RESPONSES TO COMMENTS on the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement

Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CASE NO. **2010.0305E**
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2012122040

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

Draft EIR/EIS Publication Date:	December 19, 2014
Draft EIR/EIS Public Hearing Dates:	January 20, 2015 (Sunnydale Community Room, 1652 Sunnydale Avenue) January 22, 2015 (San Francisco Planning Commission, City Hall)
Draft EIR/EIS Public Comment Period:	December 19, 2014 – February 17, 2015
Final EIR/EIS Certification Hearing Date:	July 9, 2015

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION | SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DATE: June 24, 2015

TO: Members of the Planning Commission and Interested Parties

FROM: Sarah Jones, Environmental Review Officer

RE: Attached Responses to Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Case No. 2010.0305E for the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project

Attached for your review please find a copy of the Responses to Comments document for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR/EIS) for the above-referenced project. **This document, along with the Draft EIR/EIS, will be before the Planning Commission for Final EIR certification on July 9, 2015.** The Planning Commission will receive public testimony on the Final EIR/EIS certification at the July 9, 2015, hearing. The document will also be considered by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development in its EIS finalization procedures.

Please note that the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS ended on February 17, 2015; any comments received after that date, including any comments provided orally or in writing at the Final EIR/EIS certification hearing, will not be responded to in writing.

The Planning Commission does not conduct a hearing to receive comments on the Responses to Comments document, and no such hearing is required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Interested parties, however, may always write to Commission members or to the President of the Commission at 1650 Mission Street and express an opinion on the Responses to Comments document, or the Commission's decision to certify the completion of the Final EIR/EIS for this project.

Please note that if you receive the Responses to Comments document in addition to the Draft EIR/EIS, you technically have the Final EIR/EIS. If you have any questions concerning the Responses to Comments document or the environmental review process, please contact Kansai Uchida at (415) 575-9048 or kansai.uchida@sfgov.org.

Thank you for your interest in this project and your consideration of this matter.

SUNNYDALE-VELASCO HOPE SF MASTER PLAN PROJECT

Responses to Comments

Planning Department Case No. 2010.0305E
State Clearinghouse No. 2012122040

June 24, 2015

City and County of San Francisco
Planning Department and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Important Dates:

Draft EIR/EIS Publication Date:	December 19, 2014
Draft EIR/EIS Public Comment Period:	December 19, 2014 to February 17, 2015
Draft EIR/EIS Public Hearing Dates:	January 20, 2015; January 22, 2015
Final EIR/EIS Certification Meeting Date:	July 9, 2015

This report is printed on recycled paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project Responses to Comments – Case No. 2010.0305E

This page intentionally left blank

A. Introduction

Purpose of the Responses to Comments Document

The purpose of this Response to Comments (RTC) document is to present comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS) for the proposed Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project, to respond in writing to comments on environmental issues, and to revise the Draft EIR/EIS as necessary to provide additional clarity. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Resource Code Section 21091(d)(2)(A) and (B), the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) has considered the comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS, evaluated the issues raised and is providing written responses that address each substantive environmental issue that has been raised by the commenters. In accordance with CEQA, the responses to comments focus on clarifying the project description and addressing physical environmental issues associated with the proposed project. In accordance with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations, 40 CFR §1503, the Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), as Certifying Officer under 24 CFR Part 58, has assessed and considered the comments on the Draft document and is responding in accordance with 40 CFR §1503.4. The Draft EIR/EIS together with this Responses to Comments document constitutes the Final EIR/EIS for the proposed project in fulfillment of CEQA requirements and consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132. The Final EIR/EIS has been prepared in compliance with CEQA, including the CEQA Guidelines[1] and the San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 31. It is an informational document for use by: (1) governmental agencies (in addition to the CCSF) and the public to aid in the planning and decision-making process by disclosing the physical environmental effects of the project and identifying possible ways of reducing or avoiding the potentially significant impacts; and (2) the CCSF and Planning Commission prior to their decision to approve, disapprove, or modify the proposed project. If the Planning Commission approves the proposed project, it would be required to adopt CEQA findings and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR/EIS are implemented.

MOHCD, as lead agency under NEPA, has ensured that this document has also been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA; 42 USC §4321 et seq.), CEQ Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations for Environmental Review Procedures for Entities Assuming HUD Environmental Responsibilities (24 CFR Part 58).

[1] Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Environmental Review Processes

Joint Document

This Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS is intended to comply with both CEQA and NEPA, pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3 of the *California Code of Regulations* (CCR) (the State CEQA Guidelines), Section 15222 ("Preparation of Joint Documents") and Title 40, Sections 1502.25, 1506.2, and 1506.4 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (40 CFR 1502.25, 1506.2, 1506.4) (authority for combining federal and state environmental documents).

Notice of Intent, Notice of Preparation, and Public Scoping

HUD published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register, Vol. 77, No. 222, on November 16, 2012, to inform agencies and the general public that a Draft EIR/EIS would be prepared by the City and County of San Francisco, as the Responsible Entity in accordance with 24 CFR Part 58.2. The NOI also solicited comments concerning the Draft EIR/EIS. On December 13, 2012, MOHCD mailed a Change in Date of Close of Comment Period Notice to applicable agencies. This notice extended the comment period to January 18, 2013.

The San Francisco Planning Department published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement and Public Scoping Meetings on December 19, 2012, to inform agencies and the general public that the Draft EIR/EIS would be prepared based upon the criteria of the State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15063 (Initial Study), 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), and 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance). This notice was sent to applicable agencies and organizations, tenants of the project site, and addresses within a 300-foot radius of the project site.

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21083.9 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15206, two public scoping meetings were held to receive oral comments concerning the scope of the EIR/EIS. The first meeting was held on January 5, 2013, at Visitacion Valley Branch Library at 201 Leland Avenue, San Francisco, CA. The second meeting was held on Saturday, January 12, 2013, at the Sunnydale Community Room, 1654 Sunnydale Avenue, San Francisco, CA. Attendees were given the opportunity to provide written and oral comments. A scoping report summarizing comments received was finalized in winter 2013.

Draft EIR/EIS Public Review

The San Francisco Planning Department and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development published a Draft EIR/EIS for the proposed project on December 19, 2014, and circulated the Draft EIR/EIS to local, State, and federal agencies and to interested organizations and individuals for a 60-day public review period. Paper copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were made available for public review at the following locations: (1) San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, and Planning Information Counter, 1660 Mission Street; (2) San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, 1 South Van Ness Avenue;

(3) San Francisco Main Library, 100 Larkin Street; (4) Visitacion Valley Branch Library, 201 Leland Avenue; (5) and Sunnydale Health and Wellness Center, 1711 Sunnydale Avenue.[2] During the week prior to the December 19th publication date, the Planning Department and MOHCD also distributed notices of availability of the Draft EIR/EIS; published notification of its availability in a newspaper of general circulation in San Francisco (San Francisco Chronicle); posted the notice of availability at the San Francisco County Clerk's office; and posted notices at locations within the project area.

During the Draft EIR/EIS public review period, the Planning Department and MOHCD received comments from four public agencies and several individuals. Attachment 1 of this RTC document includes copies of the comment letters submitted during the Draft EIR/EIS public review period.

During the 60-day public review period, the Planning Department and MOHCD conducted two public hearings to receive oral comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. The public hearings were held at the Sunnydale Community Room on January 20, 2015, and before the San Francisco Planning Commission on January 22, 2015, at San Francisco City Hall. A court reporter present at the public hearings transcribed the oral comments verbatim and prepared written transcripts (see Attachment 2).

Responses to Comments Document and Final EIR/EIS under CEQA

After the public hearing, the Planning Department and MOHCD prepared and published this "Responses to Comment," document. The Planning Department and MOHCD distributed this Responses to Comments document for review to the San Francisco Planning Commission, as well as to the agencies, organizations, individuals that commented on the Draft EIR/EIS, and individuals that signed in at the January 20, 2015, public hearing.

The Planning Commission will consider the adequacy of the Final EIR/EIS under CEQA in an advertised public meeting. The Final EIR/EIS consists of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Responses to Comments document. If the Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR/EIS complies with CEQA requirements, it will certify the Final EIR/EIS under CEQA.

After certification, the Planning Department will edit the Draft EIR/EIS as specified by the Responses to Comments document and print both documents in a single publication called the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIR/EIS). The Final EIR/EIS will add no new information to the combination of the two documents except to reproduce the certification resolution. It will simply provide the information in one, rather than two documents.

[2] Electronic copies of the EIR/EIS could be accessed through the internet at the following addresses: http://tinyurl.com/sfceqadocs and http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=1314.

Following certification of the Final EIR/EIS, the Planning Commission will review and consider the certified Final EIR/EIS and the associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) before making a decision and taking an approval action on the proposed project. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097, the MMRP is a program designed to ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR/EIS and adopted by decision-makers to mitigate or avoid the project's significant environmental effects are implemented. CEQA also requires the adoption of findings prior to project approval in cases where the certified EIR/EIS identifies significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15092). If the EIR/EIS identifies significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels and the project is approved, the findings must include a statement of overriding considerations for those impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[b]). The project sponsor is required to adopt CEQA findings and the MMRP as conditions of project approval.

Final EIR/EIS Under NEPA for HUD Funded projects

In accordance with updated procedures published by HUD regarding EIS notice requirements for Responsible Entities, EPA will publish a Notice of Availability of the Final EIR/EIS in the Federal Register; MOHCD will publish a NOA in local newspaper of general circulation as well as a Notice of Intent to Request a Release of Funds (NOIRROF) on the same day. After a 30-day comment period and after responding to all comments on the NOIRROF, MOHCD will publish the Record of Decision (ROD) on the proposed action. The ROD will include a Mitigation Monitoring and Enforcement Summary (MMES), similar to the MMRP, that will include a detailed description of all significant impacts and mitigation measures identified.

Document Organization

This Responses to Comments document (EIR/EIS Chapter 9) consists of the following sections, plus supplemental attachments, as described below:

A. **Introduction** – This section discusses the purpose of the RTC document, the environmental review processes, and the organization of the RTC document.

B. **List of Persons Commenting** – This section presents the names of persons who provided comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. The list is organized into the following groups: federal, state, regional, and local agencies, boards and commissions; and individuals.

C. **Comments and Responses** – This section presents the substantive comments excerpted verbatim from the public hearing transcript and comment letters. Similar comments are grouped together by topic area. Following each comment or group of comments on a topic are the City's responses.

D. **Draft EIR/EIS Revisions** – This section includes all of the changes to the Draft EIR/EIS text and graphics and cites the page number where the change is made to the text or graphics.

Attachment 1 – Draft EIR/EIS Comment Letters

Attachment 2 – Draft EIR/EIS Hearing Transcripts

B. List of Persons Commenting

This Responses to Comments document responds to all comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS, including written comments submitted by letter, fax, or email, as well as written and oral comments presented at the public hearings. This section lists all individuals that submitted comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. Commenters are grouped according to whether they commented as individuals or represented a public agency or non-governmental organization. The complete set of written and oral comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS is provided in Attachment 1, Draft EIR/EIS Comment Letters, and Attachment 2, Draft EIR/EIS Hearing Transcripts.

Federal, State, Regional, and Local Agencies, Boards, and Commissions

- United States Department of the Interior; letter, February 17, 2015 (no comments)
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA); letter, February 13, 2015
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); letter, February 2, 2015
- San Francisco Planning Commissioner Michael J. Antonini; public hearing, January 22, 2015
- San Francisco Planning Commissioner Christine D. Johnson, public hearing, January 22, 2015
- San Francisco Planning Commissioner Kathrin Moore; public hearing, January 22, 2015
- San Francisco Planning Commissioner Cindy Wu; public hearing, January 22, 2015

Individuals

- Anthony Billups; public hearing (written comment), January 20, 2015
- Nelson Gutierrez; emails, February 17, 2015, February 18, 2015
- Ting Fe Chen; public hearing January 20, 2015
- Unidentified Speaker (multiple speakers); public hearing, January 20, 2015

C. Staff-Initiated Text Changes

Project Description Revisions

As stated on page 1-4, and reiterated throughout the Draft EIR/EIS, the project site contains 767 dwelling units in the Sunnydale housing complex, and 18 units in the Velasco complex, for a total of 785 existing units on the site.

During preparation of this Responses to Comments document, the project sponsor and San Francisco Housing Authority determined that unit mergers at the Sunnydale complex had resulted in 10 fewer units. Therefore, the project site contains 775 units, as opposed to the 785 units described in the Draft EIR/EIS. The proposed project would result in construction of 1,700 units, for a net increase of 925 units, as opposed to 915 units described in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The Final EIR/EIS will revise these figures globally. The 1-percent difference in net units (925 net units versus 915 net units analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS) would not affect impact analyses or conclusions presented in the EIR/EIS. These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis

or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

Other Revisions

It is noted that there is an error in Section 3.2, Plans and Policies, describing the housing affordability requirement under the San Francisco Planning Code. Page 3.2-4 is revised as follows to correct the number of affordable units that would be built under the proposed project and Variant (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> The *Planning Code* includes a requirement for new developments to pay an Affordable Housing Fee, or to set aside 12 percent of the units on site for affordable housing. The proposed project would exceed this requirement by setting aside ~~32~~ 24 percent (~~295~~221 units) of the added 915 units as affordable housing. In total, approximately 60 percent of the dwelling units in the proposed project would be affordable housing. The Variant would set aside ~~35~~ 26 percent (~~295~~ 221 units) of its added 853 units as affordable housing.

D. Comments and Responses

This section presents summaries of the substantive comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS and responses to those comments. The comments and responses are organized by subject and are generally in the same order as presented in the Draft EIR/EIS, with general comments on the EIR/EIS or proposed project elements grouped together at the beginning of the section. Comments unrelated to a specific impact category are also classified as general comments. Comments on Chapter 1, Executive Summary, or specific mitigation measures are included under the relevant topical section of the Draft EIR/EIS. The order of the comments and responses in this section is shown below, along with the prefix to the topic codes (indicated in square brackets):

General Comments [GC]	Transportation and Circulation [TR]
Project Description [PD]	Air Quality [AQ]
Visual Quality / Aesthetics [AE]	Greenhouse Gases [GG]
Socioeconomics / Population and Housing [PH]	Public Services [PS]
Environmental Justice [EJ]	Hazards and Hazardous Materials [HZ]

Within each subsection under each topic area, similar comments are grouped together and identified using the topic code prefix and sequential numbering for each subtopic. For example, General Comments [GC] are listed as GC-1, GC-2, GC-3, and so on. Each topic code has a corresponding heading that introduces the comment subject; these subsections present quotes of comments and include the commenter's name. However, the reader is referred to Attachments 1 and 2 for the full text and context of each comment.

Following each comment or group of comments, a comprehensive response is provided to address issues raised in the comment and to clarify or augment information in the Draft EIR/EIS as appropriate. Response numbers correspond to the topic code; for example, the response to

comment GC-1 is presented under Response GC-1. The responses may clarify the Draft EIR/EIS text or revise or add text to the EIR/EIS. Revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS are shown as indented text. New or revised text is double underlined; deleted material is shown in ~~strikethrough~~.

General

Comment GC-1: Comment regarding pest control.

"Mercy or whomever develops in Sunnydale projects needs to hire professional exterminators to kill the rats and roaches huge problem in Sunnydale housing projects. Each and every one of these projects needs to be individually taken care of to properly rid of these nasty pest. This would prevent neighboring homes from being infested by rats and roaches. Developers and City of San Francisco is liable if our homes become infested." (Nelson Gutierrez; email, February 17, 2015)

Response GC-1

The comment regarding extermination of existing rats and roaches has been forwarded to the project sponsor for consideration. The demolition of the existing buildings, site grading, and construction of new infrastructure, streets, and buildings to current building code requirements would be expected to reduce or eliminate on-site pests. The project sponsor or its successor(s) would maintain the new buildings in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, including the *San Francisco Health Code,* Article 2, Section 92, Rodent Control, and Article 11, Section 581, Prohibited Public Health Nuisances.

Comment GC-2: Comment stating lack of objection of the EIR/EIS.

"Based on our review, we have rated the Draft EIS as *Lack of Objections (LO)* (see enclosed "Summary of Rating Definitions")." (USEPA, letter, February 13, 2015)

Response GC-2

The commenter states that USEPA has rated the Draft EIS as "Lack of Objections." According to the enclosed summary of rating definitions, this means that the USEPA has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposed project. Therefore, no response is required.

Comment GC-3: The NEPA analysis excluded effects that should be analyzed under NEPA.

"Scope of the National Environmental Policy Act Evaluation

The Draft EIS states that numerous environmental resource impacts are not covered under NEPA and are only evaluated under the California Environmental Quality Act portion of the combined Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Draft EIS. We believe the scope of NEPA analyses is broader than the Draft EIS suggests. The Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Regulations require the environmental consequences section of an EIS to discuss both direct and indirect environmental effects and their significance (40 CFR 1502.16). It is unclear why certain environmental effects are excluded from the NEPA analysis for this project, such as (1) criteria pollutant impacts during operations, (2) air toxics contaminants, (3) effects of hazardous materials on schools, (4) paleontological resources, among many others. Environmental impact areas that are not covered under NEPA for this project are commonly covered within other EISs.

Recommendations for the Final EIS

Please revisit the rationales for determining whether environmental impact assessments are covered under NEPA. Each time the document concludes that an evaluation is not covered under NEPA, please provide a thorough explanation." (USEPA, letter, February 13, 2015)

Response GC-3

The commenter states that it is unclear why certain environmental effects are excluded from NEPA analysis for this project and requests that the EIR/EIS be revised to either (a) explain why specific analyses required under CEQA are not included under NEPA, or (b) add the analyses to the NEPA portion of the EIR/EIS.

The EIR/EIS impact statements were organized to integrate the analysis required under NEPA and CEQA, streamline the discussion of topics that must be covered under both, and minimize repetition.

NEPA requires that an EIS be prepared when the proposed Federal action as a whole has the potential to "significantly [affect] the quality of the human environment…" (42 U.S.C. § 4332.). The NEPA determination of significance is based on context and intensity. An EIS is needed when the proposal has the potential for a significant impact as shown by an Environmental Assessment (EA) or when an agency's initial determination indicates an EIS is appropriate (Id. at § 1501.4.). Under NEPA, federal agencies have developed agency-specific guidelines regarding the content and format of environmental documents. This EIR/EIS was prepared to follow HUD Environmental Review Procedures and Guidelines.

CEQA requires the identification of each "significant effect on the environment" resulting from the whole of the action and ways to mitigate each significant effect (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15064, subd. (a) & 15126.4). If the action may have a significant effect on any environmental resource, an EIR must be prepared (Id. at § 15063, subd. (b)). In

addition, the CEQA Guidelines list a number of circumstances requiring a mandatory finding of significance, and, therefore, preparation of an EIR (Id. at § 15065). Each and every significant effect on the environment must be disclosed in the EIR and mitigated if feasible (Id. at §§ 15126.2 & 15126.4). Agency staff engaged in joint processes should, therefore, take into account that some impacts determined to be significant under CEQA may not necessarily be determined significant under NEPA.[3]

Since the analysis under the two statutory schemes varies, the conclusions are not always consistent. A good example is the different approaches used in assessing impacts to cultural resources. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act does not apply to paleontological resources unless the paleontological specimens are found in culturally related contexts. In such instances the materials are considered cultural resources and are treated in the manner prescribed for the site in question. If paleontological resources are present but not in a culturally related context, the paleontological resources are considered under Unique Natural Resources. This is not the approach taken with CEQA. In the Draft documents such divergences were incorrectly labeled as "Not Covered Under NEPA."

Essentially, what was meant by the phrase was that the project did not have a significant impact upon a particular element of the environment, or that the particular element was discussed elsewhere in the document in accordance with federal schemes.

To provide additional detail to the NEPA analysis, the EIR/EIS has been revised to clear up this confusion. **Table 1**, below, lists each impact criterion that was excluded from the NEPA analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS, as well as the response by MOHCD for that impact criterion being included or excluded from the NEPA analysis. Below the table, the revisions to the EIR/EIS are documented, first within Chapter 4, and then within the Summary chapter.

The additional detail added to the NEPA analysis portions of the EIR/EIS does not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

[3] CEQ and the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), *Integrating Federal and State Environmental Reviews*, published by the Council on Environmental Quality and the California Governor's Office of Policy and Research, available online: http://www.energy.gov/nepa/downloads/nepa-and-ceqa-integrating-state-and-federal-environmental-reviews-final, February 2014.

TABLE 1
IMPACT CRITERIA NOT COVERED UNDER NEPA IN THE DRAFT EIR/EIS

Impact Number	CEQA Impact Statement	Response to comment requesting inclusion of this analysis under NEPA
LU-1	The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. (Less than Significant)	As stated in the EIR/EIS on page 4.3-2, please see Section 4.5, Socioeconomics / Population & Housing, for an analysis of socioeconomic effects related to physical barriers or isolation of a particular group.
CP-3	The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act applies to paleontological resources when the paleontological specimens are found in culturally related contexts (e.g., fossil shell included as a mortuary offering in a burial or a culturally–related site such as petrified wood locale used as a chipped stone quarry). In such instances the materials are considered cultural resources and are treated in the manner prescribed for the site in question; mitigation being almost exclusively limited to sites determined eligible for, or listed on, the National Register of Historic Places. In accordance with HUD guidelines for assessing impacts under 24 CFR Part 58, effects on paleontological resources are analyzed as effects on unique natural features. Unique natural features are "primarily geological features which are unique in the sense that their occurrence is infrequent or they are of special social/cultural, economic, educational, aesthetic, or scientific value. Development on or near them may render them inaccessible to investigators or visitors or otherwise limit potential future use and appreciation of these resources."[4] Depending on the specific natural features being analyzed, such features could be categorized under several EIR/EIS impact categories. The categories most relevant for unique paleontological features would be Visual Quality / Aesthetics, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, and Geology and Soils. Impact CP-3 is revised to address paleontological resources. Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics, and Section 4.17, Geology and Soils, are revised to refer the reader to Section 4.7 for an analysis of paleontological resources as unique natural features.
AQ-1	Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	As stated in Section 4.10, Air Quality, on page 4.10-1, California is required to identify areas where ambient air quality does not comply with the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and to develop and implement State Implementation Plans (SIPs) that detail how the area will comply with the NAAQS. The SIP must be submitted to and approved by USEPA. The federal Clean Air Act prohibits federal assistance to projects that are not in conformance with the SIP. In addition, effects from toxic air contaminants (TACs) are analyzed pursuant to 24 CFR Part 58, Section 5(i)(2). Section 4.10, Air Quality, is revised to address these effects under NEPA. Section 4.19, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, is revised to refer the reader to Section 4.10 for an analysis of effects from TACs.
AQ-2	During project operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)	

[4] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance*, available online: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/, October 2013.

TABLE 1 (Continued)
IMPACT CRITERIA NOT COVERED UNDER NEPA IN THE DRAFT EIR/EIS

Impact Number	CEQA Impact Statement	Response to comment requesting inclusion of this analysis under NEPA
AQ-3	Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	
AQ-4	The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (Less than Significant)	
AQ-5	The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)	
WS-1	The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (Less than Significant)	Analyses of wind and shadow impacts are specific to state environmental review in certain communities. They are not a part of the State of California standard CEQA checklist (Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines). However, wind and shadow affect the human environment, and as such are analyzed under NEPA. HUD's Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance states that shadow effects must be analyzed in relation to visual quality and aesthetics, and climactic extremes related to wind should be considered in the context of energy. Section 4.12, Wind and Shadow, is revised to address these effects under NEPA. Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics, and Section 4.20, Mineral and Energy Resources, are revised to refer the reader to Section 4.12 for analyses of shadow and wind effects, respectively.
WS-2	The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (Less than Significant)	
RE-2	The proposed project would include the construction of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, the construction of which could have adverse physical effects on the environment. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of recreational resources and their capacity to serve the proposed project. This availability is analyzed under Impact RE-1. NEPA does not require separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire project—in this case, recreational facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Therefore, impacts from construction of recreational facilities are analyzed as part of the entire project and included in the applicable EIR/EIS sections, such as 4.08, Transportation and Circulation, 4.09, Noise, and 4.10, Air Quality. Impacts RE-2 and RE-3 are revised to direct the reader to these analyses.
RE-3	The proposed project would not physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)	
UT-2	The proposed project would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the proposed project. These effects are analyzed under Impact UT-1 (wastewater), UT-3 (stormwater), and UT-4 (water). Impact UT-2 is revised to direct the reader to these analyses. NEPA does not require separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire project—in this case, water distribution and wastewater and stormwater collection facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Any effects on the environment associated with construction of this infrastructure are identified in the relevant topic areas of this EIR/EIS, and they would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those sections.
UT-6	The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)	NEPA does not require a separate analysis of whether a proposed project would comply with solid waste regulations. NEPA requires an analysis of availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the proposed project. The provision of solid waste services and effects on the capacity of the solid waste system are analyzed under Impact UT-5. Impact UT-6 is revised to direct the reader to this analysis.

