cannot feasibly be mitigated.

✓ Yes, adverse environmental impacts can be eliminated through mitigation. Document and upload all mitigation requirements below.

4. Describe how compliance was achieved in the text box below. Include any of the following that apply: State Voluntary Clean-up Program, a No Further Action letter, use of engineering controls, or use of institutional controls.

Sites known to contain hazardous soils or groundwater conditions in San Francisco are governed by San Francisco Health Code Article 22A, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The site is within the Maher Area. Essel Environmental conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) at the project site (see Attachment 2 - Phase I ESA). Hazardous Conditions On-Site: Based on the Phase I ESA, two recognized environmental conditions (RECs) were identified. A Maher Ordinance-required subsurface investigation consisted of soil borings and air samples. The soil sampling found that lead and arsenic levels exceeded the commercial environmental screening levels (ESLs). This would require soil removed from the top 3.5 feet of excavation to be properly disposed of. One of the sub-slab air samples exceeded the commercial ''cancer risk'' ESL for tetrachloroethene (PCE), a common dry-cleaning solvent. Consequently, mitigation is required. Asbestos-Containing Materials and Lead-Based Paint: The existing building was constructed in 1964; therefore asbestos-containing materials (ACM) are potentially present. The building materials within the subject property building were observed to be in poor condition. State agencies, in conjunction with the US EPA and OSHA, regulate removal, abatement, and transport procedures for ACM. Additionally, the regulations include warnings that must be heeded and practices that must be followed to reduce the risk for asbestos emissions and exposure. Finally, BAAQMD must be notified prior to the onset of demolition or construction activities with the potential to release asbestos. The building was constructed prior to the 1978 prohibition on lead-based paint; therefore, such paint is potentially present. It is recommended that suspect paints and coatings be tested for lead prior to any additional disturbance and disposal. Old peeling paint can contaminate near surface soil, and exposure to residual lead can have adverse health effects, especially in children. Federal, state, BAAQMD, and City laws and regulations govern lead-based paint abatement. Conclusion: Implementation of the mitigation measure and compliance with regulations described above (Maher Ordinance; federal and state regulations for the removal of ACM and lead-based paint) and all applicable federal and state Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) regulations would prevent adverse impacts with respect to contamination and toxic substances.

If a remediation plan or clean-up program was necessary, which standard does it follow?

Complete removal

✓ Risk-based corrective action (RBCA)

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA, Remediation or clean-up plan. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances were found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property. The adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated. Mitigation Measures: A Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) shall be submitted to San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) prior to the issuance of any permits in the event review of the work plan for analysis of sampled soils and subsurface analyses report indicates the presence of hazardous substances. The SMP shall contain contingency plans to be implemented during soil excavation activities and a dust management protocol. The SMP shall also contain details of the passive vapor mitigation system required (e.g., concrete cap across the footprint of the site) to alleviate soil vapor risk. In addition, the SMP shall include a site-specific HASP which will address hazards that may be encountered by on-site workers during remediation activities and will describe the steps necessary to minimize exposure of the public to potentially impacted soil and to physical hazards originating from soil excavation and disposal activities. The HASP shall outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction. Compliance with the regulations described for the removal of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint would ensure that portions of the existing building proposed for demolition would not expose persons to hazardous materials. The proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Asbestos ACTM, which includes measures to control fugitive dust from construction activities. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

Supporting documentation

2_Phase I ESA.pdf
12_SWRCB-DTSC_2023_GeoTracker-Envirostor.pdf

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

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 *et seq*.); particularly section 7 (16 USC 1536).	50 CFR Part 402

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

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

This selection is only appropriate if none of the activities involved in the project have potential to affect species or habitats. Examples of actions without potential to affect listed species may include: purchasing existing buildings, completing interior renovations to existing buildings, and replacing exterior paint or siding on existing buildings.
Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

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.