TABLE 1 (Continued)
IMPACT CRITERIA NOT COVERED UNDER NEPA IN THE DRAFT EIR/EIS

Impact Number	CEQA Impact Statement	Response to comment requesting inclusion of this analysis under NEPA
GE-5	The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18 of the *California Building Code*, creating substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)	This is a CEQA-specific criterion, using a definition that is applicable in the State of California. The analysis of geologic effects under NEPA is presented under Impacts GE-1 through GE-4. Impact GE-5 is revised to direct the reader to these analyses.
GE-6	The proposed project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (No Impact)	Effects on septic tanks are addressed under NEPA, as well. Impact GE-6 is revised.
GE-7	The proposed project would not change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (Less than Significant)	Separate discussion of this impact topic is required under CEQA. However, topography is also covered under impact criteria in other sections. For impacts to unique features or scenic resources under NEPA, please see Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics, Impact AE-1. Please also see Impact GE-3, which describes the earthwork activities that would affect the topography of the project site. For impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features, please see Section 4.5, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, under Impact CP-3. Impact GE-7 is revised to direct the reader to these analyses.
HY-4	The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)	NEPA requires an analysis of availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the proposed project. Please see Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, Impact UT-3, for a NEPA analysis of stormwater capacity. Impact HY-1 provides the analysis of impacts to water quality from polluted runoff. Impact HY-4 is revised to direct the reader to these analyses.
HY-6	The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)	NEPA requires an analysis of the probability of local flooding. Therefore, these impact criteria are revised to be included in the NEPA analysis.
HY-7	The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)	
HZ-3	The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)	This specific question in the CEQA checklist derives from the California Education Code, which states (Sec. 17213(b)), among other things, that a school site shall not be approved unless the school district consults with the applicable hazardous materials regulatory agency and local air district "to identify both permitted and nonpermitted facilities within that district's authority, including, but not limited to, freeways and other busy traffic corridors, large agricultural operations, and railyards, within one-fourth of a mile of the proposed school site, that might reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions, or to handle hazardous or extremely hazardous materials, substances, or waste." Therefore, it is a state-specific analysis not required to be discussed separately from the rest of the hazardous materials section under NEPA. NEPA impacts related to hazardous materials release are analyzed under Impacts HZ-1 and HZ-2. Impact HZ-3 is revised to direct the reader to these analyses.

TABLE 1 (Continued)
IMPACT CRITERIA NOT COVERED UNDER NEPA IN THE DRAFT EIR/EIS

Impact Number	CEQA Impact Statement	Response to comment requesting inclusion of this analysis under NEPA
HZ-5	The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)	The potential impairment of emergency response plans is not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA. Instead, this effect is discussed for NEPA purposes in the context of both transportation (congestion effects) and provision of emergency services (public services). Please see Sections 4.08 and 4.15 for an analysis of the NEPA effects associated with provision of emergency services. Impact HZ-5 is revised to direct the reader to these analyses.
ME-1	The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state (No impact.)	In accordance with HUD guidelines for assessing impacts under 24 CFR Part 58, effects on mineral resources are analyzed as effects on unique natural features. Unique natural features are "primarily geological features which are unique in the sense that their occurrence is infrequent or they are of special social/cultural, economic, educational, aesthetic, or scientific value. Development on or near them may render them inaccessible to investigators or visitors or otherwise limit potential future use and appreciation of these resources."[5] Mineral resources may qualify as unique natural features depending on their comparative rareness or informational content. Impacts ME-1 and ME-2 are revised to analyze effects to mineral resources under NEPA. In addition, Section 4.17, Geology and Soils, is revised to refer the reader to Section 4.20 for an analysis of mineral resources to the extent they qualify as unique natural features.
ME-2	The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resources recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. (No Impact)	

[5] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance*, available online: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/, October 2013.

Chapter 4: Visual Quality / Aesthetics

Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics, page 4.4-5, at the top of the page after the bullet list, the following text is added (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> As indicated in Section 3.4 on page 3.4-3, the project site does not contain features considered to be visual or scenic resources and is not considered a visual landmark. Impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features are analyzed in Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, under Impact CP-3.
>
> The shadow effects of buildings are analyzed in Section 4.12, Wind and Shadow.

Chapter 4: Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, page 4.7-9, at the top of the page after the numerical bullet list, the following text is added (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Regarding paleontological resources, no such resources were identified during the public scoping process. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act does not apply to paleontological resources unless the paleontological specimens are found in culturally related contexts (e.g., fossil shell included as a mortuary offering in a burial or a culturally–related site such as petrified wood locale used as a chipped stone quarry). In such instances the materials are considered cultural resources and are treated in the manner prescribed for the site in question; mitigation being almost exclusively limited to sites determined eligible for, or listed on, the NRHP.
>
> HUD guidelines for review under 24 CFR Part 58 recommend analysis of effects on paleontological resources as effects on unique natural features. Unique natural features are "primarily geological features which are unique in the sense that their occurrence is infrequent or they are of special social/cultural, economic, educational, aesthetic, or scientific value. Development on or near them may render them inaccessible to investigators or visitors or otherwise limit potential future use and appreciation of these resources."[6] Therefore, the analysis below considers effects on paleontological resources that may be found in culturally related contexts and may be considered unique natural features.

[6] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance*, available online: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/, October 2013.

Page 4.7-14, top of the page, is revised as follows to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact CP-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The proposed project could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

CEQA: The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.7-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the following paragraph prior to the CEQA conclusion to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

In summary, the impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under NEPA because the proposed project could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature, but **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through M-CP-3d** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level because they require retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

~~the~~ The impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under CEQA because the proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, but **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through M-CP-3~~b~~d** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Page 4.7-17, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-CP-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The Reduced Development / Density Alternative could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.7-18, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the following paragraph prior to the CEQA conclusion to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

In summary, the impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under NEPA because the alternative could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature, but **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through M-CP-3d** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level because they require retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a** through **M-CP-3d** would ensure that impacts would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under CEQA because they would require ~~retainage~~ retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

Page 4.7-21, top of the page, is revised as follows to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-CP-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The One-for-One Replacement Alternative could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.7-21, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the following paragraph prior to the CEQA conclusion to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

In summary, the impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under NEPA because the alternative could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological

resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature, but **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through M-CP-3d** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level because they require retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a** through **M-CP-3d** would ensure that impacts would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under CEQA because they would require ~~retainage~~ retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

Chapter 4: Air Quality

Section 4.10, Air Quality, page 4.10-5, in the middle of the page, the following text is added to include local air quality impact criteria as NEPA criteria (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Context and Intensity Evaluation Guidelines under NEPA

According to HUD regulations 24 CFR, Part 58.5, Subpart A, an environmental analysis of a HUD proposed project must certify that the project complies with the federal Clean Air Act as amended, particularly the General Conformity Rule, conformance with relevant State or Federal Implementation Plans. This analysis utilizes local standards in evaluating conformance with the SIP. In addition, effects from toxic air contaminants (TACs) are analyzed pursuant to 24 CFR Part 58, Section 5(i)(2). Please see below under "Significance Criteria Under CEQA."

Page 4.10-10, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact AQ-1: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Construction

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Impact AQ-1 would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA.
>
> **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1:** Construction Emissions Minimization.

Page 4.10-15, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operation under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ### *Impact AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Operation*
>
> ~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~
>
> **NEPA/CEQA: During project operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)**

Page 4.10-16, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operation under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Operation of the proposed project would include a variety of sources that would contribute to long term emissions of criteria air pollutants (ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$). These sources would include new vehicle trips, maintenance and operation of a standby diesel generator, natural gas combustion and area sources such as landscape equipment and use of consumer products. Calculations of average daily and maximum annual emissions indicate that levels of ROG and NOx, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Page 4.10-17, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ### *Impact AQ-3: Toxic Air Contaminants*
>
> ~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~
>
> **NEPA/CEQA: Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Page 4.10-24, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Construction of the proposed project would generate emissions of toxic air contaminants, including DPM. The project-specific health risk assessment conducted indicated that without mitigation, the project would exceed the significance threshold for increased cancer risk and would be a significant impact. Annual Average concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ would be below 10 μg/m^3 and would be less than significant without mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 (Construction Emissions Minimization), impacts related to increased cancer risk would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA because construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including DPM, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, but emissions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of identified mitigation.

Page 4.10-24, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflict under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ### *Impact AQ-4: Clean Air Plan*
>
> ~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~
>
> **NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (Less than Significant)**

Page 4.10-25, third full paragraph, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflict under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, and this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Page 4.10-25, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odor effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ### *Impact AQ-5: Odors*
>
> ~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~
>
> **NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)**

Page 4.10-26, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odor effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Additionally, the proposed project includes is residential in nature with a small retail component (i.e., 16,200 square feet) and would not create a significant sources of new odors. Therefore, odor impacts would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.
>
> **Mitigation:** None required.

Page 4.10-27, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-1: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Construction

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction of the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-28, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Impact A-AQ-1 would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA.
>
> **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1:** Construction Emissions Minimization.

Page 4.10-29, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operations under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Operation

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: During Reduced Development / Density Alternative operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-30, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operations under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> In summary, operation of the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would include a variety of sources that would contribute to long term emissions of criteria air pollutants (ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$). These sources would include new vehicle trips, maintenance and operation of a standby diesel generator, natural gas combustion and area sources such as landscape equipment and use of consumer products. Calculations of average daily and maximum annual emissions indicate that levels of ROG and NOx, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.
>
> **Mitigation:** None required.

Page 4.10-31, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ***Impact A-AQ-3: Toxic Air Contaminants***
>
> ~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~
>
> **NEPA/CEQA: Construction and operation of the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Page 4.10-32, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Construction of the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would generate emissions of toxic air contaminants, including DPM. The health risk assessment conducted indicated that without mitigation, the project would exceed the significance threshold for increased cancer risk and would be a significant impact. Annual Average concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ would be below 10 ug/m^3 and would be less than significant without mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 (Construction Emissions Minimization), impacts related to increased cancer risk would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA because construction and operation of the alternative would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, but emissions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of identified mitigation.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization.

Page 4.10-32, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflict under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-4: Clean Air Plan

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-33, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflict under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

The Reduced Development / Density Alternative characteristics that would reduce emissions would be substantially similar to those of the proposed project. The alternative would not interfere with implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, and because the Reduced Development/Density Alternative would be consistent with the applicable air quality plan that demonstrates how the region will improve ambient air quality and achieve the state and federal ambient air quality standards, this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.10-33, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odors under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-5: Odors

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-33, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odors under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Therefore, odor impacts would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.10-35, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-1: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Construction

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-37, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-1 would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization.

Page 4.10-37, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operation under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Operation

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: During One-for-One Replacement Alternative operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (No Impact)

The transportation analysis shows that operation of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would have the same vehicle trip generation as what currently exits from the project site and there would be no increase in mobile emissions. Area source emissions from consumer products and landscape maintenance equipment and architectural coatings would also remain the same as current conditions given the same number of residential units. There would be a slight decrease in energy emissions from natural gas combustion for water and space heating given increased building efficiencies, but this reduction would be minor (less than 1 pound per day). Consequently, there would be ***no impact*** under both NEPA and

CEQA with regard to operational criteria air pollutant emissions under the One-for-One Replacement Alternative.

Page 4.10-37, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-3: Toxic Air Contaminants

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction and operation of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-38, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Construction of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would generate emissions of toxic air contaminants, including DPM. The health risk assessment conducted indicated that without mitigation, the project would exceed the significance threshold for increased cancer risk and would be a significant impact. Annual average concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ would be below 10 ug/m^3 and would be less than significant without mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 (Construction Emissions Minimization), impacts related to increased cancer risk would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, this impact of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA because construction and operation of the alternative would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, but emissions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of identified mitigation.

Page 4.10-39, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflicts under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-4: Clean Air Plan

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-39, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflicts under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, and this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Page 4.10-39, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odors under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ***Impact B-AQ-5: Odors***
>
> ~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~
>
> **NEPA/CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)**
>
> Construction of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would emit diesel exhaust from construction equipment would generate some odors. These odors would be similar to the odors that would be generated under construction of the proposed project and Alternative A, but for a shorter duration.
>
> The existing 785 residential units on the project site would be replaced. The alternative would not involve operation of odor sources of concern. As under existing conditions, the project site would not be substantially affected by sources of odors.[7]
>
> Therefore, odor impacts would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Chapter 4: Wind and Shadow

Section 4.12, Wind and Shadow, page 4.12-2, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why wind and shadow are not analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> **Context and Intensity Evaluation Guidelines under NEPA**
>
> ~~Wind and shadow are not analyzed under NEPA.~~ Wind and shadow affect the human environment, and as such are analyzed under NEPA. HUD's Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance states that shadow effects must be

[7] An ESA air quality and noise analyst conducted noise monitoring on April 24th and 25th 2013 during which observations regarding wind, cloud cover and the absence of noticeable odors were also noted.

analyzed in relation to visual quality and aesthetics, and climactic extremes related to wind should be considered. This analysis utilizes the local standards for evaluation of wind and shadow. Please see below under "Significance Criteria Under CEQA."

Page 4.12-3, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of wind effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact WS-1: Wind Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.12-4, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of wind and shadow effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Accordingly, the proposed project would be expected to result in a ***less-than-significant*** wind impact under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact WS-2: Shadow Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.12-13, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of shadow effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

The impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the proposed project would create new shadow in a manner that would not substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.12-14, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of wind effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-WS-1: Wind Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.12-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of wind and shadow effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

The wind impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact A-WS-2: Shadow Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (Less than Significant)

Pages 4.12-15 through 4.12-17 are revised as follows to include the analysis of wind and shadow effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

The impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would create new shadow in a manner that would not substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

Mitigation: None required.

Alternative B: One-for-One Replacement Alternative

Impact B-WS-1: Wind Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (No Impact)

The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would result in the same site plan, building massings, and building heights as under existing conditions. Given that the buildings would be located in the same location and that they would maintain their current configuration, they would not noticeably change ground-level wind patterns.

There would be ***no impact*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the alternative would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact B-WS-2: Shadow Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (No Impact)

Given that the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would result in the same building locations, heights, and massings as under existing conditions, no net new shadow would be cast as a result of the alternative.

There would be ***no impact*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the alternative would create new shadow in a manner that would not substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public area.

Mitigation: None required.

Alternative C: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not change the site plan, building heights, or building massings on the project site. The existing Sunnydale and Velasco buildings would remain in their current configurations. There would be no change

to wind or shadow conditions on the site, and there would be ***no impacts*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

4.12.3 Cumulative Impacts

Impact CC-WS: Cumulative Wind and Shadow Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse wind and shadow impacts. (Less than Significant)

Proposed Project, Variant, and Alternative A

Given that wind and shadow effects are highly location-dependent, the geographic context for cumulative wind and shadow effects encompasses the immediate project site vicinity—a few blocks (less than one-quarter of a mile) in each direction. It is in this vicinity that cumulative development, when combined with the proposed project or its alternatives, could have any effect on wind and shadow on the same locations.

Regarding cumulative wind impacts, as indicated under Impacts WS-1, above, the proposed project and its alternatives would result in buildings that would not be substantially taller than nearby buildings, and less than 80 feet tall. There are no reasonably foreseeable future developments in the cumulative geographic context that would be that tall either. The project's, variant's, and Alternative A's new buildings would be of an orientation and density that would reduce wind between buildings and increase wind speeds along the northern and western project boundaries. The cumulative impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the proposed project, variant, or alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse wind impacts.

Regarding cumulative shadow impacts, the proposed project, variant, and Alternative A would result in net new shadow on the southern edge of McLaren Park, including Herz Playground and Gleneagles Golf Course. The only reasonably foreseeable future project in proximity to these facilities is the proposed bike skills park on the north side of Sunnydale Avenue, east of the project site. The bike skills park project, however, would not include large new structures or buildings that could cast shadow on the golf course, and the proposed project, variant, and Alternative A would not cast shadow on the bike skills park.

There are no other reasonably foreseeable future developments in the project site vicinity that would result in substantial new shadow on these recreational features at other times of day. Although the project and cumulative development would result in increased shading on public sidewalks, this shading would be typical for built-out urban areas away from the downtown skyscraper core. Cumulative shadow effects would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because no other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects would cast shadows on parks.

Alternative B

Alternative B's buildings would result in wind and shadow conditions almost identical to existing conditions. There would be ***no cumulative impact***.

Chapter 4: Recreation

Section 4.13, Recreation, page 4.13-4, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact RE-2: Effects Due to Construction

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire project—in this case, recreational facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Therefore, impacts from construction of recreational facilities are analyzed as part of the entire project and included in the applicable EIR/EIS sections, such as 4.08, Transportation and Circulation, 4.09, Noise, and 4.10, Air Quality.

CEQA: The proposed project would include the construction of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, the construction of which could have adverse physical effects on the environment. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.13-4, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact RE-3: Physical Degradation Effects

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires analysis of the availability of recreational resources and their capacity to serve the proposed project. This availability is analyzed under Impact RE-1. NEPA does not require a separate analysis of physical degradation from the analysis of recreational capacity.

CEQA: The proposed project would not physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.13-6, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-RE-2: Effects Due to Construction

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire alternative—in this case, recreational facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Therefore, impacts from construction of recreational facilities are analyzed as part of the entire alternative and included in the applicable EIR/EIS sections, such as 4.08, Transportation and Circulation, 4.09, Noise, and 4.10, Air Quality.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would include construction of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, the construction of which could have adverse physical effects on the environment. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.13-7, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-RE-3: Physical Degradation Effects

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of recreational resources and their capacity to serve the alternative. This availability is analyzed under Impact A-RE-1. NEPA does not require separate analysis of physical degradation from the analysis of recreational capacity.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.13-8, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-RE-2: Effects Due to Construction

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire alternative—in this case, recreational facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Therefore, impacts from construction of recreational facilities are analyzed as part of the entire alternative and included in the applicable EIR/EIS sections, such as 4.08, Transportation and Circulation, 4.09, Noise, and 4.10, Air Quality.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, the construction of which would have less-than-significant adverse physical effects on the environment. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.13-7, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-RE-3: Physical Degradation Effects

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of recreational resources and their capacity to serve the alternative. This availability is analyzed under Impact B-RE-1. NEPA does not require separate analysis of physical degradation from the analysis of recreational capacity.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

Chapter 4: Utilities and Service Systems

Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, page 4.14-8, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact UT-2: Effects Related to Construction of New Facilities

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the proposed project. These effects are analyzed under Impact UT-1 (wastewater), UT-3 (stormwater), and UT-4 (water). In addition, NEPA does not require separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire project—in this case, water distribution and wastewater and stormwater collection facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Any effects on the environment associated with construction of this infrastructure are identified in the relevant topic areas of this EIR/EIS, and they would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those sections.

CEQA: The proposed project would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant with ~~mitigation~~ Mitigation)

Page 4.14-12, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact UT-6: Effects Related to Regulations of Solid Waste

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of whether a proposed project would comply with solid waste regulations. NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the proposed project. The provision of solid waste services and effects on the capacity of the solid waste system are analyzed under Impact UT-5.

CEQA: The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.14-14, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-UT-2: Effects Related to Construction of New Facilities

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the alternative. These effects are analyzed under Impact A-UT-1 (wastewater), A-UT-3 (stormwater), and A-UT-4 (water). In addition, NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire alternative—in this case, water distribution and wastewater and stormwater collection facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Any effects on the environment associated with construction of this infrastructure are identified in the relevant topic areas of this EIR/EIS, and they would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those sections.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.14-17, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-UT-6: Effects Related to Regulations of Solid Waste

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require separate analysis of whether an alternative would comply with solid waste regulations. NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and

their capacity to serve the alternative. The provision of solid waste services and effects on the capacity of the solid waste system are analyzed under Impact A-UT-5.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.14-18, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-UT-2: Effects Related to Construction of New Facilities

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the alternative. These effects are analyzed under Impact B-UT-1 (wastewater), B-UT-3 (stormwater), and B-UT-4 (water). In addition, NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire alternative—in this case, water distribution and wastewater and stormwater collection facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Any effects on the environment associated with construction of this infrastructure are identified in the relevant topic areas of this EIR/EIS, and they would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those sections.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.14-21, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-UT-6: Effects Related to Regulations of Solid Waste

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of whether an alternative would comply with solid waste regulations. NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the alternative. The provision of solid waste services and effects on the capacity of the solid waste system are analyzed under Impact B-UT-5.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)

Chapter 4: Geology and Soils

Section 4.17, Geology and Soils, page 4.17-3, is revised as follows to clarify that geologic effects on septic systems, and effects to unique mineral resources, are analyzed under NEPA:

Context and Intensity Evaluation Guidelines under NEPA

These thresholds encompass the factors taken into account under NEPA to determine the significance of an action in terms of the context and intensity of its effects. For geology and soils, the analysis considers whether the proposed project or alternatives would:

- Result in substantial risk of injury or death due to collapse of structures or damage to infrastructure because of ground failure or groundshaking;
- Result in substantial damage to foundations or other infrastructure due to liquefaction, differential settlement, lateral spreading, expansive soils, corrosive soils, or other adverse engineering properties of soils;
- Destabilize existing geologic conditions or accelerate adverse geologic processes;
- Expose people or structures to substantial threat of injury or damage from slope failure; or
- Cause substantial soil erosion.
- Allow for adequate site drainage for the installation and support of septic systems.

Effects to mineral resources as unique natural features are addressed in Section 4.20, Mineral and Energy Resources.

Page 4.17-9, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why expansive soils are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact GE-5: Effects from Expansive Soils

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ This is a CEQA-specific criterion, using a definition that is applicable in the State of California. The analysis of geologic effects under NEPA is presented under Impacts GE-1 through GE-4.

CEQA: The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18 of the *California Building Code*, creating substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-10, middle of the page, is revised as follows to analyze geologic effects on septic tanks under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact GE-6: Effects on Septic Tanks

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The proposed project would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include installation of septic systems. (No Impact)

CEQA: The proposed project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (No Impact)

The proposed project would not include any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems and therefore there would be no impact for this criterion.

There would be ***no impact*** under either NEPA or CEQA.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.17-10, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why effects on topography are not required to be separately analyzed in NEPA geology and soils analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact GE-7: Effects on Topography

NEPA: This topic is not required to be covered under NEPA in this section. For impacts to unique features or scenic resources, please see Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics. For impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features, please see Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Please also see Impact GE-3, which describes the earthwork activities that would affect the topography of the site.

CEQA: The proposed project would not change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why expansive soils are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-GE-5: Effects from Expansive Soils

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ This is a CEQA-specific criterion, using a definition that is applicable in the State of California. The analysis of geologic effects under NEPA is presented under Impacts A-GE-1 through A-GE-4.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18 of the *California Building Code*, creating substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-15, top of the page, is revised as follows to analyze geologic effects on septic tanks under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-GE-6: Effects on Septic Tanks

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include installation of septic systems. (No Impact)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (No Impact)

The Reduced Development/Density Alternative would not include any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, and there would be ***no impact*** under either NEPA or CEQA for this criterion.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.17-15, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why effects on topography are not required to be separately analyzed in NEPA geology and soils analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-GE-7: Effects on Topography

NEPA: This topic is not required to be covered under NEPA in this section. For impacts to unique features or scenic resources, please see Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics. For impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features, please see Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Please also see Impact A-GE-3, which describes the earthwork activities that would affect the topography of the site.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-18, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why expansive soils are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-GE-5: Effects from Expansive Soils

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ This is a CEQA-specific criterion, using a definition that is applicable in the State of California. The analysis of geologic effects under NEPA is presented under Impacts B-GE-1 through B-GE-4.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18 of the *California Building Code*, creating substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-19, top of the page, is revised as follows to analyze geologic effects on septic tanks under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-GE-6: Effects on Septic Tanks

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include the installation of septic systems. (No Impact)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (No Impact)

The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not include any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, and there would be ***no impact*** under either NEPA or CEQA for this criterion.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.17-19, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why effects on topography are not required to be separately analyzed in NEPA geology and soils analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-GE-7: Effects on Topography

NEPA: This topic is not required to be covered under NEPA in this section. For impacts to unique features or scenic resources, please see Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics. For impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features, please see Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Please also see Impact B-GE-3, which describes the earthwork activities that would affect the topography of the site.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (Less than Significant)

Chapter 4: Hydrology and Water Quality

Section 4.18, Hydrology and Water Quality, page 4.18-13, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA requires separate analysis of capacity and effects on water quality (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact HY-4: Effects on Stormwater Capacity

NEPA: This topic is not required to be separately addressed in the analysis of Hydrology under NEPA. The NEPA analysis of stormwater capacity is provided in Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, under Impact UT-3. The NEPA analysis of the effects of polluted runoff on water quality is provided under Impact HY-1, above.