Screen Summary
Compliance Determination
The project site is in a densely populated and urbanized area in central San Francisco. The project site is currently occupied by an existing, vacant building and is surrounded by an urban environment that contains ornamental landscaped vegetation which does

not support sensitive vegetation and/or wildlife. Implementation of the project would involve construction on an already developed site. No federally listed species or species proposed for listing or federally designated critical habitats are documented within the project area. No impacts on federally listed species or critical habitat would occur, as the project site is disturbed and planted with ornamental vegetation; it does not contain critical habitat or other suitable habitat for any federally listed species. This project will have No Effect on listed species due to the nature of the activities involved in the project. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

Supporting documentation

13_USFWS_2023_CriticalHabitatforThreatenedSpeciesMapper.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

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project does not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations. During the Phase I ESA, there was no visual evidence or indication of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at or immediately adjacent to the project site. The nearest above-ground storage tanks (ASTs) are at: 300 7th St. (950 feet from the project site), 90 7th St. (1000 feet from the project site), and 415 Natoma St (1000 feet from the project site) The AST at 300 7th St. has a volume of 7,250 gallons, and based on the tank's contents and size, this AST has an Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) for thermal radiation of 631.27 feet if unobstructed. The AST at 90 7th St. has a volume of 8,060 feet, and an ASD for thermal radiation of 659.75 feet. The AST at 415 Natoma St. has an ASD of 276.57 feet. Because the project site is approximately 1,000 feet away from the nearest AST,

and is separated by numerous buildings, it is located at an acceptable distance, and no explosive hazard to the project site would occur. Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.

Supporting documentation

17_HUD_415Natoma.pdf
16_HUD_90_7thSt.pdf
15_HUD_300_7thST.pdf
14_2023_APSFacilities.pdf
2_Phase I ESA(1).pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Farmlands Protection

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

No protected farmlands are located within the City and County of San Francisco. The project site consists of urban land; therefore, the project would not affect farmlands regulated under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq, implementing regulations 7 CFR Part 658, of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, as amended).

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.

Supporting documentation

18_DOC_2022_CAImportantFarmlandFinder.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

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:

4_FEMA_2023_FIRM(1).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

As discussed under the Flood Insurance compliance factor, based on FEMA flood hazard mapping and as shown on FEMA map number 0602980118A (effective 3/23/2021, not printed), the project site is within Zone X -- Area of Minimal Flood Hazard. Based on this designation, the project site is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in impacts to floodplains and would not result in direct or indirect support of floodplain development. This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Historic Preservation

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

Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)
No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].
✓ Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

Step 1 – Initiate Consultation

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

✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Response Period Elapsed

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

✓ Other Consulting Parties

- ✓ California Native American Organizations Completed

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

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended; and Title 24 Part 58 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as amended; San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) as the responsible entity (RE) would among other things, analyze the effects of the proposed project on historic architectural and archeological resources as part of the environmental assessment (EA) certification. This action is delineated in Stipulations VII and XI of the Programmatic Agreement on identification and evaluation of historic properties and consideration and treatment of archeological resources. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this project entailed four properties of which San Francisco Planning Department whose staff has expertise in this area, concluded there are no historic properties within the project site: 1. 1038 Howard Street (APN 3726/017) was surveyed in 2008 as part of the San Francisco's Planning Department SoMa Area Plan Historic Resource Survey and assigned the California Historical Resource Status Code (CHRSC) ''6Z,'' signifying that it was found ineligible for listing on the National Register or California Register or as San Francisco landmarks through survey evaluation. 2. 1044 Howard Street (the proposed building address) and two others in the immediate vicinity 1040-1042 Howard Street (APN 3726/018) and 543-545 Natoma Street (APN 3726/046) located in a Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District were determined ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties through a DPR 523 study prepared by the project sponsors consultant. The DPR study and SF Planning determination is attached. The project sponsor's consultant Environmental Science Associates (ESA) requested a records search on the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) for 1044 Howard Street (the proposed project subject property). In response to this records search, CHRIS provided a letter where they include six recommendations. One of the recommendations stipulated that the lead agency contact the local Native American tribes regarding traditional, cultural, and religious heritage values. For this, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a list of Native American tribes of interest. The Native American contact list provided by the NAHC is attached. No comments were received by Tribes in opposition of the project nor comments providing recommendations on traditional, cultural, and religious heritage values for the project.

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:**
   See attached APE map.

   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
1038 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
1040-1042 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
1044 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
543-545 Natoma Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive

Additional Notes:

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended; and Title 24 Part 58 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as amended; the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) as the responsible entity (RE) would among other things, analyzed the effects of the proposed project on historic architectural and archeological resources as part of the environmental assessment (EA) certification process. This action is delineated in Stipulations VII and XI of the Programmatic Agreement on identification and evaluation of historic properties and consideration