CEQA: The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.18-15, bottom of the page, and page 4.18-16, top of the page, are revised as follows to include effects of any flooding in the NEPA analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact HY-6: Effects from Dam or Levee Failure

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

CEQA: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

The project site is not located within any dam inundation areas and is not otherwise protected by a levee system.[8]

There would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam.

[8] Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), *Dam Failure Inundation Hazard Map for San Francisco*, http://www.abag.ca.gov/cgi-bin/pickdamx.pl, accessed March 19, 2013. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2010.0305E.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact HY-7: Effects from Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

CEQA: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

The project site is located at an elevation of 75 to 250 feet above sea level and not subject to tsunami or seiche wave run-up. According to inundation hazard maps of the *San Francisco General Plan* (Maps 6 and 7 in the Community Safety Element), the project site is outside of any identified hazard areas.

Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

~~Therefore, there~~ There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.18-19, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA requires separate analysis of capacity and effects on water quality (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-HY-4: Effects on Stormwater Capacity

NEPA: This topic is not required to be addressed in the analysis of Hydrology under NEPA. The NEPA analysis of stormwater capacity is provided in Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, under Impact A-UT-3. The NEPA analysis of the effects of polluted runoff on water quality is provided under Impact A-HY-1, above.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.18-20 is revised as follows to include effects of any flooding in the NEPA analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-HY-6: Effects from Dam or Levee Failure

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

The project site is not located within any dam inundation areas and is not otherwise protected by a levee system.[9]

There would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact A-HY-7: Effects from Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

The project site is located at an elevation of 75 to 250 feet above sea level and not subject to tsunami or seiche wave run-up. The project site is outside of identified hazard areas.

Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

9 Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), 2013, *op cit*.

~~Therefore there~~ There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.18-23, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA requires separate analysis of capacity and effects on water quality (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-HY-4: Effects on Stormwater Capacity

NEPA: This topic is not required to be addressed in the analysis of Hydrology under NEPA. The NEPA analysis of stormwater capacity is provided in Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, under Impact B-UT-3. The NEPA analysis of the effects of polluted runoff on water quality is provided under Impact B-HY-1, above.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.18-24, bottom of the page, and page 4.18-25, top of the page, are revised as follows to include effects of any flooding in the NEPA analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-HY-6: Effects from Dam or Levee Failure

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

The project site is not located within any dam inundation areas and is not otherwise protected by a levee system.[10]

There would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam.

[10] Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), 2013, *op cit*.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact B-HY-7: Effects from Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA~~. The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

The project site is located at an elevation of 75 to 250 feet above sea level and not subject to tsunami or seiche wave run-up.

Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Mitigation: None required.

Chapter 4: Hazards

Section 4.19, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, page 4.19-7, middle of the page after the first bullet list, is revised as follows to clarify NEPA requirements for air quality analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Effects from toxic air contaminants (TACs) are analyzed, pursuant to 24 CFR Part 58, Section 5(i)(2), in Section 4.10, Air Quality.

Page 4.19-13, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects of hazardous materials on schools (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools

NEPA: This topic is not required to be separately covered under NEPA. NEPA impacts related to hazardous materials release are analyzed under Impacts HZ-1 and HZ-2 and include any effects on schools from hazardous materials.

CEQA: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects on emergency response plans (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact HZ-5: Effects on Emergency/Evacuation Plans

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The potential impairment of emergency response plans are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA in this section. Instead, this effect is discussed in context of both transportation (congestion effects) and provision of emergency services (public services). Please see Sections 4.08 and 4.15 for an analysis of the NEPA effects associated with provision of emergency services.

CEQA: The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-18, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects of hazardous materials on schools (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools

NEPA: This topic is not required to be separately covered under NEPA. NEPA impacts related to hazardous materials release are analyzed under Impacts A-HZ-1 and A-HZ-2 and include any effects on schools from hazardous materials.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-19, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects on emergency response plans (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-HZ-5: Effects on Emergency/Evacuation Plans

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The potential impairment of emergency response plans are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA in this section. Instead, this effect is discussed in context of both transportation (congestion effects) and provision of emergency services (public services). Please see Sections 4.08 and 4.15 for an analysis of the NEPA effects associated with provision of emergency services.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-23, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects of hazardous materials on schools (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools

NEPA: This topic is not required to be separately covered under NEPA. NEPA impacts related to hazardous materials release are analyzed under Impacts B-HZ-1 and B-HZ-2 and include impacts upon schools.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-23, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects on emergency response plans (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-HZ-5: Effects on Emergency/Evacuation Plans

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The potential impairment of emergency response plans are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA in this section. Instead, this effect is discussed, in context of both transportation (congestion effects) and provision of emergency services (public services). Please see Sections 4.08 and 4.15 for an analysis of the NEPA effects associated with provision of emergency services.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Chapter 4: Mineral and Energy Resources

Section 4.20, Mineral and Energy Resources, page 4.20-6, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain that HUD does not analyze impacts to mineral resources (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Context and Intensity Evaluation Guidelines under NEPA

HUD guidance states that the opportunities for energy efficiency should be considered when evaluation environmental effects. The specific criterion used to evaluate the project's effect on energy resources is as follows:

- Incorporate insufficient energy efficiency measures or result in energy consumption requiring a significant increase in energy production for the energy provider.

Regarding mineral resources, HUD guidelines recommend that effects on such resources be analyzed as effects on unique natural features. Unique natural features are "primarily geological features which are unique in the sense that their occurrence is infrequent or they are of special social/cultural, economic, educational, aesthetic, or scientific value. Development on or near them may render them inaccessible to investigators or visitors or otherwise limit potential future use and appreciation of these resources."[11] Mineral resources may qualify as unique natural features depending on their comparative rareness or informational content.

Pages 4.20-6 to 4.20-7 are revised as follows to include the applicable analysis of mineral resources (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact ME-1: Effects on Known Mineral Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary. (No Impact)

CEQA: The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. (No Impact)

The project site is mapped by the California Geologic Survey as either MRZ-1 or MRZ-4, indicating that substantial mineral resources do not occur at the site. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE-SF Master Plan project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

There is ***no impact*** under NEPA because there are no mineral resources present.

Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact ME-2: Effects on Mineral Resource Recovery Sites

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ Analysis of effects on mineral resource or recovery sites under NEPA is addressed under Impact ME-1.

[11] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance*, available online: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/, October 2013.

Page 4.20-8, top of the page, is revised as follows to direct reader to the wind analysis in Section 4.12 (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> (LEED-ND) certification, which would reduce energy demand compared to traditional developments through building materials and fixtures selection, environmental systems design, and construction efficiency measures.
>
> The new, taller buildings would create surfaces that would increase the overall structural surface exposure to winds that travel across the project site. This exposure would be typical of buildings in San Francisco, and would not require a substantial increase in energy consumption for building heating. Please see Section 4.12, under Impact WS-1, for an analysis of the project's effect on wind speeds in public areas.

Pages 4.20-8 to 4.20-9 are revised as follows to include the applicable analysis of mineral resources (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-ME-1: Effects on Known Mineral Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary. (No Impact)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. (No Impact)

The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would occur in the same location as the proposed project. Therefore, it would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

There is ***no impact*** under NEPA because there are no mineral resources present.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact A-ME-2: Effects on Mineral Resource Recovery Sites

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ Analysis of effects on mineral resource or recovery sites under NEPA is addressed under Impact A-ME-1.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. (No Impact)

Page 4.20-10 is revised as follows to include the applicable analysis of mineral resources (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-ME-1: Effects on Known Mineral Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary. (No Impact)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. (No Impact)

The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would occur in the game geographic extent as the proposed project. The alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

There is ***no impact*** under NEPA because there are no mineral resources present.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact B-ME-2: Effects on Mineral Resource Recovery Sites

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ Analysis of effects on mineral resource or recovery sites under NEPA is addressed under Impact B-ME-1.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. (No Impact)

Executive Summary

Beginning on the next page, the text revisions that incorporate analyses under NEPA are added to **Tables S-1** and **S-3** in the Executive Summary. (No changes are made to the CEQA analysis.) For each applicable effect, a row is inserted into each table. In Table S-3, the impact determination acronyms are as follows:

- LTS: Less-than-significant impact; no mitigation required
- SM: Less-than-significant impact with mitigation
- SU: Significant unavoidable impact
- SB: Significant and beneficial
- NI: No Impact

The Draft EIR/EIS page number is provided for reference.

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-13, prior to the row for **Impact CP-4** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

CP-3: The proposed project could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature.	**Significant**	**Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a: Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program.** Prior to ground disturbance, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified paleontologist (is a practicing scientist who is recognized in the paleontologic community and is proficient in vertebrate paleontology) or a California Professional Geologist with appropriate paleontological expertise to carry out all mitigation measures related to paleontological resources. The qualified paleontologist or geologist shall be available "on-call" to project sponsor throughout the duration of ground-disturbing activities. **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3b: Paleontological resources training.** All construction forepersons and field supervisors conducting or overseeing subsurface excavations shall be trained by a qualified paleontologist in the recognition of potential fossil materials prior to ground disturbing activities. A one hour pre-construction training on paleontological resources shall also be provided to all other construction workers, but may include videotape of the initial training and/or the use of written materials rather than in person training by the qualified paleontologist. In addition to fossil recognition, the training shall convey procedures to follow in the event of a potential fossil discovery. **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3c: Assessment and salvage of potential fossil finds.** If potential fossils are discovered during construction, all earthwork or other types of ground disturbance in the immediate vicinity of the find shall stop until the qualified paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the fossil. If salvage is required, recommendations shall be consistent with current professional standards outlined in the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines. If required, treatment for fossil remains may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection. **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3d: Monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during ground disturbing activities.** If fossils are discovered during construction, a qualified paleontologist shall determine whether monitoring shall be required during remaining ground disturbing activities. If required, a qualified paleontologist, a California Professional Geologist with appropriate paleontological expertise, or paleontological monitor working under the supervision of a qualified paleontologist shall monitor ground-disturbing activities. This monitoring shall consist of periodically inspecting disturbed, graded, and excavated surfaces, as well as soil stockpiles and disposal sites. The frequency of monitoring would be determined by the qualified paleontologist. If the monitor encounters a paleontological resource, he or she shall assess the fossil, and record or salvage it as described in M-CP-2c.	Less than Significant

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-17, prior to the rows for "Biological Resources" and **Impact BI-1** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

Air Quality			
AQ-1: Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	Significant	**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization** A. *Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.* Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the requirements below. The project sponsor or construction contractor shall assign a construction manager to ensure compliance with the requirements: 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited; b) All off-road equipment shall have: i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. EPA or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 3 off-road emission standards, and ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).[12] c) Exceptions: i. Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation. ii. Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) *may* be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the	Less than Significant

[12] Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement, therefore a VDECS would not be required.

Air Quality

requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).

iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules in **Table M-AQ-1-1** and shall provide documentation that emissions are sufficiently reduced to ensure criteria air pollutants, excess cancer risks and PM2.5 concentrations do not exceed significance criteria.

TABLE M-AQ-1-1
OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP-DOWN SCHEDULE

Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control
1	Tier 2	ARB Level 3 VDECS
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS
3	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS

How to use the table: If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.

2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.
3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators locate staging areas and stationary construction equipment such as generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors and building HVAC intakes.
4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model,

Air Quality			
		manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used. 5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan to members of the public as requested. B. *Reporting.* Quarterly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used. Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used. C. *Certification Statement and On-site Requirements.* Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.	

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-24, prior to the row for **Impact AQ-6** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

AQ-2: During project operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-17, after the new row for Impact AQ-1, above (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

AQ-3: Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	**Significant**	**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Constructions Emissions Minimization (see above)**	Less than Significant

The following rows are inserted in Table S-1 on page S-24, after the row for Impact AQ-2, above (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

AQ-4: The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant
AQ-5: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant

The following rows are inserted in Table S-1 on page S-24, prior to the rows for "Recreational Resources" and **Impact RE-1** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

Wind and Shadow			
WS-1: The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant
WS-2: The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant
CC-WS: The proposed project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse wind and shadow impacts.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-26, after the row for **Impact GE-4** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

GE-6: The proposed project would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include the installation of septic systems.	**No Impact**	None required.	No Impact

The following rows are inserted in Table S-1 on page S-27, after the row for **Impact HY-5** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

HY-6: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam.	**No Impact**	None required.	No Impact
HY-7: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	**No Impact**	None required.	No Impact

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-28, before the row for Impact ME-3 (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

ME-1: There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present in at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary.	**No Impact**	None required.	No Impact

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-60, after the row for **Impact CP-2** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

Paleontological Resources	**CP-3:** The proposed project could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature. (SM)	**A-CP-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (SM)	**B-CP-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (SM)	**C-CP-1:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-63, before the row for **Impact AQ-6** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Impacts	**AQ-1:** Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (SM)	**A-AQ-1:** Similar to but less than the proposed project. (SM)	**B-AQ-1:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)	**C-AQ-1:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)
Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Impacts	**AQ-2:** During project operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (LTS)	**A-AQ-2:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**B-AQ-2:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**C-AQ-2:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)
Toxic Air Contaminants	**AQ-3:** Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (SM)	**A-AQ-3:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)	**B-AQ-3:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)	**C-AQ-3:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)
Clean Air Plan	**AQ-4:** The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (LTS)	**A-AQ-4:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**B-AQ-4:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**C-AQ-4:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)
Odors	**AQ-5:** The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (LTS)	**A-AQ-5:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**B-AQ-5:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**C-AQ-5:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-64, after before the row for Utilities and Service Systems (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

Wind and Shadow				
Wind	**WS-1:** The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (LTS)	**A-WS-1:** Similar to, but less than, the proposed project. (LTS)	**B- WS-1:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)	**C- WS-1:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)
Shadow	**WS-2:** The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (LTS)	**A-WS-2:** Similar to, but less than, the proposed project. (LTS)	**B- WS-2:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C- WS-2:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)
Cumulative	**CC-WS:** The proposed project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse wind and shadow impacts. (LTS)	**CC- WS:** Similar to, but less than, the proposed project. (LTS)	**CC- WS:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)	**CC- WS:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following row is inserted in Table S-3 on page S-66, after the row for **Impact GE-4** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

Support Septic Systems	**GE-6:** The proposed project would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include the installation of septic systems. (NI)	**A-GE-6:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**B-GE-6:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C-GE-6:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-66, after the row for **Impact HY-5** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

Flood from Levee or Dam Failure	**HY-6:** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam. (NI)	**A-HY-6:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**B-HY-6:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C-HY-6:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)
Flood from Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflow	**HY-7:** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (NI)	**A-HY-7:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**B-HY-7:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C-HY-7:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-67, before the row for **Impact ME-3** (addition of impact and mitigation under NEPA):

Mineral Resources	**ME-1:** There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary. (LTS)	**A-ME-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**B-ME-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C-ME-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)

Comment GC-4: Comments regarding the process of public outreach and public comment within environmental review.

"I have a question. Myself included, I can't speak for everyone, but I feel like I'm still trying to figure out where this whole meeting is going towards. I mean, I was talking to -- I should kind of clarify. I just want to address it because I may not be the only one who's feeling that way. So if you could be a little more clear about your intention, like, the meeting kind of like a -- what are your options that you're looking for?" (Unidentified Speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

"If you have questions after this meeting, how would you be able to submit your questions? … And also, you have that bulletin that it's referring to. Is that online somewhere?" (Unidentified Speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

"And those of us that's on your mailing list, you will keep informed?" (Unidentified Speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

"I forgot to include Mercy and San Francisco Planning dept have not communicated with the residents in Visitacion Valley about meetings/hearing dates concerning Sunnydale project redevelopment. No notice or mailed notice." (Nelson Gutierrez, email, February 18, 2015)

Response GC-4

One commenter asks the purpose of the public hearing held at the Sunnydale Community Center on January 20, 2015. Another commenter asks whom to contact with additional questions / comments. A third commenter requests to be informed of project updates. A fourth commenter states that the project sponsor and Planning Department have not informed the community about meetings or hearings.

As stated by City staff at the hearing and in the Notice of Availability, the purpose of the public hearing was to allow the public to provide comments on the adequacy and accuracy of the Draft EIR/EIS. A second public hearing was held on January 22, 2015, at the Planning Commission at City Hall. The public and agencies were also invited to submit comments in writing to the Planning Department and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development.

The public comment period on the Draft EIR/EIS was from December 19, 2014, through 5:00 p.m. on February 17, 2015. The public comment period is now closed. The EIR/EIS can be found on the Planning Department's website at http://www.sf-planning.org/sfceqadocs and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development website at http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=1314

This Response to Comments document contains a summary of all relevant comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, as well as responses to those comments, along with copies of the letters received and transcripts of the public hearings. All commenters on the Draft EIR/EIS who provided their name and contact information will be informed of publication of the Response to Comments document. In addition, the project sponsor will continue to hold meetings in the community as the project moves forward.

For more information about the Draft EIR/EIS, please contact Kansai Uchida at the San Francisco Planning Department at (415) 575-9048 or kansai.uchida@sfgov.org.

Regarding prior meetings and hearings, please see Section 3.6, Environmental Justice. As stated on page 3.6-5, the project sponsor has organized a community planning process for the proposed project. Between November 2008 and May 2011, the sponsor held a total of 19 meetings and workshops at the project site and the surrounding community to develop the Master Plan. The sponsor mailed notices in English, Chinese, Spanish, and Samoan, and language interpretation and activities for children were provided. The sponsor had notices posted on the VisValley EYE neighborhood listserv, and alerted the Visitacion Valley Planning Alliance, which included the meeting notices in member communications. When meetings were held at the nearby Visitacion Valley Elementary School, transportation shuttles were provided.

For the EIR/EIS, two public scoping meetings were held to gather input in January 2013. One meeting was held at the Sunnydale Community Center, and a second meeting was held at the Visitacion Valley Branch Library. The San Francisco Planning Department and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development distributed meeting notices, directions on where to send written comments, and contact details for further information to applicable agencies and organizations (including neighborhood groups registered on the Planning Department's group list for Visitacion Valley), tenants of the project site, and addresses within a 300-foot radius of the project site, as is required pursuant to Chapter 31 of the *San Francisco Administrative Code*; nearly 1,300 notices were mailed.

In November 2014, the project sponsor held a public meeting at the Sunnydale Community Room to engage the community and inform members of the public that the Draft EIR/EIS comment period was about to commence. In early December 2014, the sponsor mailed a preliminary notice to project site residents. This notice explained that a separate notice informing residents of initiation of the comment period would arrive later that month. The project sponsor also presented at the Visitacion Valley Planning Alliance meeting of December 13, 2014, to inform the members that the Draft EIR/EIS comment period was about to commence. Prior to publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Planning Department and Mayor's Office again distributed public hearing notices to applicable agencies and organizations (including neighborhood groups registered on the Planning Department's group list for Visitacion Valley), tenants of the project site, and addresses within a 300-foot radius of the project site pursuant to the *Administrative Code*; again, nearly 1,300 notices were mailed. In addition, the Planning Department and Mayor's Office hung public notices on telephone poles throughout the project site and at major

intersections within 1 or 2 blocks of the project site. Two public hearings were held on the Draft EIR/EIS, the first at the Sunnydale Community Room on January 20, 2015, and the second at the San Francisco Planning Commission (City Hall) on January 22, 2015. Without the commenter's address, it is not possible to know whether the commenter was individually notified or is within the area that would have required that he be notified. However, the Planning Department routinely compiles lists of interested individuals for a particular project and provides notice to individuals who so request, even if they are outside the required geographic area of noticing.

Comment GC-5: Comments regarding approach to analysis.

"The other question I have is that -- again, in Comments [and] Responses -- have the environmental impacts been analyzed if the project was done simultaneously?

It's apparently going to be done in phases, which has a different -- a different environmental impact.

And I'm not advocating; I'm just saying that, you know, in Valencia Gardens, North Beach Place, I think many of the HOPE projects that were done in the past were done all at once. The tenants were given housing elsewhere and then they were brought back after it was finished. And some of the impacts that we've talked about as far as noise and traffic and others are made more difficult by the fact that you still have some of the housing there while this is being done.

So anyway, I wonder if that has been looked at or was analyzed as any part of the thing, whether that alternative was thought about." (Commissioner Antonini, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

Response GC-5

The commenter asks whether the EIR/EIS analyzed environmental impacts of construction of the entire project at one time.

Sunnydale-Velasco is the City's largest public housing site. The 50-acre neighborhood is populated by approximately 1,700 people. Please see Chapter 2, Project Alternatives / Project Description, page 2-11. As stated in the fourth full paragraph, the Sunnydale-Velasco project site is currently 92 percent occupied.

Simultaneous relocation of the entire neighborhood would not be feasible and is not proposed as part of this project or alternatives. Therefore, it is outside the scope of the analysis. Also, variable market forces and funding availability would preclude simultaneous redevelopment of 50 acres of urban property.

Therefore, the EIR/EIS analyzes feasible alternatives that would entail redevelopment of the project site over three separate phases. This phasing scheme was developed by the project sponsor and determined to be a feasible means in which to construct the project.

As stated on page 2-13, the proposed project would be constructed over three phases, totaling 9 to 15 years in duration. This three-phase approach provides a reasonable worst case scenario by which construction impacts to traffic, noise, and air quality were analyzed. Further, simultaneous construction of all three phases could result in more concentrated environmental effects for some topics analyzed, such as effects on regional air quality, which is assessed based on average daily emissions. Proposed construction activities are described at a level of detail sufficient for environmental review, and will be refined as project design advances. Actual construction impacts would be equal to or less intensive than those described in the EIR/EIS. Please see EIR/EIS sections 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10, respectively, for those analyses.

It is noted that page 2-13 included an error in the length of time of each construction phase. The following text is revised on page 2-13, first paragraph (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in <u>double underline</u>):

> As discussed above, the proposed project would be constructed in three phases. It is estimated that each phase of construction would last between three to ~~9~~ <u>five</u> years for a total of 9 to 15 years in duration for the entire project.

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

Comment GC-6: Comment regarding impact fees.

"Additionally, Impact Fees how much Mercy will be paying to the Visitacion Valley community? This was ever mention in the report." (Nelson Gutierrez; email, February 18, 2015)

Response GC-6

Regarding the commenter's request for a list of impact fees that would be paid to the Visitacion Valley neighborhood, the discussion of impact fees, below, is provided for informational purposes.

Development impact fees are created through legislation and apply consistently to projects that are subject to the impact fee. The City imposes development impact fees on development projects in order to address the impacts caused by new development on public services, infrastructure and facilities. For example, the burden on the transit system created by a new office building is offset through the payment of an impact fee used to improve MUNI. Impact fees are different from, and apply in addition to, application fees, which are used to cover the cost of the City's review of a given proposal. For the most part, impact fees are assessed by the Planning Department and are collected by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) upon permit issuance.

Some impact fees apply throughout the City to various types of development projects. Others apply only in certain neighborhoods. Another type of impact fee only applies when a builder chooses to pay them in-lieu of meeting a particular Planning Code requirement (e.g. usable open space).

Based upon preliminary review, developers of the proposed Master Plan would be required to pay the Citywide Schools Impact Fee, Wastewater Capacity Charge, Water Capacity Charge, the Transit Impact Development Fee (for non-residential uses only), and the Visitacion Valley Impact Fee. The final determination of which fees would be required of developers of the mixed-income housing development would be typically determined during building permit review. However, as stated in Chapter 1, Purpose Need, and Objectives, on page 1-14, the project sponsor intends to enter into a development agreement. Development agreements can waive or reduce impact fees where such development is addressing the impact through another means, usually by providing infrastructure improvements directly. Development agreements are tailored to specific developments and vary in how impacts are addressed. The Development Agreement would specify the impact fees that would apply to the project. Development Agreements are approved by the Board of Supervisors following a recommendation by the Planning Commission.

Project Description

Comment PD-1: Comments regarding the unit mix of the proposed project.

"I think one of the alternatives spelled out the breakdown of the different units -- how many market units there were market rate, how many there would be of -- obviously we have one-to-one replacement of the public housing.