and treatment of archeological resources. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this project entailed four properties of which San Francisco Planning Department whose staff has expertise in this area, concluded there are no historic properties within the project site: 1. 1038 Howard Street (APN 3726/017) was surveyed in 2008 as part of the San Francisco's Planning Department SoMa Area Plan Historic Resource Survey and assigned the California Historical Resource Status Code (CHRSC) ''6Z,'' signifying that it was found ineligible for listing on the National Register or California Register or as San Francisco landmarks through survey evaluation. 2. 1044 Howard Street (the proposed building address) and two others in the immediate vicinity 1040-1042 Howard Street (APN 3726/018) and 543-545 Natoma Street (APN 3726/046) located in a Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District were determined ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties through a DPR 523 study prepared by the project sponsors consultant. The DPR study and SF Planning determination is attached. The project sponsor's consultant Environmental Science Associates (ESA) requested a records search on the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) for 1044 Howard Street (the proposed project subject property). In response to this records search, CHRIS provided a letter where they include six recommendations. One of the recommendations stipulated that the lead agency contact the local Native American tribes regarding traditional, cultural, and religious heritage values. For this, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a list of Native American tribes of interest. The Native American contact list provided by the NAHC is attached. No comments were received by Tribes in opposition to the proposed project nor comments providing recommendations on traditional, cultural, and religious heritage values for the project. CHRIS also stipulated on their letter that, "Although the proposed project area is located in an area of generalized archaeological sensitivity, as per the project description, the previous extent of disturbance exceeds the proposed project work. Therefore, no further study for archaeological resources is recommended at this time. If archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work should be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers should avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations." Given the potentiality of encountering resources during construction, the California State

Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) was consulted solely for this purpose and provided a 30-day response period. However, their consultation period elapsed.

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

Yes

✓ 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. The project is in compliance with Section 106.

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

Supporting documentation

United Playaz_SHPO Consult Letter_FINAL-signed.pdf
Attachment E__1044 Howard St_Project Plans.pdf
Attachment D__NAHC Native American Contact List.xlsx
Attachment C__NAHC Sacred Lands File search response.pdf
Attachment B__NWIC CHRIS Letter - Arch Records Search for 1044 Howard St.pdf
Attachment A__APE for 1044 Howard Street project.pdf
Sacred-Lands-File-NAHC_United Playaz Bldg Renovation.pdf
Native American_Consult_Invitation_FINAL-signed.pdf
3_Historic and Cultural Resources Documentation.pdf
1044 Howard project Form A and B completed w attachments.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Noise Abatement and Control

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

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

New construction for residential use

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

HUD Noise Standards: Noise exposure standards promulgated by HUD apply only to sensitive land uses. Recreation centers are not considered a sensitive use unless the use is combined with services such as childcare and/or senior services. Because these uses are not proposed, HUD standards do not apply to the proposed project and this analysis relies on the standards in the San Francisco General Plan. SF General Plan Noise Standards: The SF General Plan establishes land use compatibility categories for specific land uses proposed within the City. For playgrounds and parks, a noise level of 70 day-night average sound level (DNL) or less is considered satisfactory.

ESA modeled noise levels at the project site using the HUD DNL Calculator, which requires assessing noise impacts from roadways up to 1,000 feet away and railways up to 3,000 feet away that could potentially affect noise at the project site. Roadways within 1,000 feet of the project site included in the analysis are 6th Street and 7th Street. Existing traffic volumes for these roadways were obtained from SF Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) traffic count data. Two airports are located within the preliminary 15-mile screening distance from the project site, SF International Airport and Oakland International Airport. The project site is several miles outside of the 60 dBA and 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level airport noise contours based on each airport's respective noise contour map. Consequently, airport noise would not contribute to the noise environment and was not included in the HUD DNL Calculator assessment. The DNL exterior noise from these sources was calculated to be 70 dBA DNL at the project site. This would fall within the City's ''satisfactory'' range for playgrounds and parks, which is 70 dBA DNL or less. Since the project site would not be exposed to noise levels exceeding 70 dBA DNL, attenuation measures would not be required to ensure interior noise standards are met. Construction Noise: Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code). Construction at the project site generally would be limited to daytime hours. No pile driving is proposed. Operational Noise: Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' trip generation rates (a conservative metric that does not account for nearby transit), a stand-alone recreation center of the size proposed would generate about 127 daily vehicle trips, of which about 8 would occur during the morning peak hour and about 10 during the afternoon peak hour. Based on existing traffic data for Howard Street compiled by SFMTA, the afternoon peak hour volume is approximately 1,030 vehicles. Therefore, the addition of project traffic during peak hours would lead to a less than one percent increase in traffic, assuming that all trips were to use the same roadways to reach the project site. In addition, the project's fixed noise sources, such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, would be subject to noise limits in Article 29 of the Police Code (section 2909, Noise Limits). The proposed project would not generate significant noise impacts. This project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project complies with HUD's Noise regulation.