And so I didn't see that -- maybe I didn't read carefully enough -- in the preferred project alternatives. So I'd like to have that spelled out in Comments and Responses." (Commissioner Antonini, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

"Residents are concern of the high amount of Section 8/low income housing in Visitacion Valley. Mercy want to increase low income household from 785 to 1,006. Take into account Heritage homes, Britton Court, Carter Terrace and John King senior Housing the total amount of Section 8/low income housing in Visitacion Valley is 1,500. It my understanding San Francisco have about 4,000 Section 8/low income housing Visitacion Valley will account about 40% of the these homes. Visitacion Valley SHOULD NOT be the capital of Section 8/low income housing. This is reflected on the neighborhood, Leland Ave site serves as the neighborhood's primary commercial corridor is nonexistent. Vacant store fronts lack of thriving businesses. Grocery outlet is struggling, original owner Derek and Gina Navarro have left in 6 months because of lack of sales and theft. I was told by Grocery Outlet workers and police officers they might be closing.

This community have struggle for many decades there needs to be reduction of Section 8/low income housing. We are aware of Schlage lock redevelopment 85% market rate housing but we need more to support businesses on Leland Ave, grocery store and for safe, clean and thriving community." (Nelson Gutierrez; email, February 17, 2015)

"The summary says there's going to be up to 1,700 units. What determines how many there will wind up being?" (Unidentified Speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

"Just like to follow up to hers. Like you mentioned earlier, like 1700 total units. Is there like a breakdown of the numbers? And if it's like a majority would be replacement -- from my understanding, I believe Sunnydale is over 1,000 units, probably like the largest in San Francisco. Like, what's the number breakdown? …. As far as like the market rate ones, lower income housing, the replacement housing." (Unidentified Speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

Response PD-1

Commenters ask about the mix of income levels that would be targeted by the project. One commenter states that Visitacion Valley should not have a concentration of low-income housing, and states that low-income housing does not generate enough consumer demand to support thriving commercial activity on Leland Avenue. The commenter states that the project would result in a net increase of affordable units, from 785 to 1,006. The comment concerning retail business on Leland Avenue does not address the adequacy or accuracy of the EIR/EIS, and therefore no further response is warranted.

According to a performance audit of San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) prepared by the San Francisco Budget and Legislative Analyst in 2013, there are 5,372 units among all SFHA properties. Of those 5,372 units, only 14 percent are located in Visitacion Valley neighborhood: those specifically within the Sunnydale and Velasco complexes.[13]

Regarding housing where rental assistance is provided, a total of 317 units are provided in the Heritage Homes, Britton Court, Carter Terrace, and the John King Senior developments. These units represent less than 12 percent of the more than 2,700 units among 37 properties managed by Mercy Housing citywide.[14]

As stated in Chapter 1, Purpose Need and Objectives, on page 1-8, one of HOPE SF's guiding principles is to create an economically integrated neighborhood. As indicated on page 1-9, one of the CEQA Project Objectives is to create an economically integrated neighborhood with new public housing units, affordable rental apartments, and market-

[13] San Francisco Budget and Legislative Analyst, *Performance Audit of the San Francisco Housing Authority*, available online: http://www.sfbos.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=45587, June 3, 2013. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2010.0305E.

[14] Mercy Housing, California Properties web page: https://www.mercyhousing.org/california-properties#San Fran Properties, accessed April 7, 2015.

rate for-sale homes. Please see Chapter 2, Project Alternatives/Project Description, page 2-1. As stated there, approximately 60 percent of the proposed project would be affordable housing, while the remainder would be market-rate housing. Please see page 2-11. As stated there, the proposed project analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS includes 1,700 units. This includes replacement units for each of the existing public housing units, 221 additional affordable units, and 694 market-rate units. These almost 700 market rate units would support further economic integration of the neighborhood, as they would be developed on a site where currently no market rate units exist. Residents of new units, both affordable and market-rate, would support businesses on Leland Avenue.

As stated on page 2-15, the Reduced Development/Density Alternative would include a total of 1,372 units, including replacement units for each of the public housing units, 67 additional affordable units, and 520 market-rate units. As stated on page 2-18, Alternative B would include only replacement of the existing public housing units. These alternatives are analyzed in the document to provide decision-makers and the public with an understanding of how reducing the total number of units would change the environmental effects.

Decision-makers, market forces, and funding availability will affect the ultimate total number of units constructed. However, the total number of units would not exceed 1,700, and any iteration of project would include replacement for each of the existing public housing units.

Comment PD-2: Comments requesting revisions to the Project Description.

"Like Alice Griffith, we have a huge opportunity here to really implement the sustainability plans that the SFPUC [San Francisco Public Utilities Commission] has really looked at for some other major projects, particularly around gray water and waste treatment.

We are digging up whole streets. We are realigning them. We are providing almost fully new infrastructure for this project. And the fact that I see almost nothing about those plans other than a sort of slight reference to the fact that the PUC is spending a lot on their sewer improvement project, it seems not as sufficient as it probably could be. I won't go as far as saying it's insufficient.

I would love to see more about that. And I definitely [will] call out gray water because that's my thing. It's something that I've been on -- I've been on that horse for about ten years." (Commissioner Johnson, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

"There's a creek/spring I think called Sunnydale Creek, runs in Sunnydale projects it would great if landscape architecture can incorporate this into green space and or entire redevelopment project. Would be a natural beautiful feature for the community." (Nelson Gutierrez; email, February 17, 2015)

"Sustainability

EPA applauds the measures that the San Francisco Planning Department and HUD are taking to make this project environmentally sustainable, such as striving for Leadership in Energy and Environment Design for Neighborhood Development certification. EPA recommends taking additional measures, such as incorporating renewable energy into the site, addressing urban heat island effects, and promoting water efficiency. As the first national specification for water-efficient new homes, EPA's WaterSense New Home Specification sets criteria for indoor and outdoor efficiency, while allowing flexibility for regional landscaping preferences and green add-ons. Given the current drought in California and uncertainty over future water supply under climate change scenarios, we strongly encourage the San Francisco Planning Department and HUD to take all reasonable measures to conserve water.

In addition, President Obama issued a federal memorandum in June 2014 entitled *Creating a Federal Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators*[15] which directs federal agencies to take steps to protect and restore domestic populations of pollinators. To help achieve this goal, the Council on Environmental Quality issued an addendum to its sustainable landscape guidance on October 22, 2014 entitled *Supporting the Health of Honey Bees and other Pollinators*[16] which provides guidance to help federal agencies incorporate pollinator friendly practices in new construction and landscaping improvements.

Recommendations for the Final EIS

- Assess the feasibility, impacts and benefits of incorporating renewable energy, such as rooftop solar, into the project design. Renewable energy could reduce or avoid the need for onsite natural gas and associated air emissions. If found to be feasible, add renewable energy components to the project alternatives.
- Analyze urban heat island effects from the proposed development, and consider strategically placing trees, selecting appropriate building materials and/or adding green roofs on select buildings to minimize effects.
- Assess the feasibility and benefits of developing the project to meet EPA's WaterSense New Home Specification.[17]
- Include a landscape plan that promotes pollinator-friendly plant species and incorporates pollinator-friendly practices into site landscape requirements, particularly regarding the use of pesticides, and ensure all maintenance personnel are made aware of these practices." (USEPA, letter, February 13, 2015)

Response PD-2

One commenter requests that the proposed project include graywater systems or other sustainable features in connection with the provision of new site infrastructure and utilities.[18] Another commenter states that a creek runs through the project site and

[15] http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/06/20/presidential-memorandum-creating-federal-strategy-promote-health-honey-b
[16] http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/supporting_the_health_of_honey_bees_and_other_pollinators.pdf
[17] http://www.epa.gov/watersense/new_homes/building.html
[18] Graywater is water from showers, bath tubs, washing machines, and bathroom sinks that is reused for outdoor irrigation. (http://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=100)

requests that the proposed project uncover ("daylight") the creek. Another commenter requests that the City assess the feasibility, impacts, and benefits of incorporating renewable energy into the project design; analyze the urban heat island effect of the proposed development; assess the feasibility of developing the project to meet EPA's WaterSense New Home Specification; and include a landscape plan that promotes pollinator-friendly plant species.

Water Demand

As stated in Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, under **Impact UT-4** on page 4.14-10, the project would be subject to the City's Residential Water Conservation Ordinance, Commercial Water Conservation Ordinance, and Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance, all of which are designed to minimize water use. The project would be designed to incorporate water-conserving features. As a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-Neighborhood Design (LEED-ND)-certified project, the project would reduce water consumption by 20 percent compared to comparable non-LEED-certified projects. As stated under **Impact UT-4** on pages 4.14-9 and 4.14-10, SFPUC prepared a Water Supply Assessment for the proposed project, which found that the project would generate a net increase in potable water demand of approximately 0.18 million gallons per day (mgd). Based on this demand, SFPUC determined that no new water delivery or treatment facility would be required to serve the project. The project would be subject to the City's Residential Water Conservation Ordinance, Commercial Water Conservation Ordinance, and Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance, all of which are designed to minimize water use. The project would also be designed with low-flow fixtures, as required by the California Plumbing Code. Therefore, the EIR/EIS concluded the impact would be ***less than significant*** because the proposed project would have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements. Therefore, no mitigation measures to reduce water use are required under CEQA or NEPA.

Regarding WaterSense New Home Specification, according to USEPA, WaterSense-labeled plumbing fixtures are those that have been independently certified for efficiency and performance to be 20 percent more efficient than average projects in that category. Therefore, compliance with existing water conservation regulations discussed above and design features of the project to meet the LEED-ND standard would result in a comparable reduction in water use as compared to using WaterSense labeled plumbing features. The project sponsor or its successor(s) may explore the installation of WaterSense-labeled fixtures or other water-saving features to meet these commitments.

Graywater

Regarding the provision of a graywater system, the use of such systems can lower the demand for potable water and reduce stormwater and wastewater flows. The suggested use of a graywater system will be forwarded to the project sponsor for consideration.

Implementation of a graywater system is not necessary to reduce water demand to a less-than-significant level. As stated under **Impact UT-4** on page 4.14-10, the proposed project

would result in an increase in water demand, but the impact would be less than significant. As stated under **Impact UT-1** on pages 4.14-6 and 4.14-7, the proposed project would not result in wastewater generation that would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, and the impact would be less than significant. Also, as discussed under **Impact UT-3** on pages 4.14-8 and 4.14-9, the project would result in construction of a new stormwater conveyance system, which would result in less-than-significant impacts with incorporated mitigation measures to reduce the environmental effects associated with construction of new stormwater systems on below-grade archeological resources, construction noise, and hazardous materials. Because impacts UT-4 (water supply) and UT-1 (wastewater generation) were found to be less than significant, no additional mitigation measures, such as a graywater system, are required under CEQA or NEPA.

It is noted that the SFPUC has a Non-Potable Water Program that provides technical assistance and some funding for installation of non-potable water systems. For example, the headquarters building of the SFPUC at 525 Golden Gate Avenue, utilizes both graywater and "blackwater" (wastewater from toilets and kitchen sinks) treated on-site and reused for toilet flushing. Rainwater is also harvested and used for irrigation. Other buildings—such as the Exploratorium at Pier 15, the Whole Foods development at 38 Dolores Street, and the PG&E Service Center at 2270 Folsom Street—use rainwater for purposes such as toilet flushing and irrigation, and the under-construction Transbay Transit Center will employ graywater reuse. The proposed project is analyzed at the conceptual level necessary for environmental review. The project could include graywater reuse and/or other non-potable water systems as design development proceeds. However, because the impact of water use and wastewater treatment were found to be less than significant, inclusion of a graywater system as a mitigation measure is not required under CEQA or NEPA. The commenter's recommendation to consider the inclusion of graywater will be forwarded to the project sponsor.

Creek Daylighiting

Regarding daylighting an underground creek, as stated in Section 3.18, Hydrology and Water Quality, on page 3.18-2, the project site sits within the Sunnydale Watershed, which is 52 percent impervious. Runoff entering the combined sewer system drains to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. Prior to the development of the project site and vicinity, the site sat within the Sunnydale Drainage basin, which naturally drained into the bay near Candlestick Point. Watershed maps show a historic creek close to the north property line. Other than a surface drainage ditch at this location, no evidence of this creek exists today. Though not part of the proposed project, support for exploring the possibility of restoring the creek has been communicated to the project sponsor.

Renewable Energy and Sustainability

Regarding comments related to "sustainability," the proposed project's impacts to energy resources are analyzed in Section 4.20, Mineral and Energy Resources, under **Impact ME-3** on pages 4.20-7 to 4.20-8. As stated there, according to HUD, multi-family units like those

in the proposed project consume less energy annually than single-family dwellings. The project would meet local building Code standards for energy efficiency, including demonstration of a 15 percent energy reduction compared to the 2008 California Energy Code, as well as requirements for fundamental building commissioning. The project sponsor intends to achieve LEED-ND certification, which would reduce energy demand compared to traditional, non-certified developments. The project would include the construction of replacement energy distribution lines to the new buildings, but it would not require new energy generation facilities Therefore, because energy use was found to be less than significant, CEQA and NEPA do not require energy reduction measures, such as the generation of renewable energy. Developers of the Master Plan have the discretion to explore the possibility of providing renewable energy at the project site. However, none is proposed at this time.

Urban Heat Island Effect

According to USEPA, the urban heat island effect "describes built up areas that are hotter than nearby rural areas. The annual mean air temperature of a city with 1 million people or more can be 1.8–5.4°F (1–3°C) warmer than its surroundings. In the evening, the difference can be as high as 22°F (12°C). Heat islands can affect communities by increasing summertime peak energy demand, air conditioning costs, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, heat-related illness and mortality, and water quality."[19]

San Francisco's climate is characteristic of the cool-summer Mediterranean "generally characterized by moist mild winters and dry summers."[20] San Francisco's weather is influenced by the cool currents of the Pacific Ocean, which moderate temperature swings and produce a mild year-round climate with little seasonal temperature variation. Among major U.S. cities, San Francisco has the coldest daily mean, maximum, and minimum temperatures for June, July, and August.[21] During the summer months, the city is generally cooler than inland suburban and rural areas. Therefore, the urban heat island effect is less prevalent in San Francisco than in other major cities in the United States and other major cities in the region.

As stated in Section 4.13, Recreation, on page 4.13-3, the proposed project would provide approximately 5.6 acres of new parks, one acre of linear open space, and 5 acres of courtyard/common open space. In addition, as explained in Section 4.16, Biological Resources, on page 4.16-15, the project sponsor has prepared a preliminary landscape plan, and the project sponsor has committed to meeting the requirements of Planning Code Section 138.1, which requires planting of one street tree every 20 feet of property frontage. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant urban heat island effects because urban heat island effects are not prevalent in San Francisco and the project would include new parks, open spaces and replacement trees.

[19] USEPA, Heat Island Effect, web page: http://www.epa.gov/heatisland/, accessed March 3, 2015.
[20] Golden Gate Weather Services, Climate of San Francisco: Narrative Description, web page: http://ggweather.com/sf/narrative.html, accessed March 1, 2015.
[21] Osborn, Liz, "Coolest U.S. Cities in Summer," Current Notes: Weather and Science Facts, available online: http://www.currentresults.com/Weather-Extremes/US/coldest-cities-summer.php, accessed March 1, 2015.

Lastly, regarding pollinator-friendly plant species, as stated in Section 4.16, Biological Resources, on page 4.16-15 under **Impact BI-5**, the replacement street tree species have been coordinated with the San Francisco Bureau of Urban Forestry. The project sponsor or its successor(s) may explore the plantings of pollinator-friendly species with the Bureau of Urban Forestry.

Comment PD-3: Questions regarding project start date.

"If the construction is approved, when will it start?" (Unidentified speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

"Is this a project that's really going to take? Because they've been saying for years that they're going to remodel out here. So is this something that's really going to take effect?" (Unidentified speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

Response PD-3

The commenters ask when construction of the proposed project would begin.

Development of the Master Plan, and environmental analysis, occurred from 2008 to 2015. Environmental review under both CEQA and NEPA is anticipated to be finalized this year. Upon completion of environmental review, the overall project and each phase must receive permit review.

A construction start date is not finalized, but it would occur no earlier than 2017. If approved and funded, as stated in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives / Project Description, on page 2-13, the proposed project would be constructed over three phases, totaling 9 to 15 years in duration. As stated on page 2-17, the Reduced Development/Density Alternative would be constructed over approximately the same 9- to 15-year period. As stated on page 2-9, the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would be constructed in three phases over approximately 24 months each.

It is noted that page 2-13 included an error in the length of time of each construction phase of the proposed project. The following text is revised on page 2-13, first paragraph (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in <u>double underline</u>):

> As discussed above, the proposed project would be constructed in three phases. It is estimated that each phase of construction would last between three to ~~9~~ <u>five</u> years for a total of 9 to 15 years in duration for the entire project.

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial

importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

Comment PD-4: Question regarding project characteristics.

"I see the design. It was written. The street in front of my property. It might affect the green zone in my property. So if there is an issue, how do I get in touch with you?

The property belongs to my daughter and my husband. … I reviewed the plan, and the street will be straight in front of my property. It might impact the green zone in the property in front of my house. If the project impact[s] me, of course, I will -- you know, I would have issues. Otherwise, it's okay."(Ting Fe Chen, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

Response PD-4

The commenter asks whether the project will affect the "green zone" in front of her family's property, and whom to contact. The commenter lives at 493 Sunrise Way (Block 6374, Lot 23), which is on the south side of the cul-de-sac at the western terminus of the street. The "green zone" in front of her property is her front lawn.

Please see Chapter 2, Project Alternatives / Project Description. As shown in **Figure 2-3** on page 2-7, the street network within the project site would be realigned, and new streets would be constructed. Detailed parking controls on these streets would be determined upon completion of each project phase.

Blythedale Avenue would be realigned to connect through to Sunrise Way in this location. The Sunrise Way cul-de-sac is bordered by the following parcels:

- 493 Sunrise Way; Block 6374, Lot 23 (commenter's lot)
- 487 Sunrise Way; Block 6374, Lot 24
- 481 Sunrise Way; Block 6374, Lot 25
- 494 Sunrise Way; Block 6312, Lot 006
- 298 Hahn Street; Block 6312, Lot 005

The cul-de-sac and parts of the immediately adjacent landscaped areas would be removed. The project would require modification to the geometry of the Sunrise Way cul-de-sac to fully connect to the realigned Blythedale Avenue, which could require adjustment of the property lines of the properties adjacent to the cul-de-sac. Driveway access to the properties would be maintained.

The project sponsor will initiate discussions with the property owners regarding the proposed project and potential arrangements to allow for the connection to the realigned Blythedale Avenue.

In Chapter 2, on page 2-9, the following text is inserted after the fourth paragraph to clarify the actions necessary to complete the Blythedale Avenue realignment (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> To allow for the realigned Blythedale Avenue to connect to Sunrise Way, the geometry of the existing Sunrise Way cul-de-sac would be modified to make Sunrise Way into a through street. This geometry modification could affect a portion of the private properties fronting onto the cul-de-sac: Block 6374, Lot 23, Lot 24, and Lot 25; and Block 6312, Lot 005 and Lot 006. The project sponsor will initiate discussions with these property owners regarding the proposed project and potential arrangements to allow for the connection to the realigned Blythedale Avenue. These arrangements may include adjustment of the property line of each lot.

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). There would be no additional physical environmental impacts or effects under CEQA or NEPA. Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

Visual Quality / Aesthetics

Comment AE-1: Comment regarding impacts to the visual character of the neighborhood and project site.

"Visitacion Valley exhibits visual character that is diverse, slope and topography reflecting the characteristics of its natural elements, these features set Visitacion Valley apart visually from other neighborhood. The developers need to take these natural assets into account and try not to grade out natural contours and shape of hill side. This is very important to the open feel and natural aesthetics of Visitacion Valley." (Nelson Gutierrez; email, February 17, 2015)

Response AE-1

The commenter states that Visitacion Valley has a unique visual character defined by its topography, and that the developers should consider these assets and try not to grade out natural contours.

As stated in Section 4.4, Visual Quality/Aesthetics under **Impact AE-2** on page 4.4-13, the project site's topographic character would be preserved. Impacts to visual character and views would be less than significant.

As stated in Chapter 1, Purpose, Need, and Objectives, on page 1-5, "the site slopes down from west (Brookdale Avenue) to east (Hahn Street), at slopes ranging from 15.5 percent at its highest and steepest point to a 2-percent slope at the lower elevations. The average

grade change is 9 percent. Elevations range from 250 feet at the western edge of the site to 75 feet at the southeastern corner. The topography allows for sweeping views to the south and to the east toward the San Francisco Bay." The existing topography of the surrounding neighborhood is described in Section 3.4-1, Visual Quality/Aesthetics. As stated on pages 3.4-1 to 3.4-2, Visitacion Valley is a topographic depression, and the western portion slopes upward toward McLaren Park.

As stated in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives / Project Description, on page 2-13, each phase of construction would require grading to create accessible housing sites and accessible right of ways and path of travel through the site, as required by the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Disability and Department of Public Works' ADA/ Disability Access Coordinator. The project would require that approximately 221,000 cubic yards of soil be hauled off the 50-acre site. The project would retain the general topography of the site, so as to maintain and enhance connections to the surrounding neighborhood.

The project's effects on visual topography are discussed in Section 4.4, Visual Quality/Aesthetics. As stated under **Impact AE-1** on page 4.4-6, although the project would alter views at the pedestrian level within the site and from nearby locations, mid-range views of the site would not change because the slope of the site would remain generally as it is under existing conditions—sloping down to the south and east. Visual simulations in **Figures 4.4-2** through **4.4-5**, on pages 4.4-7 through 4.4-10, show how the project site topography would change from different viewpoints at and around the project site. As stated under **Impact AE-2** on page 4.4-13, the project site's topographic character would be preserved. Impacts to visual character and views would be less than significant.

Socioeconomics / Population and Housing

Comment PH-1: Questions and comments regarding project-level displacement and the relocation procedures.

"So on displacement/environmental justice, the summary of impacts does not adequately -- I'll say this: The summary of the impacts does not adequately state how the City and the developer have thought about both the potential impact and the mitigation measures that have already been considered around displacement.

This is a one-for-one housing – public housing replacement. But unlike in Alice Griffith, where there's actually a bunch of acres right next to the existing project and we're building new and people are moving in over time, we have to demolish sections of this project, move people to somewhere, and then they have to -- they can move back once that project is completed over somewhere between a 9- and 12- or 17-year -- I think a number in here project plan, project timeline.

So I would say that, taken together, that series of project details means that there is not -- there's more than a less-than-significant impact on -- for both -- under both NEPA and CEQA for displacement of existing residents.

The existing, I think, fill of units in the Sunnydale project is somewhere along the 70 or 80 percent -- and again, the percentages aren't here; so I'm trying to remember off the top of my head -- range, but you can't assume that every single unit that is not currently occupied is occupiable by another displaced individual or resident given the infrastructure problems there.

So I will say that, to summarize my first point, I think that the summary of impacts needs to say that that displacement is not less than significant.

And I think that the mitigation measure needs to be called out as to the relocation and assistance plan which is actually described in summary level in the document. So I'll say that.

Getting to the actual mitigation itself, I think that there's not enough detail there. Like I said, based on the current rates of units being occupied, there is some percentage of unoccupied units that the assumption is made that every effort will be made to move people, as their units are demolished, into those other units.

But in no way -- number one, the numbers don't work out, even if 100 percent of those unoccupiable units were occupiable. And, two, I don't think 100 percent of those units are occupiable. So I think the relocation and assistance plan or the mitigation measure in general needs to have way more detail about where these people are going to go.

Part -- and how this links directly back to the environmental impact report is you have to analyze, under CEQA, do you have environmental impacts related to providing housing somewhere else for people that you're displacing.

I think it's fantastic that we're doing this project. I think it's necessary. But I think we have to be realistic about where these people are going and the environmental impacts, either in San Francisco or regionally, of providing units for those people.

So that needs to show up somewhere. And having "none required" as a mitigation measure is totally insufficient." (Commissioner Johnson, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

"I will add a couple comments to say that, on the question of displacement, the EIR just refers again to the relocation assistance plan.

But not all plans are created equal. So can there be some more consideration of criteria of what is a sufficient plan, criteria of looking at whether or not there are undue environmental impacts to moving people very far away from where they currently live and so on." (Commissioner Wu, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

"How would you determine who goes and who stays in these buildings? ... What determines who lives there? And those that are not accepted will be moved out? Or where will they be

placed? ... The ones that are not accepted in the program that you're talking about rebuilding, those that are not accepted in that, are they just replaced out? Or they have no way of getting back in or what?" (Unidentified Speaker, public hearing, January 20, 2015)

"If the -- until the place is being done, where will they move to?" (Unidentified Speaker, public hearing, January 20, 2015)

Response PH-1

Commenters request further clarification regarding displacement effects and tenant relocation, both permanently as well as temporarily during construction. One commenter states that the summary chapter does not adequately address displacement impacts under both CEQA and NEPA. The commenter states that impacts due to displacement require mitigation measures, and this mitigation should be included in the summary, as well as described in detail in the document. The commenter asks whether there will be environmental impacts under CEQA related to providing housing elsewhere for displaced residents.

Please see Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/Population and Housing. As stated under **Impact PH-2** on pages 4.5-5 and 4.5-6, the proposed project would result in displacement. However, the project would be legally required to include preparation and implementation of a Relocation Assistance Plan, as well as a right to return for residents in good standing, which would ensure impacts would be less than significant. The preparation of the Relocation Assistance Plan is governed through regulations that are in place to address displacement issues. Therefore, there is no basis for concluding significant impacts under CEQA or NEPA. The following discussion further clarifies these regulations.

Summary of Project Phasing and Relocation

Please see Chapter 2, Project Alternatives / Project Description, page 2-11. As stated there, "the proposed project would be constructed in three phases. The site is approximately 92 percent occupied, with the balance of units vacant.[22] Current residents would be moved to available (vacant) residences on the project site as each phase is constructed. However, not all tenants may be relocated on site."

Displacement Effects Under NEPA

As stated under **Impact PH-2**, on pages 4.5-5 and 4.5-6, NEPA analysis requires an assessment of the effects on the human environment associated with this displacement, as well as with the social effect of such displacement—specifically, the potential lessening or loss of community cohesion and public well-being. The analysis defines "community

[22] Mercy Housing California, personal communication with Environmental Science Associates, August 9, 2013. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2010.0305E.

cohesion" as the maintenance of connections in the community, and it defines "public well-being" as access to amenities that allow for the maintenance of a reasonable quality of life, including walkability, aesthetic quality, open space, and social connections. The following text on pages 4.5-6 and 4.5-7 further explains the potential effects on the human environment associated with displacement:

> Generally, a displaced person under the URA [Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970] is an individual, family, partnership, association, corporation, or organization, which moves from their home, business, or farm, or moves their personal property, as a direct result of acquisition, demolition or rehabilitation for a federally funded project for a duration greater than 12 months. It is estimated that each phase of construction would last between 3 to 5 years for a total of 9 to 15 years in duration for the entire project. Therefore, residents temporarily relocated off-site using vouchers provided by the Housing Authority would be displaced for a duration greater than 1 year, and they would be defined as "displaced" under the URA.
>
> Residents would be inconvenienced by the relocation and the time and effort required to pack, move, and re-establish living routines—including locating and accessing community and commercial services—both when moving from their original units and when returning to the project site. It is possible that students could be required to change schools, depending on where in the City families relocate.
>
> Although the entire site population would not be displaced simultaneously, the relocation of residents could disrupt existing social networks because displaced residents would not move en-masse, but instead move to individual available units in various locations. This disruption of existing social networks could result in a lessening or loss of community cohesion and a lessening of public well-being.

Therefore, EIR/EIS determines that the proposed project would result in displacement for a period greater than 1 year, which would be an adverse effect under NEPA.

As explained in the Project Description, however, beginning in the last paragraph on page 2-11, "pursuant to Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and in accordance with the URA, the project sponsor will prepare a Relocation Assistance Plan (RAP), or Equivalent Plan, that will comply with the requirements of RAP-equivalent documents and applicable regulations. The RAP will describe criteria for financial assistance for replacement housing, and reimbursement criteria for moving costs and/or different housing costs (including rents). Residents in good standing (lease compliant) who are unable to relocate on site would be given housing vouchers by the Housing Authority for relocation elsewhere during the construction period."

A summary of the requirements of the URA is provided in Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/Population and Housing, on page 4.5-1. To further summarize the regulatory framework for relocation assistance, the following text has been added to Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/Population and Housing, on page 4.5-1 after the third paragraph (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in <u>double underline</u>):

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 24, Part 970 – Public Housing Program – Demolition or Disposition of Public Housing Projects

Part 970, promulgated by HUD, details the administrative steps required to perform demolition/disposition activity. Pursuant to Part 970, a Public Housing Agency must offer each family displaced by demolition or disposition comparable housing that meets housing quality standards and is located in an area that is generally not less desirable than the location of the displaced persons. The housing must be offered on a nondiscriminatory basis, without regard to race, color, religion, creed, national origin, handicap, age, familial status, or gender, in compliance with applicable Federal and state laws. For persons with disabilities displaced from a unit with reasonable accommodations, comparable housing should include similar accommodations.

United State Department of Housing and Urban Development Handbook 1378

The HUD Handbook 1378, also known as the Tenant Assistance, Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Handbook, consolidates basic statutory and regulatory requirements, and HUD policy guidance on acquisition and relocation under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (URA) and certain relocation requirements in one place. These requirements and policies are to be followed when acquiring real property or displacing persons for a project or program with HUD financial assistance. Chapter 2 describes the required advisory assistance for an individual or family to be displaced from a dwelling unit, and Chapter 3 describes Relocation Payments to be provided to that individual or family, including both moving expenses and the cost of comparable replacement dwelling units.

To further clarify the legal requirements for relocation assistance, the following text has been added to Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/Population and Housing, on page 4.5-1 after the header "State" (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

California Relocation Assistance Law (CRAL) and California Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines

California Government Code Title 1, Chapter 16, Sections 7260-7277, require that all public entities adopt rules and regulations to administer relocation assistance and to implement the payments under the provision of the Code. CRAL establishes requirements governing relocation assistance and replacement housing for persons displaced due to public agency projects in California. The relocation statute is intended for the benefit of displaced persons in order to ensure that they receive fair and equitable treatment and do not suffer disproportionately as a result of programs designed for the benefit of the public as a whole. The Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines, codified in California Code

of Regulations Title 25, Division 1, Chapter 6 assist public entities in the development of regulations and procedures implementing CRAL.

To further clarify the legal requirements for residents' right to return to the site after construction, the following text has been added to Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/Population and Housing, on page 4.5-2 after the third paragraph (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

San Francisco Ordinance No. 227-12 - Public Housing Right to Return to Revitalized Housing

In 2012, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 227-12, which amended the San Francisco Administrative Code by adding Chapter 39, Sections 39.1 through 39.9, to establish the San Francisco Right to Revitalized Housing Ordinance and set City policy regarding the Right to Return to Revitalized Public Housing Units. Under the Ordinance, public housing households have the right to revitalized housing after temporary relocation or displacement as a result of a Public Housing Development Project so long as the household is not in the eviction process or has not been evicted from a unit that is managed by the San Francisco Housing Authority. Any relocation plans produced by the project sponsor of a Public Housing Development Project must be reviewed by the City department providing financial assistance.

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

As explained on page 4.5-6, "existing households would be provided a relocation coordinator who would assist in evaluating the moving options, special needs of the households, and assistance in moving. The cost of the temporary housing for the existing residents would not increase as a result of the temporary relocation." No existing households would be moved off-site unless these conditions are met for that household.

The preparation and implementation of the RAP is legally required of the project sponsor, and is therefore part of the Project Description. It is not an optional task that must be made a condition of approval through inclusion in a mitigation measure. A more detailed description of RAP criteria is included below, under the heading "Relocation Plan Criteria."

Therefore, the impact would be ***less than significant*** under NEPA because the proposed project would result in displacement of existing residents, but would reduce impacts associated with relocation through preparation and implementation of a RAP.

Displacement Effects under CEQA

CEQA requires an analysis of a project's displacement effects that would result in the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed project would not require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Residents would be relocated to existing vacant units in San Francisco or the surrounding jurisdictions, and the cost of the temporary housing for the existing residents would not increase as a result of the temporary relocation. As stated above, the Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that residents would be inconvenienced by the relocation and the time and effort required to pack, move, and re-establish living routines—including locating and accessing community, commercial services, and schools—both when moving from their original units and when returning to the project site. Relocation could disrupt existing social networks, which could result in a lessening or loss of community cohesion and a lessening of public well-being. However, these disruptions are social considerations. They would not result in physical environmental effects associated with construction of replacement housing. Pursuant to legal requirements, if no vacant units are available for tenant relocation, then residents would not be relocated and the project would not proceed until suitable vacant units are identified.

As explained on page 4.5-7, the impact would be ***less than significant*** under CEQA because the proposed project would temporarily displace existing housing units and residents, but this displacement would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Relocation Plan Criteria

The RAP for the proposed project has not yet been prepared. Its preparation and implementation are legally required of the sponsor prior to construction of each project phase. The following text is inserted after the first full sentence on page 2-12 to provide additional information regarding the contents of the RAP (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in <u>double underline</u>):

> Residents in good standing (lease compliant) who are unable to relocate on site would be given housing vouchers by the Housing Authority for relocation elsewhere during the construction period. <u>The RAP will include:</u>
>
> - <u>Description of the project that is requiring the permanent relocation of the residents and non-residential tenants, including its location, and financing;</u>
> - <u>Explanation of laws, statutes and regulations governing the relocation of the Project occupants, including the requirements for a relocation plan;</u>
> - <u>Process to develop, approve and update the relocation plan;</u>
> - <u>Details about the people impacted by the project who will be relocated;</u>
> - <u>Description of the replacement housing resources available to re-house the residents who will be relocated and resources available for the non-residential uses;</u>

- Relocation program to be provided, including the rights of the displaced, benefits and services they are eligible to receive, and criteria for eligibility to receive relocation assistance;
- Responsibilities of the SFHA in the implementation of this plan;
- Process for any appeals of the relocation benefits and services provided; and
- Preliminary schedule of relocation activity and cost estimate for relocation cost.

Regulations require that eligible persons relocated by a publicly assisted project receive the following services and benefits:

- Required advanced notice of the relocation.
- Written information statement of their rights to relocation benefits and services for which they are eligible.
- Assistance in locating and securing comparable, decent, safe and sanitary replacement housing (residential occupants) or suitable commercial sites (non-residential occupants).
- Assistance moving to replacement housing, including relocation of personal property and transferring utility accounts to their replacement sites.
- Right to appeal decisions made within the relocation program that affect them.

The SFHA Commission would be required to approve the RAP prior to implementation of the project.

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

The new dwellings would be populated as each phase is completed. Existing residents in good standing (lease compliant) who had moved off-site during construction would be given the first opportunity to return.

Every household residing in a public housing dwelling unit and in good standing at the start of their relocation phase and during their relocation phase would have the right to return to the project site. Returning households would be provided a preference for occupancy prior to other eligible households. This preference would be retained even if the household has received permanent relocation benefits.

Comment PH-2: Comments regarding cumulative displacement.

"In follow-up to both Commissioners Johnson and Wu, I would like to ask about cumulative displacement. This project coincides with a number of very large projects which have a significant amount of displacement, Bay View-Hunters Point together with Treasure Island.

And I'd like the EIR, if at all possible, to address what these large numbers of units require the City to do or to admit that they can't do it because we don't have affordable housing, leave alone housing for displacement of people who live in the areas just mentioned. I'd like to ask that we start being realistic about those as impacts." (Commissioner Moore, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

"I definitely agree [with Commissioner Moore]. I would just sort of add, if that is something that we're going to have staff time to consider, that Hunters Point, in my view, is not as much of an issue because most of the construction was on the shipyard and no one lives there other than a select few people that are being taken care of through the Community Benefits Plan." (Commissioner Johnson, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

Response PH-2

Commenters state that the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative projects, could result in cumulative impacts related to displacement.

Cumulative impacts from displacement are analyzed in Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/ Population and Housing, under impact **CC-PH**, starting on page 4.5-15 (starting in the third full paragraph). The impact would be less than significant.

As stated in the cumulative analysis, cumulative redevelopment projects in the geographic vicinity of the Sunnydale-Velasco project, such as those at Hunters Point, generally comprise reuse of so-called "brownfield" sites that currently lack residential development. Thus, and as noted by Commissioner Johnson, these projects would not displace substantial numbers of existing residents or housing.

As stated in the last paragraph on page 4.5-15, cumulative development projects farther away from the project site, such as the HOPE SF Potrero Terrace and Annex project, could result in displacement similar to the proposed project. For example, the Potrero project could require temporary on- and off-site displacement of the 606 residential units and 1,280 residents. This potential displacement could combine with the phased displacement of a total of 1,700 residents at the Sunnydale-Velasco site.

However, not all residents from each cumulative development project would be relocated simultaneously. These cumulative development projects—including Treasure Island—each have different implementation schedules and construction timelines, like the proposed project. Projects will provide relocation assistance in accordance with the applicable federal Uniform Relocation Act and the California Relocation Law (California

Government Code 7260 et seq and the California Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines, Title 15, CCR, Section 6000 et seq.) and the Public Housing Right to Return to Revitalized Housing Ordinance, as well as the additional regulations listed at the beginning of Section 4.5.

As stated above in response to comment PH-1, if no vacant units are available for relocation, then, by law, residents would not be relocated and the project would not proceed until suitable vacant units are identified. Residents would only be relocated upon availability of housing. The project sponsor does not propose the construction of relocation housing.

Separate from the proposed project and projects described above, the San Francisco Housing Authority seeks to convert public housing at various sites (29 total properties in two phases) to funding under the federal Rental Assistance Demonstration Program (RAD) under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended and/ or The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act of 2012, Public Law 112-55. Conversion to RAD will create financially sustainable real estate assets with a minimum of 20-year useful life, improve resident experience, and ensure the sustainability of the City's public housing infrastructure. The RAD developments will receive increased rent subsidies while continuing to be 100 percent affordable for low-income families. The RAD rehabilitation activities will ensure long term preservation of affordable housing. After conversion to RAD, SFHA will continue to refer potential residents from the SFHA waiting list.

As part of the RAD process, building upgrades requiring temporary relocation of existing residents may be necessary. The upgrades will result in some currently uninhabitable housing units becoming habitable, thereby increasing the supply of low-income housing units. A specific timeline for this work is not yet available. Like the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan project, RAD-related construction work would not proceed until suitable housing units for relocation are identified. Preservation and rehabilitation of units under the RAD program would further reduce the less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to displacement.

Therefore, the projects would not combine with other public housing projects to result in cumulative impacts with respect to displacement of existing residents and housing. The cumulative displacement impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Environmental Justice

Comment EJ-1: Comment stating that the project does not address cumulative environmental justice impacts.

"Environmental Justice

Page 4.6-3 states that the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable project-level impacts and, therefore, disproportionate impacts to low-income and minority populations would not occur. This is inconsistent with Page 5-1, which states that the project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to level-of-service at local intersections.

Recommendation for the Final EIS

Analyze whether low income and minority populations would be disproportionately affected from transportation and traffic impacts from the proposed project. While drivers from other parts of San Francisco would pass through newly congested areas, it seems that those living near the project area would be most affected." (USEPA, February 13, 2015)

Response EJ-1

The commenter states that the Environmental Justice analysis is not consistent with the Transportation analysis and requests that the EIR/EIS analyze whether minority or low-income populations would be disproportionately affected from transportation and traffic effects of the proposed project.

As stated on page 4.6-2, each section of Chapter 4 includes impact analyses under other environmental topics. Under the environmental justice analysis, the impacts identified as significant and unavoidable elsewhere in Chapter 4 are analyzed in this Section 4.6 to determine whether those impacts would disproportionately affect low-income and/or minority populations.

The crux of an environmental justice analysis is whether the significant and unavoidable impact disproportionately affects environmental justice populations. For example, locating a new factory with noise and toxic air emissions in a neighborhood with a prevalence of minority residents would affect those minority residents in that neighborhood disproportionately more than it would affect residents of another neighborhood that do not live in proximity to the factory.

Regarding *project-level* impacts, as stated under **Impact EJ-1** on page 4.6-3, the project would not result in any significant and unavoidable *project level* impacts. As such, there would be no *project-level* impact that disproportionately affects minority or low-income populations, including *project-level* impacts to level of service at local intersections.

Regarding *cumulative-level* impacts, please see **Impact CC-EJ** on pages 4.6-4 and 4.6-5. As stated there, the project would result in significant and unavoidable *cumulative* impacts to

level of service at local intersections, specifically along Bayshore Boulevard and Geneva Avenue.

However, the City's *General Plan* Transportation Element designates both Bayshore Boulevard and Geneva Avenue as Major Arterials, meaning that they are cross-town thoroughfares of citywide significance that link districts and distribute traffic from and to freeways. Given these are major cross-town thoroughfares of "citywide" importance, impacts to levels of service at intersections along these routes would be experienced citywide, by people of a diverse range of incomes and minority status. In addition, degraded intersection level of service is a common occurrence in San Francisco, given it is a densely built City. Intersections in most areas of the City—irrespective of income level or presence of minority communities—experience degraded levels of service during the p.m. peak hour.

While it is true that local minority and low-income populations would be affected by this cumulative impact, LOS impacts are a frequent result of urban development projects and affect all persons, of all income levels and minority status. There would not be disproportionate impacts on minority or low-income populations. Therefore, as concluded under **Impact CC-EJ** on pages 4.6-4 and 4.6-5, cumulative environmental justice impacts would be less than significant.

Comment EJ-2: Comment stating that the project requires mitigation measures to address environmental justice effects.

"I think environmental justice is an offshoot of [potential displacement of existing residents] because, under NEPA and CEQA, you kind of look at environmental justice. And I think that, because you're having people live on site during the, you know, 9-to-15-year, something like that, project, we need to look at -- the mitigation measure needs to be the protections against construction methods that are already laid out here.

So, again, I think maybe on that piece it's not so much necessarily that the EIR in total isn't sufficient, but the mitigation measure is definitely not "none required."

And there are mitigation measures against noise and dust and transit impacts that are laid out here. And I think that they need to be added as specific mitigation measures under the environmental justice pieces." (Commissioner Johnson, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

Response EJ-2

The commenter states that mitigation measures that are identified to reduce transportation, air quality, and noise impacts related to construction should be reiterated in the environmental justice analysis to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

As stated in Section 4.6, Environmental Justice, under **Impact EJ-1** on page 4.6-3, the project would not result in any significant and unavoidable *project level* impacts that disproportionately affect environmental justice populations. The impact would be less than significant.

As stated at the top of page 4.6-2, environmental justice analysis applies only to federal actions, and it is not applicable under CEQA.

As explained on page 4.6-2, in the "Approach to Analysis," second paragraph, each section of Chapter 4 contains impact analyses under other environmental topics. Under environmental justice analysis, impacts identified as significant and unavoidable in these other environmental topic sections are analyzed in Section 4.6 to determine whether they would disproportionately affect low-income and minority populations.

Please see page 4.6-3, under **Impact EJ-1**. As stated there, the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable project-level impacts. As such, there would be ***no impact*** to environmental justice populations at the project-specific level. Please see Sections 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources; Section 4.8, Transportation and Circulation; 4.9, Noise; 4.10, Air Quality; 4.15, Biological Resources, and 4.19, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. These analyses describe project-level impacts that would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of identified mitigation measures. Among these are impacts with respect to topics identified by the commenter, including construction and operational noise (Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, -1b, and 1c); air quality impacts during construction (Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1); and construction and operational effects on transportation (Mitigation Measures M-TR-6 and M-CC-TR-1(a), -1(b), and -1(c). No mitigation measures are identified with respect to transit, as no significant impacts were identified. Given these impacts would be reduced to a level of insignificance, they are not significant and unavoidable impacts. As stated above, only significant and unavoidable impacts are considered in the environmental justice analysis. Impacts on residents near construction sites are analyzed in the sections listed above. The mitigation measures reduce impacts to all relevant populations (not just environmental justice populations). It is not necessary to repeat these mitigation measures in Section 4.6 because they do not reduce impacts specifically for environmental justice populations.

Please also see pages 4.6-4 and 4.6-5, under **Impact CC-EJ**, where it is noted that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to vehicular levels of service at several intersections. However, as explained in the response to Comment EJ-1, this impact would not disproportionately affect environmental justice communities of concern. Therefore, environmental justice impacts would be ***less than significant***.

Transportation and Circulation

Comment TR-1: Comment requesting what details are included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

"Lead Agency

As the lead agency, the City and County of San Francisco is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to State highways. Given the project's high vehicle trip generation, fair share contribution financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

This information should also be presented in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) of the environmental document, a draft of which should be included in the DEIR. Please send the draft MMRP for our review before finalizing the Final Environmental Impact Report." (Caltrans; letter, February, 2015)

Response TR-1

The commenter states that the City and County of San Francisco is responsible for mitigation, that mitigation responsibilities should be presented in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan and included in the environmental document. The commenter also infers that mitigation for improvements to state highways may be required.

As stated in Chapter 1, page 1-1, the San Francisco Planning Department is the lead agency under CEQA, and the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development is the lead agency under NEPA.

Under CEQA, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will be included in the Planning Department staff report submitted to decision-makers at project approval, and implementation of the MMRP by the project sponsor will be required as a condition of project approval by the San Francisco Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The MMRP includes mitigation measures M-CC-TR-1(a), -1(b), and -1(c). As applicable, it describes fair share contribution financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities, and monitoring for impacts at local intersections. There is no requirement under CEQA that the MMRP be included in the Draft EIR. A copy of the Draft MMRP was provided to Caltrans prior to publication of this Responses to Comments document.

Under NEPA, mitigation measures will be detailed in a Mitigation Monitoring and Enforcement Program (MMEP) that will be attached to the Record of Decision published in the Federal Register. There is no requirement that the MMEP be included in the Draft EIS.

Regarding the commenter's statement that CCSF is responsible for all project mitigation, including improvements to state highways, the geographic scope of the transportation

analysis is shown in Figure 4.8-1 on page 4.8-11. The area studied quantitatively is sufficiently large to include all roadway facilities where the project could conceivably have significant impacts. This study area does not include state highways. Access to the nearest highway, U.S. Route 101, is approximately 1.25 miles along City streets. State highways were not included in the quantitative analysis because the project would not physically change any state highways or generate a high enough volume of vehicle trips to substantially affect the operation of any state highways, especially compared to the high traffic capacities and volumes on nearby routes. Therefore, the proposed project could not have significant impacts on state highways, and no mitigation measures are required. As indicated on page 4.8-9, the proposed project would generate 621 p.m. peak hour vehicular trips, which were assigned to the four San Francisco Superdistricts (northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest), the East Bay, the North Bay, the South Bay, and areas outside the region. The percentage distribution of inbound and outbound vehicular trips to each of these locations is presented in Appendix TR on pages 41-42 for further information.

Comment TR-2: Comment requesting a.m. peak hour trip generation and analysis.

"Traffic Forecasting

The DEIR report should include AM and PM trip generation, its turning traffic per study intersection and associated traffic impact analysis under Proposed Project Only, Variant Scenario, Alternative 1 Conditions, and 2030 Cumulative Conditions for our further review.

While peak PM traffic would result from residential, retail, and the community center, peak AM traffic may be caused from residential and community center trips in opposing directions. The DEIR only includes PM trip generation and its turning traffic per study intersection (Figures 18 & 19)." (Caltrans; letter, February, 2015)

Response TR-2

The commenter requests that the EIR/EIS analyze a.m. peak-hour trip generation.

As stated on EIR/EIS page 4.8-8, the daily and p.m. peak-hour person trips for the residential and retail uses were based on the trip generation rates and peak-hour factors in the San Francisco Planning Department's *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (San Francisco Guidelines)*. Trip generation for the community center use was based on the Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip rate for Recreational Community Center (Land Use 495).

The *San Francisco Guidelines* state that transportation impact analysis should include total unadjusted daily and p.m. peak hour trips by mode. As further explained in Appendix TR on pages 36–37, for the purpose of providing a conservative transportation analysis, it is assumed that total a.m. peak-hour trip generation would be the same as p.m. peak-

hour trip generation. As noted in the *San Francisco Guidelines,* in the experience of the City's transportation planners, the p.m. peak period (4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) is the time period when the maximum use of the transportation system occurs. Also, according to the ITE Trip Generation 8th Edition (2008), trip generation rates for Mid-Rise Apartment (Code 223), Rental Townhouse (Code 224), Residential Condo/Townhouses (Code 230), and Multipurpose Recreational Facility (Code 495) show lower trip generation rates for the a.m. peak hour than the p.m. peak hour. Accordingly, a.m. peak-hour traffic effects would be less substantial than those reported for the p.m. peak hour. The Planning Department typically quantifies a.m. peak hour traffic for projects where the peak period of trip generation would not be during the traditional p.m. peak hour (i.e. certain industrial uses, large educational institutions, special events venues, etc.), or where nearby intersections routinely experience heavier traffic during the a.m. peak (i.e. intersections on the downtown one-way street network that primarily serve inbound traffic). Such conditions are not applicable to the proposed project. Given that the composition of the existing site, proposed project, and surrounding neighborhood is primarily residential, there is no evidence to suggest that local traffic volumes would be higher in the a.m. peak hour than in the p.m. peak hour. Therefore, the p.m. peak hour analysis performed for the EIR/EIS adequately captures the highest traffic hour of the day, and analysis of the a.m. peak would not provide any information that would change the transportation impact conclusions or mitigation measures.