Supporting documentation

21_CACOSF_2023_Article29RegulationofNoiseGuidelines.pdf
20_SFMTA_2023_2014-2018TrafficCountData.pdf
19_CACOSF_2023_EnvironmentalProtectionElement.pdf
4_Noise Calculator Results.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

Yes

✓ No

Sole Source Aquifers

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

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

✓ Yes

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

No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project site is not served by a U.S. EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer. The project site would be entirely served by the existing municipal water supply. Based on the project description, the project consists of activities that are unlikely to have an adverse impact on groundwater resources. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

Supporting documentation

MOU HUD EPA Region 9.pdf
22_EPA_2023_SoleSource.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

United-Playaz-Facility---1044-Howard-St---EDI-CPF-23	San Francisco, CA	900000010340515

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 site is not located within or adjacent to a wetland area, as shown in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory Mapper. The nearest wetland to the project site is the China Basin Water Channel, located approximately 0.81 mile southeast of the project site. The China Basin Water Channel is part of the estuarine and marine deep-water wetland connected to the adjacent San Francisco Bay. The proposed action would have no impact on wetlands or other water of the state. The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

Supporting documentation

23_USFWS_2023_NationalWetlandsInventory.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

The nearest classified Wild and Scenic River is a 23-mile segment of the American River, which is located over 80 miles northeast of the project site. The project would therefore not affect a wild and scenic river. Implementation of the project would not conflict with the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Supporting documentation

California _ Rivers.pdf
1044 Howard St - Ntl Wild and Scenic Rivers.pdf
24_NPS_2023_ScenicRivers.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Environmental Justice

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

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

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

✓ Yes

No

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

Yes

✓ No

Explain:

The project site is currently occupied by an existing, vacant building and contains no residential population. No residents would be permanently displaced with implementation of the proposed project. The project site is in Census Tract 176.02 per the 2021 U.S. Census, which had a population of 3,218. Within this tract, approximately 24 percent was white, 22 percent was Black or African American, 45 percent was Asian, 2 percent was Hispanic or Latino, 7 percent was two or more races, and 1 percent was some other race. Approximately, 16.4 percent of families have an income below the poverty line. This is substantially higher than the citywide average of 5 percent Black or African Americans, 34 percent Asian, and 10.3 percent of families with household incomes below the poverty line. Therefore, the project census tract

is considered to have an environmental justice population. The project would provide a new community hall for use by the community, thus providing benefits to an environmental justice population. As analyzed in this EA, the project does not anticipate significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area. This Environmental Justice analysis considered project impacts and their potential to disproportionately affect the project's introduced environmental justice population. Several environmental topics were identified to generate potential effects requiring mitigation. However, impacts would be shared by neighboring non-environmental justice populations, thus the following impacts do not represent impacts with the potential to disproportionately affect an environmental justice population. Air Quality: As discussed above in the section titled Clean Air, criteria pollutant emissions resulting from construction and operation of the project would be below BAAQMD's thresholds of significance. The project would be required to comply with the City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance, and Best Management Practices employed in compliance with the ordinance would be effective in controlling construction-related fugitive dust. Noise: Construction would occur entirely within the City and is therefore subject to the SF Noise Ordinance. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would occur within the allowed hours specified in the SF Noise Ordinance and would not include impact pile driving. In addition, the proposed project would not include substantial vehicle trips, and the project's fixed noise sources, such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, would be subject to noise limits in Article 29 of the Police Code (section 2909, Noise Limits). The proposed project would not result in adverse noise impacts on an environmental justice population with respect to construction and operational noise. Contamination and Toxic Substances: No environmental issues from any businesses that reportedly occupied the subject property or from offsite properties that are expected to have affected the subject property were identified; however, de minimis conditions have been identified due to the potential for asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint at the building. The proposed project would be required to implement a SMP to mitigate both construction impacts and the long-term environmental or health and safety risks and comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The project construction is not expected to result in adverse effects with respect to hazardous materials. Overall, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area to an environmental justice population. Construction of a community hall would result in a beneficial impact for a predominantly minority and low-income population. No adverse

environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project complies with Executive Order 12898.

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

nepa_promising_practices_document_2016.pdf
ExhibitH_23 03 02_EJC Map User Guide.pdf
ExhibitG_23 03 10_EJC Map Technical Documentation_Transmittal_w app.pdf
Environmental_Justice_Communities-Map.pdf
25_CensusReporter_2021_CensusTract176_02.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No