Comment TR-3: Comments requesting projects to be included in, or removed from, the cumulative traffic analysis.

"Project Impacts / U.S. Highway 101

The City/County should work with Caltrans and other agencies to develop a co-operative agreement to fund the extension of Geneva Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard to U.S. 101 and the U.S. 101 and Harney Way interchange improvements as identified in the Bi-County Transportation Study (pg. 4.8-6). Similar to the transit improvement projects planned in the vicinity of the project site, considered roadway improvement projects incorporated into the project's future cumulative conditions should have a scheduled year of implementation. A reasonable worst-case analysis assumes only those improvements that are fully funded and scheduled to be operational prior to opening day of the proposed project. The cumulative analysis should be consistent with this approach." (Caltrans; letter, February, 2015)

"There's a proposal [by] Urban Riders to put in an extreme bike facility. They said they're going to have 300 to 500 cars coming in when they have their events. It's not serving our community. Do not want this in our community, and been no transparent process." (Nelson Gutierrez; email, February 17, 2015)

Response TR-3

The comment states that agencies should work together to develop a cooperative agreement to fund the Geneva Avenue Extension from its current terminus at Bayshore Boulevard in the City of Brisbane northeast to connect to Harney Way in San Francisco. This comment does not directly relate to the proposed project or the accuracy or adequacy of the EIR/EIS. As stated on EIR/EIS p. 4.8-5, and noted by the commenter, extension of Geneva Avenue from Bayshore Boulevard east to U.S. 101 and Harney Way is a key recommendation of the San Francisco–San Mateo Bi-County Study. The City and County of San Francisco has been working with Caltrans, the City of Brisbane, and other local agencies on the Bi-County Study. Please also see the following discussion concerning inclusion of the Geneva Avenue Extension in the cumulative analysis.

The commenter also states that the cumulative analysis should include a reasonable worst-case scenario assuming only improvements that are fully funded and scheduled to be operational prior to opening day of the proposed project. The commenter notes that the Geneva Avenue Extension is not fully funded.

A separate comment is regarding the planned bike skills park to be located on four acres on the north side of Sunnydale Avenue in McLaren Park, west of the project site.

As stated on pages 4.8-45 to 4.8-54, under Impact CC-TR-1, cumulative effects on levels of service would be significant and unavoidable.

Geneva Avenue Extension

Despite full funding not yet being assured, the Geneva Avenue extension is considered a reasonably foreseeable project by the CCSF and is included in the 2040 scenario in the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) transportation model, SF-CHAMP (San Francisco Chained Activity Modeling Process). Therefore, it is included in the cumulative analysis under 2040 conditions in an effort to provide a conservative analysis of transportation impacts. The proposed Geneva Avenue extension is located 0.75 miles from the project site along local streets. The extension would not substantially change traffic patterns to and from the project site. Exclusion of the Geneva Avenue extension in the 2040 scenario would not substantially affect the conclusions of the analysis or increase the significance of potential transportation impacts.

As stated in the EIR/EIS on page 4.8-5, the cumulative conditions assume that Geneva Avenue is extended to the east of Bayshore Boulevard to connect to Harney Way and U.S. 101. Therefore, different traffic assignments were used for the cumulative conditions from existing conditions. For example, currently 100 percent of trips from U.S. 101 southbound use the Bayshore Boulevard off-ramp, but these trips are assumed to be equally split between Bayshore Boulevard and the proposed Harney Way off-ramps under the Future Cumulative Conditions.

As explained in EIR/EIS pages 4.8-37 through 4.8-50, with the Geneva Avenue Extension, the proposed project would result in significant traffic delays at intersections on Bayshore Boulevard. Specifically, it would result in:

- the deterioration from LOS E to LOS F at Sunnydale Avenue (Intersection 4),
- a considerable contribution of vehicle volume to an existing LOS F condition at Geneva Avenue (Intersection 10), and
- the deterioration from LOS E to LOS F at Visitacion Avenue (Intersection 11).

Therefore, the project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to traffic, even when assuming that vehicular trips from U.S. 101 southbound to the project site could be disbursed via the Geneva Avenue Extension.

If the Geneva Avenue Extension were not completed under cumulative conditions, then 100 percent of the trips from U.S. 101 southbound would continue to travel to and from the project site via Bayshore Boulevard, traversing through Study Intersections 4, 10, 11, as well as the other intersections analyzed. Although the delay and change in LOS at these intersections would be different under this scenario, and the delays and changes in LOS at other intersections analyzed in EIR/EIS could be different under this scenario, the analysis already provides a conservative conclusion of significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts due to LOS F at analyzed intersections, regardless of the incorporation of the Geneva Avenue Extension.

Bike Skills Park

Regarding the planned bike skills park, as stated in Section 4.3, Land Use and Land Use Planning, on page 4.3-11, "…the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department has awarded a grant to SF Urban Riders for the first phase of construction of an off-road bicycle skills park on the north side of Sunnydale Avenue immediately west of the Sunnydale-Velasco project site. The park would contain bike trails, jumps, berms, and mounds, as well as a downhill course and other features."

The text has been revised, as follows (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in <u>double underline</u>):

> ~~This project has not undergone environmental review and has not obtained Planning Department or Commission approvals.~~ <u>The project was determined to qualify for a Class 4 (Minor Alterations to Land) Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act.[23] This exemption was issued in 2013. The project sponsor, San Francisco Urban Riders (SFUR), has engaged in a collaborative process with park neighbors and users. The sponsor specifically held meetings</u>

[23] San Francisco Planning Department, CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination: Case No. 2013.0354E, March 23, 2013. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2010.0305E.

with community members in November 2010, as well as June through November 2011, typically attended by approximately 50 people.

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

Phase 1 of the bike skills project would entail improvements on 0.75 acres immediately west of the Sunnydale-Velasco project site. The project is under design development, and construction of this phase is anticipated to occur from April through September 2016.[24]

As stated in Section 4.8, Transportation and Circulation, on page 4.8-5, cumulative traffic volumes for the year 2040 cumulative analysis were developed using the latest SF-CHAMP model. Traffic generated by the bike skills project would have been accounted for in the background growth for the cumulative traffic analysis. Although the bike skills park may host events that generate a higher number of vehicle trips than under normal operations, these events would occur on an irregular and infrequent basis, and the trips generated by such events would be unlikely to combine with proposed project to result in cumulative traffic impacts. Therefore, the cumulative impacts of the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan project and the Bike Skills Park are already included in the analysis in Section 4.8, Transportation and Circulation.

Comment TR-4: Comment requesting detail of the Transportation Demand Management Program and analysis of impacts of mitigation measures.

"Vehicle Trip Reduction

1. Provide additional details on the vehicle trip reducing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures identified in the project. Financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring of the TDM Program should be included in the draft MMRP provided for our review. The TDM Plan should include appropriate documentation for monitoring TDM measures, including annual reports to demonstrate the ongoing reduction of vehicle trips while continuing to survey the travel patterns of residents within the Project area.

2. Secondary impacts on pedestrians and bicyclists resulting from any traffic impact mitigation measures should be analyzed. The analysis should describe any pedestrian and bicycle mitigation measures and safety countermeasures that would in time be needed as a means of maintaining and improving access to transit facilities and reducing vehicle trips and traffic impacts on State highways." (Caltrans; letter, February, 2015)

[24] SFRPD, personal communication with ESA RE: McLaren Bike Park, March 11, 2015.

Response TR-4

The commenter requests additional details regarding vehicle-trip-reducing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures identified in the Project, and states that the requirements of the TDM should be included in the MMRP.

The impacts of the proposed project on transportation are analyzed in Sections 3.8 and 4.8 of the EIR/EIS. As stated there, the project would result in less-than-significant existing-plus-project impacts to transportation, with mitigation incorporated. The project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to cumulative traffic levels of service at certain intersections, and a less-than-significant impact to cumulative transit service. Though a TDM program may reduce the amount of vehicle trips generated by the proposed project, data is not currently available to show that a TDM program would demonstrably reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

Regarding the MMRP, please see response to Comment TR-1. As stated there, the MMRP will be included in the project approvals, and financing responsibility, schedule, and implementation responsibilities are detailed in the MMRP, as appropriate.

The commenter also states that secondary impacts to pedestrians and bicyclists from traffic impact mitigation measures should be analyzed.

As stated on page 3.8-10, pedestrian traffic in the study area is light to moderate and easily accommodated on sidewalks and crosswalks. Pages 4.8-16 through 4.8-18 analyzed potential impacts on bicycle and pedestrian facilities and concluded that the proposed project would result in an improvement in pedestrian and bicycle facilities on site.

Regarding mitigation measures, as stated on page 4.8-60 under "Impacts of Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures," implementation of the mitigation measures would not result in additional environmental effects, with the exception of Mitigation Measures M-CC-TR-1(b) and -1(c), which would be infeasible due to coordinated signal timing on Geneva Avenue. Therefore, the EIR/EIS identifies the secondary impacts of the proposed mitigation measures, where applicable.

Comment TR-5: Comment regarding permit application processes from Caltrans.

"Transportation Permit

Project work that requires movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on State roadways requires a transportation permit that is issued by Caltrans (pg. 4.8-1). To apply, a completed transportation permit application with the determined specific route(s) for the shipper to follow from origin to destination must be submitted to: Caltrans Transportation Permits Office, 1823 14th Street, Sacramento, CA 95811-7119. See the website below for more information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/permits.

Encroachment Permit

Please be advised that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto the State ROW requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. Where traffic restrictions and detours affect State highways, a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) or construction TIS may be required. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five (5) sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW must be submitted to the following address: David Salladay, District Office Chief, Office of Permits, California Department of Transportation, District 4, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660. See the website below for more information: http://www.dot.ca.govhq/traffops/developserv/permits." (Caltrans; letter, February, 2015)

Response TR-5

The comment states that the movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on State roadways requires a transportation permit. As stated on page 4.8-1, transport of oversize or overweight loads would require a permit from Caltrans. If oversized loads are necessary, the project sponsor or successor(s) would apply to Caltrans and provide the required permit information.

The comment also states that work in State right-of-way would require an encroachment permit. The project is not anticipated to require work within a State right-of-way. Similarly, traffic detours are not anticipated to affect State highways, so a Transportation Management Plan is not anticipated to be required. If detours would affect state highways, the project sponsor or successor(s) would apply to Caltrans and provide the required permit information.

Comment TR-6: Question regarding bus route frequency.

"What are changes to bus route and frequency? As of right now bus traffic is very busy, noisy and air pollution and roads are crumbling." (Nelson Gutierrez; email, February 17, 2015)

Response TR-6

The commenter asks how the project will affect bus routes and frequency.

During construction, the project would result in temporary changes to bus routing, but not to bus frequency. As stated in Section 4.8, Transportation and Circulation, under Impact TR-6 on pages 4.8-26 and 4.8-27, the project sponsor has been coordinating with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to develop a rerouting and bus stop plan. While Phase I is under construction, Muni routes 8X, 8BX, and 9 that run on Santos Street and Sunnydale Avenue would be rerouted. During Phase II construction, Muni routes 8X, 8BX, and 9 would be restored on Santos Street and the eastern half of Sunnydale Avenue, but the Route 9 terminus would be relocated. During Phase III construction, all routes would be restored to their current configurations.

During operation, the proposed project would not affect bus routes or frequency; any future such changes would be separate projects of the SFMTA, which operates Muni. They would not be necessary in order to meet the increased ridership demand due to the proposed project. As stated in under Impact TR-2, on pages 4.8-13 to 4.8-15, the increases in transit ridership that would result from the proposed project could be accommodated by existing service, would not cause significant impacts with regard to crowding, and would not require additional or modified Muni service in order to meet demand. The project would not result in permanent changes to transit.

The commenter is concerned about existing noise and air pollution caused by bus traffic. Existing noise and air quality conditions are described in Section 3.9 and 3.10, respectively, and are part of the baseline conditions to which the project's impacts are compared and analyzed. For example, noise measurements taken at the project site under existing conditions account for traffic noise. Similarly, local air pollutant analyses account for existing traffic, including bus traffic. Impacts to noise and air quality that would result from the proposed project are analyzed in Sections 4.9 and 4.10, respectively.

As stated under Impact TR-2, on pages 4.8-13 to 4.8-15, the increases in transit ridership that would result from the proposed project could be accommodated by existing service. The proposed project would not increase bus frequency or permanently affect bus routing, nor would such changes be needed to meet the additional transit demand generated by the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an increase in bus noise or air contaminant emissions associated with bus operations. As stated in Section 4.9 and 4.10, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to noise and air quality, with implementation of identified mitigation measures.

The commenter is concerned about the condition of existing roads. As stated under Impact TR-1 on pages 4.8-10 to 4.8-12, the proposed project's trip generation would result in less-than-significant impacts to traffic. As stated under Impact TR-6 on pages 4.8-23 to 4.8-28, construction of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts with incorporated mitigation. The project would entail realignment and complete reconstruction of all roadways within the project site. These roadways would be constructed to standards capable of handling anticipated traffic.

Comment TR-7: Request for additional mitigation to reduce transportation effects on child safety.

"Child Safety During Construction Activities

Executive Order 13045 on the Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks directs each federal agency to make it a high priority to assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and ensure that its policies, programs, activities and standards address disproportionate risks to children. Construction activities would result in temporary heavy truck traffic and altered transportation routes. Safety

measures that offer additional protection to children who are walking in areas near construction activities should be included in the Construction Traffic Control Plan.

Recommendations for the Final EIS

Augment **Mitigation Measure M-TR-6** to state that the Construction Traffic Control Plan will:

- Identify and assess the potential safety risks of project construction to children, especially in areas where the project is located near homes, schools, daycare centers, youth recreation facilities or parks.
- Promote child safety within and near the project area. For example, crossing guards could be provided in areas where construction activities are located near schools, daycare centers, youth recreation facilities, or parks.
- Commit to establish truck traffic routes away from schools, daycares, and residences, or at a location with the least impact if those areas are unavoidable." (USEPA, letter, February 13, 2015)

Response TR-7

The commenter states that construction activities would result in temporary heavy truck traffic and altered transportation routes, and that **Mitigation Measure M-TR-6** should be modified to further indicate how the Construction Traffic Control Plan will protect children.

As stated in Section 4.8, Transportation and Circulation, on pages 4.8-23 to 4.8-28, construction impacts would be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-TR-6**.

As stated on page 4.8-26, construction traffic would be routed along Geneva Avenue, Brookdale Avenue and Santos Street and would be managed to avoid peak periods. As stated on page 4.8-27, construction of the proposed project would require pedestrian re-routing via temporary pedestrian walkways, as well as bus re-routings. The project sponsor would be required to develop a construction traffic management plan for approval by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), Police Department (SFPD), Fire Department (SFFD), Department of Public Works (DPW), and the Unified School District (SFUSD). The plan would ensure that all modes of travel, including pedestrian travel by children, are accommodated.

Details of the site access plan are conceptual because project planning has not proceeded to the point that a detailed construction traffic control plan can be prepared. Refinements to the conceptual access plan would be made as project design progresses. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-TR-6** would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level by requiring preparation and implementation of the traffic control plan during construction.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-6 is included in pages 4.8-58 to 4.8-59. As stated there, "the coordinated plan shall include measures that address street closures, and ensure safe

access to McLaren Early Education School and all occupied residents." In addition, the construction contractor shall coordinate with school administrators to ensure safe access to and from the school for students, teachers, and parents at all times. The contractors shall inquire as to the school start and dismissal times and schedule construction vehicle trips outside of the peak school drop-off and pick up hours to the extent feasible. If avoiding these hours is infeasible, the construction contractor shall provide additional flaggers during school drop-off and pick-up hours near school. The specific actions required by Mitigation Measure TR-6 would ensure that effects to child safety would be minimized.

The following text is revised on page 4.8-59, within **Mitigation Measure TR-6**, after the third bullet on the page (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

- The construction contractor shall coordinate with school administrators to ensure safe access to and from the school for students, teachers, and parents at all times. The contractors ~~should~~ shall inquire as to the school start and dismissal times and schedule construction vehicle trips outside of the peak school drop-off and pick up hours to the extent feasible. If avoiding these hours is infeasible, the construction contractor shall provide additional flaggers and crossing guards during school drop-off and pick-up hours near school.

- Establish truck traffic routes away from schools, daycares, and residences, or at a location with the least impact if those areas are unavoidable.

The same text is added to the Executive Summary Chapter in the following locations:

- In Table S-1, on page S-15, within **Mitigation Measure TR-6**, and
- In Table S-2, on page S-38, within **Mitigation Measure TR-6**.

In both cases, it is inserted after the last bullet of the mitigation measure (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

TR-6 (cont.)		• The construction contractor shall coordinate with school administrators to ensure safe access to and from the school for students, teachers, and parents at all times. The contractors ~~should~~ shall inquire as to the school start and dismissal times and schedule construction vehicle trips outside of the peak school drop-off and pick up hours to the extent feasible. If avoiding these hours is infeasible, the construction contractor shall provide additional flaggers and crossing guards during school drop-off and pick-up hours near school. • To the extent applicable, the traffic control plan shall conform to Caltrans's Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones. • Establish truck traffic routes away from schools, daycares, and residences, or at a location with the least impact if those areas are unavoidable.	

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

Comment TR-8: Request for additional transit service as mitigation for level of service impacts.

"Traffic Congestion Mitigation

Page 4.8-59 lists three mitigation measures that would require the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution toward roadway modifications if level-of-service declines at specific intersections. It is unclear whether level-of-service issues could, alternatively, be addressed through enhancing transit service. Further, the Draft EIS does not offer any measures to monitor or mitigate impacts to transit in case the project induces higher transit ridership than expected.

Recommendations for the Final EIS

- Include a transportation mitigation measure to monitor transit. If induced ridership is higher than expected and significantly declines the quality of transit service, require the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution toward improving transit service.
- In addition to requiring the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution toward roadway improvements if needed, consider requiring the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution toward enhancing transit service to alleviate traffic, which could have the added benefit of reducing long term air emissions from vehicles." (USEPA, letter, February 13, 2015)

Response TR-8

The commenter states that impacts to roadway levels of service (LOS) could be mitigated through enhanced transit service, and that the EIR/EIS should include measures to monitor or mitigate impacts to transit in case the project induces higher ridership than expected.

As stated in Section 4.8, Transportation and Circulation, under Impact TR-1 on pages 4.8-10 through 4.8-12, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts to roadway levels of service in the existing-plus-project scenario. As stated on pages 4.8-45 to 4.8-54, under Impact CC-TR-1, the project would have a considerable contribution to cumulative effects on levels of service that would be significant and unavoidable.

As explained on page 4.8-9, the estimated new person trips were assigned to different transportation modes based on the San Francisco Planning Department's *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* and the *2000 US Census*. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate 621 vehicular trips and 562 transit trips.

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to intersection LOS at the locations explained under Impact CC-TR-1 on pages 4.8-45 to 4.8-53.

Provision of additional transit service may induce a mode shift that would reduce project trip generation, and therefore reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. However, it would be speculative to estimate the degree of mode shift that could occur and hence effectiveness of increased transit's ability to mitigate LOS impacts. Thus, a mitigation measure to increase transit service to address LOS impacts was not included in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The mitigation measures proposed (M-TR-1a through M-TR-1c) require monitoring of traffic conditions. Roadway geometry changes are to be undertaken if, and only if, unacceptable LOS occurs. The EIR/EIS has identified specific engineering solutions to reduce cumulative significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, but these are found to be significant and unavoidable because implementation would be the responsibility of SFMTA, who would need to further evaluate traffic circulation and volumes in the project area.

Cumulative impacts to transit are analyzed under Impact CC-TR-2 on pages 4.8-54 through 4.8-58. As stated there, the proposed project would not make a substantial contribution to transit delay on Muni or regional transit. With the project, Muni capacity utilization would be between 68 and 73 percent across each screenline, which would be below the 85 percent capacity utilization standard. Regional transit capacity utilization would be unchanged compared to cumulative conditions without the project. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. Accordingly, no mitigation measures are required.

Significant impacts must be based on substantial evidence and the EIR/EIS employs a conservative (worst-case) traffic and transit analysis. It would be speculative to assume an even higher transit mode share than that assumed in the EIR/EIS. Therefore, because no significant transit impacts were identified, mitigation measures, such as those suggested, are not warranted and cannot be legally imposed under CEQA. However, the SFMTA, which operates public transportation in San Francisco, periodically makes service adjustments based on changes in ridership patterns.

Air Quality

Comment AQ-1: Comments regarding health effects of emissions.

"Concern about asthma effects on children during construction." (Anthony Billups, public hearing written comment, January 20, 2015)

"What is the probability of the hazard, once they start -- you know, like little kids that has asthma, and what is the ratio for each set as you tear it down?" (Unidentified speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

Response AQ-1

The commenters express concern about asthma effects related to demolition and construction.

As stated on page 3.10-4, studies in the United States and elsewhere have demonstrated a strong link between elevated particulate levels and asthma attacks and the state Air Resources Board reports that statewide attainment of particulate matter standards could prevent asthma-related emergency room visits in California.[25] High levels of particulate matter can exacerbate chronic respiratory ailments, such as bronchitis and asthma, and have been associated with increased emergency room visits and hospital admissions. Thus, the Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that increased concentrations of fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) represents a potential air quality impact and that $PM_{2.5}$ levels are linked to increased asthma attacks.

The analysis addresses the severity of elevated $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations resulting from construction activities at both on-site and off-site receptors in Section 4.10, Air Quality, under **Impact AQ-3** on pages 4.10-17 through 4.10-23.

To evaluate $PM_{2.5}$ impacts from the proposed project, near-field air dispersion modeling of $PM_{2.5}$ from project construction emission sources was conducted using USEPA's American Meteorological Society/Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model (AERMOD), version 11059,[26] as recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*. This assessment estimated $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations based on data generated by the OFFROAD2007 mobile source inventory and the 2011 Inventory Model for the In-use Off-road Equipment Rule.

---

[25] California Air Resources, Board, "Recent Research Findings: Health Effects of Particulate Matter and Ozone Air Pollution," November 2007. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.

[26] USEPA, *User's Guide for the AMS/EPA Regulatory Model (AERMOD)*, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emissions Monitoring and Analysis Division, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, EPA-454/B-03-001, September 2004.

Table 4.10-6, on page 4.10-22, presents the estimated $PM_{2.5}$ concentration for off-site receptors without mitigation, and **Table 4.10-7** presents the estimated $PM_{2.5}$ concentration for on-site receptors with mitigation. The maximum resultant $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations would be slightly higher than background concentrations of 8.6 micrograms per cubic meter. This resultant concentration is below the applicable City of San Francisco threshold of 10 micrograms per cubic meter. This threshold is based on the health protective $PM_{2.5}$ standard of 12 $\mu g/m^3$, as supported by the USEPA's Particulate Matter Policy Assessment, although lowered to 10 $\mu g/m^3$ to be even more health protective and to account for potential error bounds in emissions modeling programs. This primary standard was developed by USEPA to provide public health protection, including protecting the health of sensitive populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly.

Although the resulting concentrations were below the thresholds, implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1**, on pages 4.10-40 through 4.10-43, would be required during construction. This measure calls for preparation of a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan, which shall incorporate requirements to, among other actions, minimize use of diesel engines, use diesel engines with Tier 3 off-road emissions standards, and limit idling time for off-road and on-road equipment. Quarterly reports must be submitted to the Environmental Review Officer indicating compliance with these requirements. With implementation of this measure, construction air quality impacts, including concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$, would be less than significant.

Table 4.10-8, on page 4.10-23, presents the estimated $PM_{2.5}$ concentration for off-site receptors with mitigation, and **Table 4.10-9** presents the estimated $PM_{2.5}$ concentration for on-site receptors with mitigation. With mitigation, the maximum resultant $PM_{2.5}$ concentration would be indistinguishable from background concentrations, both of which would be 8.6 micrograms per cubic meter. This resultant concentration is below the threshold of 10 micrograms per cubic meter.

Therefore, health effects, including links to asthma, are considered through the EIR/EIS analysis of PM2.5 emissions.

Comment AQ-2: Request for further mitigation of construction emissions.

"***Construction Air Quality***

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, which is designated as a nonattainment area for the 8-hour ozone and 24 hour $PM_{2.5}$ National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Sensitive receptors, such as children and elderly people, would be located in the project area during both construction and operational phases. Given existing air quality challenges and the presence of sensitive receptors, EPA strongly encourages the San Francisco Planning Department and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to require all feasible measures to avoid, reduce and mitigate construction impacts to air quality. Mitigation

Measure M-AQ-1 states that off-road engines must meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. Major infrastructure projects, such as the California High Speed Rail project, are requiring Tier 4 engines, to the extent that they are available. We strongly encourage the San Francisco Planning Department and HUD to do the same.

Recommendations for the Final EIS

Mobile and Stationary Source Controls:

- Employ periodic, unscheduled inspections to limit unnecessary idling and to ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained, tuned and modified consistent with established specifications.
- Prohibit any tampering with engines and require continuing adherence to manufacturer's recommendations.
- Commit to the best available emissions control technologies for project equipment.

On-Highway Vehicles: On-highway vehicles used for this project should meet or exceed the U.S. EPA exhaust emissions standards for model year 2010 and newer heavy-duty on-highway compression-ignition engines (e.g., long-haul trucks, refuse haulers, shuttle buses, etc.).[27]

Nonroad Vehicles & Equipment: Nonroad vehicles and equipment used for this project should meet or exceed the U.S. EPA Tier 4 exhaust emissions standards for heavy-duty nonroad compression-ignition engines (e.g., construction equipment, nonroad trucks, etc.).[28]

Low Emission Equipment Exemptions: The equipment specifications outlined above should be met unless: 1) a piece of specialized equipment is not available for purchase or lease within the U.S.; or 2) the relevant project contractor has been awarded funds to retrofit existing equipment, or purchase/lease new equipment, but the funds are not yet available.

Advanced Technology Demonstration & Deployment: Demonstrate and deploy heavy-duty technologies that exceed the latest U.S. EPA emission performance standards for the equipment categories that are relevant for this project (e.g., plug-in hybrid-electric vehicles, battery-electric vehicles, fuel cell electric vehicles, advanced technology locomotives, etc.).

Administrative controls: Specify the means by which the San Francisco Planning Department and HUD will minimize impacts to sensitive receptors, such as children and elderly and infirm individuals. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners." (USEPA, letter, February 13, 2015)

Response AQ-2

The commenter requests additional, or more stringent, mitigation requirements to reduce impacts to criteria air pollutants during construction.

The Draft EIR/EIS assesses potential construction-related air quality impacts from criteria pollutant emissions under **Impact AQ-1**, on pages 4.10-10 to 4.10-14, and assesses

[27] http://www.epa.gov/otaq/standards/heavy-duty/hdci-exhaust.htm
[28] http://www.epa.gov/otaq/standards/nonroad/nonroadci.htm

potential construction-related health risk impacts from diesel particulate matter under **Impact AQ-3**, on pages 4.10-17 to 4.10-24. Impacts were determined to be less-than-significant with incorporation of identified mitigation measures.

As indicated in **Table 4.10-4** on page 4.10-14 of the Draft EIR/EIS, implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1**, on pages 4.10-41 through 4.10-43, would reduce significant emissions of NOx to below 54 pounds per day. Emissions below this level would not make a considerable contribution to the cumulative concentration of ozone precursors. This threshold is based on the federal New Source Review Significant Emission Rate requirements. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 requires Tier 3 engines on construction equipment and California Air Resources Board Level 3 verified diesel emissions control strategies (VDECS). Because this mitigation measure would be sufficient to reduce significant NOx emissions to less than significant levels, additional or more stringent mitigation measures (Tier 4 engine requirements) are not required under CEQA or NEPA.

Similarly, as indicated in Impact AQ-3, implementation **of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** would reduce significant exposures to diesel particulate matter to a less than significant exposure level, as indicated in Table 4.10-8 on page 4.10-23 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The cancer risk significance criteria of 100 per one million persons (100 excess cancer risk) is based on USEPA guidance for conducting air toxic analyses and making risk management decisions at the facility and community-scale level.[29] As shown in Table 4.10-9 on page 4.10-23 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the maximum excess cancer risk would occur at offsite receptor locations, who would be exposed to an excess cancer risk of between 47-49 per one million persons exposed. It is noted that the background cancer risk concentration is about 35 per one million persons exposed. Therefore, the cumulative mitigated cancer risk (background cancer risk plus project cancer risk) would be substantially below the significance criteria of 100 per one million persons exposed. **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** requires Tier 3 engines on construction equipment and California Air Resources Board Level 3 verified diesel emissions control strategies (VDECS). Because this mitigation measure would be sufficient to reduce significant diesel particulate emission exposures to a less than significant level, additional or more stringent mitigation measures (Tier 4 engine requirements) are not required under CEQA or NEPA.

Regarding the request for use of 2010 or newer trucks and advanced technology demonstration and deployment, as discussed above, with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1, both criteria air pollutant and health risk impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and additional mitigation is not required under CEQA or NEPA.

[29] BAAQMD, *Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance,* October 2009, page 67.

Regarding comments pertaining to idling restrictions and proper maintenance of vehicles and equipment, requirement A2 of **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** on page 4.10-42 of the Draft EIR/EIS restricts idling time for on-road and off-road equipment to 2 minutes, and requirement A3 requires that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. These measures are required to be included in the *Construction Emissions Minimization Plan*, and they would ensure that impacts from mobile emissions would be less than significant. Third-party verification would not be required because Mitigation Measure AQ-1 on page 4.12-41 has been revised as indicated below to require that a construction manager be assigned to ensure implementation of the plan provisions:

A. *Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.* Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the ~~following~~ requirements below. The project sponsor or construction contractor shall assign a construction manager to ensure compliance with the requirements:

Regarding the comment on equipment exemptions, section A1 (c) of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 specifies in detail the available exceptions to compliance with the low-emission equipment requirements. These exceptions were determined necessary to ensure safety and feasibility of the mitigation measure.

Finally, in regards to the comment on administrative controls, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 has been revised as indicated below to address staging areas and equipment in Measure A3 on page 4.10-42 of the Draft EIR/EIS:

3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators locate staging areas and stationary construction equipment, such as generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors and building HVAC intakes.

These revisions to M-AQ-1 are also made in the Executive Summary of the EIR/EIS.

The above revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

As shown in Response to Comment GC-3, above, Table S-1 on page S-17 is revised to include Impacts AQ-1 and AQ-3, and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1. This inserted text also reflects the changes described here, in Response to Comment AQ-2.

Table S-1 on page S-40 is revised as follows:

AQ-1: Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	**Significant**	**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization** A. *Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.* Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the ~~following~~ requirements below. The project sponsor or construction contractor shall assign a construction manager to ensure compliance with the requirements:	Less than Significant

Table S-1 on page S-43 is revised as follows:

AQ-1 (cont.)		and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit. 3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators locate staging areas and stationary construction equipment such as generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors and building HVAC intakes. 4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used. 5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan to members of the public as requested. B. *Reporting.* Quarterly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used. Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction	

Greenhouse Gases

Comment GG-1: Comment stating the NEPA greenhouse gas analysis should be revised to incorporate draft guidance.

"Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

On December 18, 2014, the Council on Environmental Quality released revised draft guidance for public comment that describes how Federal departments and agencies should consider the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in their NEPA reviews. The revised draft guidance supersedes the draft greenhouse gas and climate change guidance released by CEQ in February 2010.

This guidance explains that agencies should consider both the potential effects of a proposed action on climate change, as indicated by its estimated greenhouse gas emissions, and the implications of climate change for the environmental effects of a proposed action.

Recommendation for the Final EIS

Update the discussion of the Council on Environmental Quality's 2010 greenhouse gas and climate guidance on page 4.11-9 so that it reflects the 2014 guidance.[30]" (USEPA, letter, February 13, 2015)

Response GG-1

The commenter requests that the NEPA greenhouse gas analysis be modified to reflect recent draft guidance published by USEPA.[31]

Greenhouse gases are analyzed in Section 4.11, Greenhouse Gases, under impact GG-1 on pages 4.11-7 through 4.11-10. The project would result in a less-than-significant impact to greenhouse gases.

The following text is revised on page 4.11-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS to acknowledge the recent release of a revised draft guidance for public comment that describes how Federal departments and agencies should consider the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in their NEPA reviews (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in <u>double underline</u>):

> In ~~February 2010~~ <u>December 2014</u>, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) ~~provided a~~ <u>released a revised</u> draft guidance memorandum on consideration the effects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) in NEPA documentation[32]. ~~This document identifies the Clean Air Act reporting requirement of 25,000 metric tons (MT) or more of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2E) as an~~

[30] http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/nepa_revised_draft_ghg_guidance_searchable.pdf
[31] It is noted that the guidance was published the day before the Draft EIR/EIS was published, and therefore could not have been considered in the Draft EIR/EIS.
[32] Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). *Draft NEPA Guidance on Consideration of the Effects of Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, 2010.

> ~~indication that greenhouse gas emissions could be considered as potential adverse impact of a federal action but specifies that the reporting requirement should not, necessarily, be used as a threshold.~~ CEQ provides a reference point of 25,000 metric tons of CO_2e emissions on an annual basis below which a quantitative analysis of GHG emissions is not warranted unless quantification below that reference point is easily accomplished. This reference point has been proposed to allow agencies to focus their attention on proposed projects with potentially large GHG emissions. This draft document clarifies that this is a reference point for conducting a quantitative analysis and not, necessarily, a threshold of significance.

The CEQ's revisions to the draft guidance memorandum do not suggest the need for any change in the analysis of GHG emission impacts nor the related findings of significance contained in the Draft EIR/EIS. The same screening threshold of 25,000 metric tons of CO_2e per year was applied in the Draft EIS as well as more stringent state of California considerations in the EIR for CEQA purposes. While the revised Draft guidance currently includes text stating that NEPA documents should include an assessment of the implications of climate change for the environmental effects of a proposed action, a recent presentation by CEQ's Associate Director for NEPA Oversight[33] indicates that the 25,000 metric tons of CO_2e per year screening threshold may be used as a proxy for assessing the climate change impacts of a proposed action, when the guidance is formally adopted. That is, emissions of less than 25,000 metric tons of CO_2e per year would indicate that a project would not make a considerable contribution to climate change. However, the following text is hereby added as the third paragraph on page 4.11-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS:

> With regard to the potential effects of climate change on the proposed project, the most reasonably foreseeable impact would be related to sea level rise. As stated in Chapter 1, Purpose, Need and Objectives, on page 1-5, elevations at the project site range from 250 feet above mean sea level at the western edge of the site to 75 feet at the southeastern corner. The National Research Council's (NRC's) 2012 report, Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future (the NRC Report) provides a scientific review of sea level rise for the West Coast and provides the most recent regional sea level rise predictions for 2030, 2050, and 2100, relative to the year 2000 sea level.[34] In this report, the NRC projects that sea levels in the San Francisco Bay area will rise by approximately one foot by 2050 and three feet by 2100. Consequently, given the inland and elevated location of the project site, foreseeable sea level increases do not pose an adverse impact for the proposed project.

---

33 Greczmiel, Horst, Associate Director for NEPA Oversight, *Overview of the Council on Environmental Quality's Revised Draft Guidance on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews*, presented to the National Association of Environmental Professionals webinar on January 28, 2015.

34 National Research Council, *Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2012. Available on the internet at: http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13389. Accessed on October 1, 2014.

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

Public Services

Comment PS-1: Comment stating that impacts to schools require mitigation measures.

"The second major area that I pointed out was public services. And, again, here, again, mitigation measure in the summary of impacts is "none required."

I think that's insufficient.

I think we do have impacts fees coming from SB50 that will provide for new schools for some number of these families of this sort of doubling of density of this area -- or tripling, depending on which project we do -- that are going to need schools, and the area -- is insufficient for the number of children that are going to be coming to the area.

So the mitigation measure was laid out in whole in the EIR as SB50 fees and other impact fees that will come in that could provide for new facilities such as schools. And I think that needs to be noted specifically as a mitigation measure in the summary." (Commissioner Johnson, public hearing transcript, January 22, 2015)

Response PS-1

The commenter states that the proposed project would increase school-aged population such that the demand for public schools would increase and require new or expanded facilities. The commenter states that impact fees provided pursuant to SB50 would not be sufficient to address the number of children coming to the area.

As stated in Section 4.15, Public Services, under Impact PS-1 on pages 4.15-3 to 4.15-6, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to public services.

As stated on page 4.15-4 in the fourth paragraph, the San Francisco Unified School District projects that each non-senior unit in the proposed project would generate an average 0.5 additional students. Therefore, the 765 new non-senior units (694 market rate + 71 affordable) would result in a net increase of 383 students among the schools that serve the project site. School enrollment, remaining school capacity, and the potential students from the proposed project are shown in **Table 4.15-1** on page 4.15-5 (and revised below to reflect 2013 enrollment and capacity). As shown there (and below), remaining capacity at each school would accommodate the potential students from the proposed project. Therefore, because enrollment could be accommodated, the EIR/EIS found that

the project would not require new or expanded school facilities, the construction of which could result in environmental impacts.

Although development of the proposed project could indirectly increase resident population and potential student enrollment in the SFUSD, payment of fees mandated under SB 50 prescribed by the statute is deemed full and complete mitigation. Fees would be paid by the project sponsor or successor developer to the Department of Building Inspection at the time of building permit application.[35]

This impact was found to be less than significant and therefore, mitigation measures are not required under CEQA or NEPA.

It is noted that Table 4.15-1 on page 4.15-5 includes data from the 2009 – 2010 school year. Table 4.15-1 is revised, as follows, to update the data from the 2013–2014 school year (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

TABLE 4.15-1
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND CAPACITY

	Capacity[1]	**~~2010~~ 2013 Enrollment**[2]	**~~2010~~ 2013 Remaining Capacity**	**Potential Students from Proposed Project**
Visitacion Valley Elementary School (K–5)	750	~~434~~ 443	~~260~~ 307	177
Visitacion Valley Middle School (6–8)	850	257 567	~~593~~ 283	88
June Jordan School for Equity High School (9–12)	1,250	~~240~~ 247	~~1,010~~ 1,003	59
Philip & Sala Burton High School (9–12)	1,925	~~749~~ 922	~~1,176~~ 1,003	59

SOURCE:
1 SFUSD, *Capital Plan FY 2010-2019*, September 2009
2 SFUSD, School Site ~~and List Summary~~ List & Summary, ~~October 6, 2010~~ October 1, 2014 (data from November 5, 2013).

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

---

35 San Francisco DBI, Development Impact Fee – Collection Process and Procedure, web page: although development under the Specific Plan could indirectly increase resident population and potential student enrollment in the SFUSD, payment of fees mandated under SB 50 prescribed by the statute is deemed full and complete mitigation., accessed August 1, 2014.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Comment HZ-1: Comments regarding exposure to hazardous materials during site demolition and excavation.

"Mercy or whomever develops in Sunnydale projects needs to individually wrap every single housing projects (a tent over entire building) to safety remove the hazardous materials (LEAD BASE PAINT, ASBESTOS AND POLYCHLORINTED BIPHERYLS PCBs) prevent dangerous materials from getting airborne specially since Visitacion Valley can be very windy." (Nelson Gutierrez; email, February 17, 2015)

"I also want to know what is the ground that they're tearing up? Is it hazardous at all?" (Unidentified speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

"If we're here while they're tearing it down or moving it, I just want to know, you know –" (Unidentified speaker, public hearing transcript, January 20, 2015)

Response HZ-1

One commenter states that hazardous building materials should not become airborne during demolition. Another commenter asks about soil and groundwater contamination.

Lead-based paint, asbestos, and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) are hazardous building materials and are discussed in Section 4.19, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, under Impact HZ-1 on pages 4.19-8 through 4.19-12. The impact was determined to be less than significant with implementation of identified mitigation.

As stated on page 4.19-9, regulations and procedures already established as a part of the permit review process would ensure that any potential impacts due to asbestos-containing building materials, and lead-based paint, would be reduced to a level of insignificance. Project construction would adhere to Section 3426 of the San Francisco Building Code, which governs the removal of lead-based paint. The Code contains performance standards, including establishment of containment barriers. Asbestos removal is governed by State law, and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has authority to regulate asbestos through both inspection and enforcement. BAAQMD must be notified in advance of demolition or renovation that involves asbestos removal. The State Occupational Safety and Health Administration must also be notified, and asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations. The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection will not issue the required permit until applicable requirements are complied with.

Regarding PCBs, generally speaking, most electrical transformers that once contained PCBs have been removed or replaced with non-PCB containing fluids. Nevertheless, PCBs could still be present within the project area in older electrical equipment. Implementation of

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1, Hazardous Building Materials, would require that the presence of such materials be evaluated prior to demolition and, if such materials were present, that they be properly handled during removal and building demolition. This would reduce the potential impacts of these hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.

As stated in the "Contaminated Soil and Groundwater" section beginning at the bottom of page 4.19-9, a review of databases of documented hazardous releases indicates that no hazardous release sites are present within or immediately adjacent to the project site. No documented hazardous release sites within half a mile have been identified. However, as discussed on page 4.19-10, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment was conducted and consisted of collecting soil samples across the project site. Results of soil sampling indicate that contaminates were below all Environmental Screening Levels, with the exception of arsenic and vanadium. Upon review of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, the San Francisco Department of Public Health has determined that a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) would be required. This requirement has been incorporated into **Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2**. The SMP shall specify procedures to follow upon discovery of suspect soils and include appropriate notification, handling, and disposal protocols. The SMP shall also include contingency response actions, worker health and safety protocols, stormwater protection measures, dust mitigation in accordance with San Francisco Health Code Article 22B, and noise control in accordance with San Francisco Noise Ordinance. In addition, M-HZ-2 requires the sponsor to prepare a work plan describing procedures for a radon soil vapor survey to be conducted prior to construction. With implementation of the SMP and radon soil vapor survey, impacts related to soils contamination would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

E. Draft EIR/EIS Revisions

The following changes to the text of the Draft EIR/EIS are made in response to comments on the Draft EIR/EIS or are included to clarify the Draft EIR/EIS text. For each change, new language is double underlined, while deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~. The changes are organized in the order of the Draft EIR/EIS table of contents.

These revisions do not result in any changes in the analysis or conclusions prepared pursuant to CEQA, and thus does not constitute "new information of substantial importance" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

Executive Summary

Beginning on the next page, the text revisions that incorporate analyses under NEPA are added to **Tables S-1** and **S-3** in the Executive Summary. For each applicable effect, a row is inserted into each table. The Draft EIR/EIS page number is provided for reference.

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-13, prior to the row for **Impact CP-4**:

CP-3: The proposed project could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature.	**Significant**	**Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a: Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program.** Prior to ground disturbance, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified paleontologist (is a practicing scientist who is recognized in the paleontologic community and is proficient in vertebrate paleontology) or a California Professional Geologist with appropriate paleontological expertise to carry out all mitigation measures related to paleontological resources. The qualified paleontologist or geologist shall be available "on-call" to project sponsor throughout the duration of ground-disturbing activities. **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3b: Paleontological resources training.** All construction forepersons and field supervisors conducting or overseeing subsurface excavations shall be trained by a qualified paleontologist in the recognition of potential fossil materials prior to ground disturbing activities. A one hour pre-construction training on paleontological resources shall also be provided to all other construction workers, but may include videotape of the initial training and/or the use of written materials rather than in person training by the qualified paleontologist. In addition to fossil recognition, the training shall convey procedures to follow in the event of a potential fossil discovery. **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3c: Assessment and salvage of potential fossil finds.** If potential fossils are discovered during construction, all earthwork or other types of ground disturbance in the immediate vicinity of the find shall stop until the qualified paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the fossil. If salvage is required, recommendations shall be consistent with current professional standards outlined in the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines. If required, treatment for fossil remains may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection. **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3d: Monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during ground disturbing activities.** If fossils are discovered during construction, a qualified paleontologist shall determine whether monitoring shall be required during remaining ground disturbing activities. If required, a qualified paleontologist, a California Professional Geologist with appropriate paleontological expertise, or paleontological monitor working under the supervision of a qualified paleontologist shall monitor ground-disturbing activities. This monitoring shall consist of periodically inspecting disturbed, graded, and excavated surfaces, as well as soil stockpiles and disposal sites. The frequency of monitoring would be determined by the qualified paleontologist. If the monitor encounters a paleontological resource, he or she shall assess the fossil, and record or salvage it as described in M-CP-2c.	Less than Significant

The following row is revised in Table S-1 on page S-15:

TR-6 (cont.)		• The construction contractor shall coordinate with school administrators to ensure safe access to and from the school for students, teachers, and parents at all times. The contractors ~~should~~ shall inquire as to the school start and dismissal times and schedule construction vehicle trips outside of the peak school drop-off and pick up hours to the extent feasible. If avoiding these hours is infeasible, the construction contractor shall provide additional flaggers and crossing guards during school drop-off and pick-up hours near school. • To the extent applicable, the traffic control plan shall conform to Caltrans's Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones. • Establish truck traffic routes away from schools, daycares, and residences, or at a location with the least impact if those areas are unavoidable.	

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-17, prior to the rows for "Biological Resources" and **Impact BI-1**:

Air Quality			
AQ-1: Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	Significant	**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization** A. *Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.* Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the requirements below. The project sponsor or construction contractor shall assign a construction manager to ensure compliance with the requirements: 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited; b) All off-road equipment shall have: i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. EPA or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 3 off-road emission standards, and ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).[36] c) Exceptions: i. Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an	Less than Significant

[36] Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement, therefore a VDECS would not be required.

Air Quality

alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation.

ii. Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) *may* be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).

iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules in **Table M-AQ-1-1** and shall provide documentation that emissions are sufficiently reduced to ensure criteria air pollutants, excess cancer risks and PM2.5 concentrations do not exceed significance criteria.

TABLE M-AQ-1-1
OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP-DOWN SCHEDULE

Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control
1	Tier 2	ARB Level 3 VDECS
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS
3	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS

How to use the table: If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.

2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.
3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. The project sponsor

Air Quality			
		shall require that construction operators locate staging areas and stationary construction equipment such as generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors and building HVAC intakes. 4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used. 5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan to members of the public as requested. B. *Reporting.* Quarterly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used. Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used. C. *Certification Statement and On-site Requirements.* Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.	

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-17, after the new row for Impact AQ-1, above:

AQ-3: Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Significant	**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Constructions Emissions Minimization (see above)**	Less than Significant

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-24, prior to the row for **Impact AQ-6**:

AQ-2: During project operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant

The following rows are inserted in Table S-1 on page S-24, after the row for Impact AQ-2, above:

AQ-4: The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant
AQ-5: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant

The following rows are inserted in Table S-1 on page S-24, prior to the rows for "Recreational Resources" and **Impact RE-1**.

Wind and Shadow			
WS-1: The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant
WS-2: The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant
CC-WS: The proposed project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse wind and shadow impacts.	**Less than Significant**	None required.	Less than Significant

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-26, after the row for **Impact GE-4**:

GE-6: The proposed project would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include the installation of septic systems.	**No Impact**	None required.	No Impact

The following rows are inserted in Table S-1 on page S-27, after the row for **Impact HY-5**:

HY-6: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam.	**No Impact**	None required.	No Impact
HY-7: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	**No Impact**	None required.	No Impact

The following row is inserted in Table S-1 on page S-28, before the row for **Impact ME-3**:

ME-1: There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary.	**No Impact**	None required.	No Impact

The following row is revised in Table S-2 on page S-38

TR-6 (cont.)		• The construction contractor shall coordinate with school administrators to ensure safe access to and from the school for students, teachers, and parents at all times. The contractors ~~should~~ shall inquire as to the school start and dismissal times and schedule construction vehicle trips outside of the peak school drop-off and pick up hours to the extent feasible. If avoiding these hours is infeasible, the construction contractor shall provide additional flaggers and crossing guards during school drop-off and pick-up hours near school. • To the extent applicable, the traffic control plan shall conform to Caltrans's Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones. • Establish truck traffic routes away from schools, daycares, and residences, or at a location with the least impact if those areas are unavoidable.	

The following row is revised Table S-2 on page S-40, for **Impact AQ-1**:

AQ-1: Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	**Significant**	**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization** A. *Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.* Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the ~~following~~ requirements below. The project sponsor or construction contractor shall assign a construction manager to ensure compliance with the requirements:	Less than Significant

The following row is revised Table S-2 on page S-43, for **Impact AQ-1**:

AQ-1 (cont.)		and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit. 3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators locate staging areas and stationary construction equipment, such as generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors and building HVAC intakes. 4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used. 5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan to members of the public as requested. B. *Reporting.* Quarterly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used. Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction	

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-60, after the row for **Impact CP-2**:

Paleontological Resources	**CP-3:** The proposed project could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature. (SM)	**A-CP-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (SM)	**B-CP-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (SM)	**C-CP-1:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-63, before the row for **Impact AQ-6**:

Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Impacts	**AQ-1:** Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (SM)	**A-AQ-1:** Similar to but less than the proposed project. (SM)	**B-AQ-1:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)	**C-AQ-1:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)
Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Impacts	**AQ-2:** During project operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (LTS)	**A-AQ-2:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**B-AQ-2:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**C-AQ-2:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)
Toxic Air Contaminants	**AQ-3:** Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (SM)	**A-AQ-3:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)	**B-AQ-3:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)	**C-AQ-3:** Less than the proposed project. (SM)
Clean Air Plan	**AQ-4:** The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (LTS)	**A-AQ-4:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**B-AQ-4:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**C-AQ-4:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)
Odors	**AQ-5:** The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (LTS)	**A-AQ-5:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**B-AQ-5:** Less than the proposed project. (LTS)	**C-AQ-5:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-64, after before the row for Utilities and Service Systems:

Wind and Shadow				
Wind	**WS-1:** The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (LTS)	**A-WS-1:** Similar to, but less than, the proposed project. (LTS)	**B- WS-1:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)	**C- WS-1:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)
Shadow	**WS-2:** The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (LTS)	**A-WS-2:** Similar to, but less than, the proposed project. (LTS)	**B- WS-2:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C- WS-2:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

Wind and Shadow				
Cumulative	**CC-WS:** The proposed project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse wind and shadow impacts. (LTS)	**CC- WS:** Similar to, but less than, the proposed project. (LTS)	**CC- WS:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)	**CC- WS:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following row is inserted in Table S-3 on page S-66, after the row for **Impact GE-4**:

Support Septic Systems	**GE-6:** The proposed project would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include the installation of septic systems. (NI)	**A-GE-6:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**B-GE-6:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C-GE-6:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-66, after the row for **Impact HY-5**:

Flood from Levee or Dam Failure	**HY-6:** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam. (NI)	**A-HY-6:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**B-HY-6:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C-HY-6:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)
Flood from Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflow	**HY-7:** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (NI)	**A-HY-7:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**B-HY-7:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C-HY-7:** Less than the proposed project. (NI)

The following rows are inserted in Table S-3 on page S-67, before the row for **Impact ME-3**:

Mineral Resources	**ME-1:** There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary. (LTS)	**A-ME-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**B-ME-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)	**C-ME-3:** Similar to the proposed project. (NI)

Chapter 1, Purpose, Need, and Objectives

As stated on page 1-4, and reiterated throughout the Draft EIR/EIS, the project site, the project site contains 767 units in the Sunnydale housing complex, and 18 units in the Velasco complex, for a total of 785 existing units on the site.

During preparation of this Responses to Comments document, the project sponsor and San Francisco Housing Authority determined that unit mergers at the Sunnydale complex had resulted in 10 fewer units. Therefore, the project site contains 775 units, as opposed to the 785 units described in the Draft EIR/EIS. The proposed project would result in construction of 1,700 units, for a net increase of 925 units, as opposed to 915 units described in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The Final EIR/EIS will revise these figures globally.

Chapter 2, Project Alternatives (EIS) / Project Description (EIR)

On page 2-9, the following text is inserted after the fourth paragraph (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> To allow for the realigned Blythedale Avenue to connect to Sunrise Way, the geometry of the existing Sunrise Way cul-de-sac would be modified to make Sunrise Way into a through street. This geometry modification could affect a portion of the private properties fronting onto the cul-de-sac: Block 6374, Lot 23, Lot 24, and Lot 25; and Block 6312, Lot 005 and Lot 006. The project sponsor will initiate discussions with these property owners regarding the proposed project and potential arrangements to allow for the connection to the realigned Blythedale Avenue. These arrangements may include adjustment of the property line of each lot.

The following text is inserted after the first full sentence on page 2-12 (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Residents in good standing (lease compliant) who are unable to relocate on site would be given housing vouchers by the Housing Authority for relocation elsewhere during the construction period. The RAP will include:
>
> - Description of the project that is requiring the relocation of the residents and non-residential tenants, including its location, and financing;
> - Explanation of laws, statutes and regulations governing the relocation of the Project occupants, including the requirements for a relocation plan;
> - Process to develop, approve and update the relocation plan;
> - Details about the people impacted by the project who will be relocated;
> - Description of the replacement housing resources available to re-house the residents who will be relocated and resources available for the non-residential uses;

- Relocation program to be provided, including the rights of the displaced, benefits and services they are eligible to receive, and criteria for eligibility to receive relocation assistance;
- Responsibilities of the SFHA in the implementation of this plan;
- Process for any appeals of the relocation benefits and services provided; and
- Preliminary schedule of relocation activity and cost estimate for permanent relocation cost.

Regulations require that eligible persons relocated by a publicly assisted project receive the following services and benefits:

- Required advanced notice of the relocation.
- Written information statement of their rights to relocation benefits and services for which they are eligible.
- Assistance in locating and securing comparable, decent, safe and sanitary replacement housing (residential occupants) or suitable commercial sites (non-residential occupants).
- Assistance moving to replacement housing, including relocation of personal property and transferring utility accounts to their replacement sites.
- Right to appeal decisions made within the relocation program that affect them.

The SFHA Commission would be required to approve the RAP prior to implementation of the project.

The following text is revised on page 2-13, first paragraph (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> As discussed above, the proposed project would be constructed in three phases. It is estimated that each phase of construction would last between three to ~~9~~ five years for a total of 9 to 15 years in duration for the entire project.

Chapter 3, Affected Environment

Chapter 3: Plans and Policies

Page 3.2-4 is revised as follows (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> The *Planning Code* includes a requirement for new developments to pay an Affordable Housing Fee, or to set aside 12 percent of the units on site for affordable housing. The proposed project would exceed this requirement by setting aside ~~32~~ 24 percent (~~295~~221 units) of the added 915 units as affordable housing. In total, approximately 60 percent of the dwelling units in the proposed project would be affordable housing. The Variant would set aside ~~35~~ 26 percent (~~295~~ 221 units) of its added 853 units as affordable housing.

Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences

Chapter 4: Land Use and Land Use Planning

On page 4.3-11, the following has been revised (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ~~This project has not undergone environmental review and has not obtained Planning Department or Commission approvals.~~ The project was determined to qualify for a Class 4 (Minor Alterations to Land) Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act.[37] This exemption was issued in 2013. The project sponsor, San Francisco Urban Riders (SFUR), has engaged in a collaborative process with park neighbors and users. The sponsor specifically held meetings with community members in November 2010, as well as June through November 2011, typically attended by approximately 50 people.

Chapter 4: Visual Quality / Aesthetics

Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics, page 4.4-5, at the top of the page after the bullet list, the following text is added (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> As indicated in Section 3.4 on page 3.4-3, the project site does not contain features considered to be visual or scenic resources and is not considered a visual landmark. Impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features are analyzed in Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, under Impact CP-3.
>
> The shadow effects of buildings are analyzed in Section 4.12, Wind and Shadow.

Chapter 4: Socioeconomics / Population and Housing

To further summarize the regulatory framework for relocation assistance, the following text has been added to Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/Population and Housing, on page 4.5-1 after the third paragraph (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ***Code of Federal Regulations, Title 24, Part 970 – Public Housing Program – Demolition or Disposition of Public Housing Projects***
>
> Part 970, promulgated by HUD, details the administrative steps required to perform demolition/disposition activity. Pursuant to Part 970, a Public Housing Agency must offer each family displaced by demolition or disposition comparable housing that meets housing quality standards and is located in an area that is generally not less desirable than the location of the displaced persons. The housing must be offered on a nondiscriminatory basis, without regard to race, color, religion, creed, national origin, handicap, age, familial

[37] San Francisco Planning Department, CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination: Case No. 2013.0354E, March 23, 2013. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2010.0305E.

status, or gender, in compliance with applicable Federal and state laws. For persons with disabilities displaced from a unit with reasonable accommodations, comparable housing should include similar accommodations.

United State Department of Housing and Urban Development Handbook 1378

The HUD Handbook 1378, also known as the Tenant Assistance, Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Handbook, consolidates basic statutory and regulatory requirements, and HUD policy guidance on acquisition and relocation under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (URA) and certain relocation requirements in one place. These requirements and policies are to be followed when acquiring real property or displacing persons for a project or program with HUD financial assistance. Chapter 2 describes the required advisory assistance for an individual or family to be displaced from a dwelling unit, and Chapter 3 describes Relocation Payments to be provided to that individual or family, including both moving expenses and the cost of comparable replacement dwelling units.

To further clarify the legal requirements for relocation assistance, the following text has been added to Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/Population and Housing, on page 4.5-1 after the header "State" (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

California Relocation Assistance Law (CRAL) and California Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines

California Government Code Title 1, Chapter 16, Sections 7260-7277, require that all public entities adopt rules and regulations to administer relocation assistance and to implement the payments under the provision of the Code. CRAL establishes requirements governing relocation assistance and replacement housing for persons displaced due to public agency projects in California. The relocation statute is intended for the benefit of displaced persons in order to ensure that they receive fair and equitable treatment and do not suffer disproportionately as a result of programs designed for the benefit of the public as a whole. The Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines, codified in California Code of Regulations Title 25, Division 1, Chapter 6 assist public entities in the development of regulations and procedures implementing CRAL.

To further clarify the legal requirements for residents' right to return to the site after construction, the following text has been added to Section 4.5, Socioeconomics/Population and Housing, on page 4.5-2 after the third paragraph (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

San Francisco Ordinance No. 227-12 - Public Housing Right to Return to Revitalized Housing

In 2012, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 227-12, which amended the San Francisco Administrative Code by adding Chapter 39, Sections 39.1 through 39.9, to establish the San Francisco Right to Revitalized Housing Ordinance and set

City policy regarding the Right to Return to Revitalized Public Housing Units. Under the Ordinance, public housing households have the right to revitalized housing after temporary relocation or displacement as a result of a Public Housing Development Project so long as the household is not in the eviction process or has not been evicted from a unit that is managed by the San Francisco Housing Authority. Any relocation plans produced by the project sponsor of a Public Housing Development Project must be reviewed by the City department providing financial assistance.

Chapter 4: Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, page 4.7-9, at the top of the page after the numerical bullet list, the following text is added (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Regarding paleontological resources, no such resources were identified during the public scoping process. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act does not apply to paleontological resources unless the paleontological specimens are found in culturally related contexts (e.g., fossil shell included as a mortuary offering in a burial or a culturally–related site such as petrified wood locale used as a chipped stone quarry). In such instances the materials are considered cultural resources and are treated in the manner prescribed for the site in question; mitigation being almost exclusively limited to sites determined eligible for, or listed on, the NRHP.

HUD guidelines for Part 58 funded projects recommend analysis of effects on paleontological resources as effects on unique natural features. Unique natural features are "primarily geological features which are unique in the sense that their occurrence is infrequent or they are of special social/cultural, economic, educational, aesthetic, or scientific value. Development on or near them may render them inaccessible to investigators or visitors or otherwise limit potential future use and appreciation of these resources."[38] Therefore, the analysis below considers effects on paleontological resources that may be found in culturally related contexts and may be considered unique natural features.

Page 4.7-14, top of the page, is revised as follows to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact CP-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The proposed project could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

[38] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance*, available online: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/, October 2013.

CEQA: The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.7-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the following paragraph prior to the CEQA conclusion to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

In summary, the impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under NEPA because the proposed project could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature, but **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through M-CP-3d** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level because they require retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

~~In summary, the~~ The impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under CEQA because the proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, but **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through M-CP-3~~b~~d** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Page 4.7-17, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-CP-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The Reduced Development / Density Alternative could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.7-18, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the following paragraph prior to the CEQA conclusion to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

In summary, the impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under NEPA because the alternative could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature, but **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through M-CP-3d** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level because they require retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as

well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a** through **M-CP-3d** would ensure that impacts would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under CEQA because they would require ~~retainage~~ retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

Page 4.7-21, top of the page, is revised as follows to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-CP-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The One-for-One Replacement Alternative could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.7-21, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the following paragraph prior to the CEQA conclusion to incorporate the analysis of paleontological resources under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

In summary, the impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under NEPA because the alternative could have an adverse effect on a unique paleontological resource or site found in a culturally related context or unique natural feature, but **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a through M-CP-3d** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level because they require retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a** through **M-CP-3d** would ensure that impacts would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under CEQA because they would require ~~retainage~~ retention of a qualified professional who would train on-site supervisors in charge of excavation to identify potential resources during ground-disturbing activities, as well as require halting of ground-disturbance until the importance of the find can be assessed, as well as construction monitoring by a qualified paleontologist if warranted.

Chapter 4: Transportation and Circulation

The following text is revised on page 4.8-59, within **Mitigation Measure TR-6**, after the third bullet on the page (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

- The construction contractor shall coordinate with school administrators to ensure safe access to and from the school for students, teachers, and parents at all times. The contractors ~~should~~ shall inquire as to the school start and dismissal times and schedule construction vehicle trips outside of the peak school drop-off and pick up hours to the extent feasible. If avoiding these hours is infeasible, the construction contractor shall provide additional flaggers and crossing guards during school drop-off and pick-up hours near school.

- Establish truck traffic routes away from schools, daycares, and residences, or at a location with the least impact if those areas are unavoidable.

Chapter 4: Air Quality

Section 4.10, Air Quality, page 4.10-5, in the middle of the page, the following text is added to include local air quality impact criteria as NEPA criteria (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Context and Intensity Evaluation Guidelines under NEPA

According to HUD regulations 24 CFR, Part 58.5, Subpart A, an environmental analysis of a HUD proposed project must certify that the project complies with the federal Clean Air Act as amended, particularly the General Conformity Rule, conformance with relevant State or Federal Implementation Plans. This analysis utilizes local standards in evaluating conformance with the SIP. In addition, effects from toxic air contaminants (TACs) are analyzed pursuant to 24 CFR Part 58, Section 5(i)(2). Please see below under "Significance Criteria Under CEQA."

Page 4.10-10, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact AQ-1: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Construction

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact AQ-1 would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization.

Page 4.10-15, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operation under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Operation

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: During project operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-16, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operation under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Operation of the proposed project would include a variety of sources that would contribute to long term emissions of criteria air pollutants (ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$). These sources would include new vehicle trips, maintenance and operation of a standby diesel generator, natural gas combustion and area sources such as landscape equipment and use of consumer products. Calculations of average daily and maximum annual emissions indicate that levels of ROG and NOx, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Page 4.10-17, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact AQ-3: Toxic Air Contaminants

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-24, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Construction of the proposed project would generate emissions of toxic air contaminants, including DPM. The project-specific health risk assessment conducted indicated that without mitigation, the project would exceed the significance threshold for increased cancer risk and would be a significant impact. Annual Average concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ would be below

10 μg/m^3 and would be less than significant without mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 (Construction Emissions Minimization), impacts related to increased cancer risk would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA because construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including DPM, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, but emissions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of identified mitigation.

Page 4.10-24, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflict under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact AQ-4: Clean Air Plan

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-25, third full paragraph, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflict under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, and this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Page 4.10-25, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odor effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact AQ-5: Odors

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-26, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odor effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Additionally, the proposed project includes is residential in nature with a small retail component (i.e., 16,200 square feet) and would not create a significant sources of new odors. Therefore, odor impacts would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.10-27, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-1: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Construction

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction of the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-28, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-1 would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization.

Page 4.10-29, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operations under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Operation

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: During Reduced Development / Density Alternative operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-30, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operations under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

In summary, operation of the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would include a variety of sources that would contribute to long term emissions of criteria air pollutants (ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$). These sources would include new vehicle trips, maintenance and operation of a standby diesel generator, natural gas combustion and area sources such as landscape equipment and use of consumer products. Calculations of average daily and maximum annual emissions indicate that levels of ROG and NOx, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not

exceed significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.10-31, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-3: Toxic Air Contaminants

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction and operation of the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-32, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Construction of the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would generate emissions of toxic air contaminants, including DPM. The health risk assessment conducted indicated that without mitigation, the project would exceed the significance threshold for increased cancer risk and would be a significant impact. Annual Average concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ would be below 10 ug/m^3 and would be less than significant without mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 (Construction Emissions Minimization), impacts related to increased cancer risk would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA because construction and operation of the alternative would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, but emissions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of identified mitigation.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization.

Page 4.10-32, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflict under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-4: Clean Air Plan

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-33, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflict under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> The Reduced Development / Density Alternative characteristics that would reduce emissions would be substantially similar to those of the proposed project. The alternative would not interfere with implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, and because the Reduced Development/Density Alternative would be consistent with the applicable air quality plan that demonstrates how the region will improve ambient air quality and achieve the state and federal ambient air quality standards, this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.
>
> **Mitigation:** None required.

Page 4.10-33, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odors under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-AQ-5: Odors

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.10-33, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odors under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Therefore, odor impacts would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.
>
> **Mitigation:** None required.

Page 4.10-35, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-1: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Construction

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-37, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during construction under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-1 would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Minimization.

Page 4.10-37, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of criteria air pollutants during operation under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Impacts During Operation

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: During One-for-One Replacement Alternative operations, the proposed project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (No Impact)

The transportation analysis shows that operation of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would have the same vehicle trip generation as what currently exits from the project site and there would be no increase in mobile emissions. Area source emissions from consumer products and landscape maintenance equipment and architectural coatings would also remain the same as current conditions given the same number of residential units. There would be a slight decrease in energy emissions from natural gas combustion for water and space heating given increased building efficiencies, but this reduction would be minor (less than 1 pound per day). Consequently, there would be ***no impact*** under both NEPA and CEQA with regard to operational criteria air pollutant emissions under the One-for-One Replacement Alternative.

Page 4.10-37, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-AQ-3: Toxic Air Contaminants

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: Construction and operation of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.10-38, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of toxic air contaminants under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Construction of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would generate emissions of toxic air contaminants, including DPM. The health risk assessment conducted indicated that without mitigation, the project would exceed the significance threshold for increased cancer risk and would be a significant impact. Annual average concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ would be below 10 ug/m^3 and would be less than significant without mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 (Construction Emissions Minimization), impacts related to increased cancer risk would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, this impact of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would be ***less than significant with mitigation*** under both NEPA and CEQA because construction and operation of the alternative would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, but emissions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of identified mitigation.

Page 4.10-39, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflicts under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ***Impact B-AQ-4: Clean Air Plan***
>
> ~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~
>
> **NEPA/CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. (Less than Significant)**

Page 4.10-39, middle of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of *2010 Clean Air Plan* conflicts under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, and this impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Page 4.10-39, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of odors under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> ***Impact B-AQ-5: Odors***
>
> ~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~
>
> **NEPA/CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)**

Construction of the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would emit diesel exhaust from construction equipment would generate some odors. These odors would be similar to the odors that would be generated under construction of the proposed project and Alternative A, but for a shorter duration.

The existing 785 residential units on the project site would be replaced. The alternative would not involve operation of odor sources of concern. As under existing conditions, the project site would not be substantially affected by sources of odors.[39]

Therefore, odor impacts would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 on page 4.12-41 has been revised as indicated below to require that a construction manager is assigned to ensure implementation of the plan provisions:

A. *Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.* Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the ~~following~~ requirements below. The project sponsor or construction contractor shall assign a construction manager to ensure compliance with the requirements:

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 has been revised as indicated below to address staging areas and equipment in Measure A3 on page 4.10-42 of the Draft EIR/EIS:

3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators locate staging areas and stationary construction equipment, such as generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors and building HVAC intakes.

Chapter 4: Greenhouse Gases

The following text is revised on page 4.11-9 (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

In ~~February 2010~~ December 2014, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) ~~provided a~~ released a revised draft guidance memorandum on consideration the effects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) in NEPA documentation[40]. ~~This document identifies the Clean Air Act reporting requirement of 25,000 metric tons (MT) or more of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2E) as an indication that greenhouse gas emissions could be considered as potential adverse impact of a federal action but specifies that the reporting requirement should not, necessarily, be used as a threshold.~~ CEQ provides a reference point of 25,000 metric tons of CO_2e emissions on an annual basis below which a quantitative

[39] An ESA air quality and noise analyst conducted noise monitoring on April 24th and 25th 2013 during which observations regarding wind, cloud cover and the absence of noticeable odors were also noted.

[40] Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). *Draft NEPA Guidance on Consideration of the Effects of Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, 2010.

analysis of GHG emissions is not warranted unless quantification below that reference point is easily accomplished. This reference point has been proposed to allow agencies to focus their attention on proposed projects with potentially large GHG emissions. This draft document clarifies that this is a reference point for conducting a quantitative analysis and not, necessarily, a threshold of significance.

The following text is added as the third paragraph on page 4.11-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS:

With regard to the potential effects of climate change on the proposed project, the most reasonably foreseeable impact would be related to sea level rise. As stated in Chapter 1, Purpose, Need and Objectives, on page 1-5, elevations at the project site range from 250 feet above mean sea level at the western edge of the site to 75 feet at the southeastern corner. The National Research Council's (NRC's) 2012 report, Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future (the NRC Report) provides a scientific review of sea level rise for the West Coast and provides the most recent regional sea level rise predictions for 2030, 2050, and 2100, relative to the year 2000 sea level.[41] In this report, the NRC projects that sea levels in the San Francisco Bay area will rise by approximately one foot by 2050 and three feet by 2100. Consequently, given the inland and elevated location of the project site, foreseeable sea level increases do not pose an adverse impact for the proposed project.

Chapter 4: Wind and Shadow

Section 4.12, Wind and Shadow, page 4.12-2, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why wind and shadow are not analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Context and Intensity Evaluation Guidelines under NEPA

~~Wind and shadow are not analyzed under NEPA.~~ Wind and shadow affect the human environment, and as such are analyzed under NEPA. HUD's Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance states that shadow effects must be analyzed in relation to visual quality and aesthetics, and climactic extremes related to wind should be considered. This analysis utilizes the local standards for evaluation of wind and shadow. Please see below under "Significance Criteria Under CEQA."

Page 4.12-3, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of wind effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact WS-1: Wind Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

[41] National Research Council, *Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2012. Available on the internet at: http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13389. Accessed on October 1, 2014.

NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.12-4, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of wind and shadow effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Accordingly, the proposed project would be expected to result in a ***less-than-significant*** wind impact under both NEPA and CEQA.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact WS-2: Shadow Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.12-13, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of shadow effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

The impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the proposed project would create new shadow in a manner that would not substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.12-14, top of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of wind effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-WS-1: Wind Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.12-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to include the analysis of wind and shadow effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

The wind impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact A-WS-2: Shadow Effects

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (Less than Significant)

Pages 4.12-15 through 4.12-17 are revised as follows to include the analysis of wind and shadow effects under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

The impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would create new shadow in a manner that would not substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

Mitigation: None required

Alternative B: One-for-One Replacement Alternative

Impact B-WS-1: Wind Effects

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (No Impact)

The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would result in the same site plan, building massings, and building heights as under existing conditions. Given that the buildings would be located in the same location and that they would maintain their current configuration, they would not noticeably change ground-level wind patterns.

There would be ***no impact*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the alternative would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact B-WS-2: Shadow Effects

~~NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.~~

NEPA/CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not create new shadow in a manner that would affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Department, or other public area. (No Impact)

Given that the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would result in the same building locations, heights, and massings as under existing conditions, no net new shadow would be cast as a result of the alternative.

There would be ***no impact*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the alternative would create new shadow in a manner that would not substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public area.

Mitigation: None required.

Alternative C: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not change the site plan, building heights, or building massings on the project site. The existing Sunnydale and Velasco buildings would remain in their current configurations. There would be no change to wind or shadow conditions on the site, and there would be ***no impacts*** under both NEPA and CEQA.

4.12.4 Cumulative Impacts

Impact CC-WS: Cumulative Wind and Shadow Effects

~~**NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.**~~

NEPA/CEQA: The proposed project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse wind and shadow impacts. (Less than Significant)

Proposed Project, Variant, and Alternative A

Given that wind and shadow effects are highly location-dependent, the geographic context for cumulative wind and shadow effects encompasses the immediate project site vicinity—a few blocks (less than one-quarter of a mile) in each direction. It is in this vicinity that cumulative development, when combined with the proposed project or its alternatives, could have any effect on wind and shadow on the same locations.

Regarding cumulative wind impacts, as indicated under Impacts WS-1, above, the proposed project and its alternatives would result in buildings that would not be substantially taller than nearby buildings, and less than 80 feet tall. There are no reasonably foreseeable future developments in the cumulative geographic context that would be that tall either. The project's, variant's, and Alternative A's new buildings would be of an orientation and density that would reduce wind between buildings and increase wind speeds along the northern and western project boundaries. The cumulative impact would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because the proposed project,

variant, or alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse wind impacts.

Regarding cumulative shadow impacts, the proposed project, variant, and Alternative A would result in net new shadow on the southern edge of McLaren Park, including Herz Playground and Gleneagles Golf Course. The only reasonably foreseeable future project in proximity to these facilities is the proposed bike skills park on the north side of Sunnydale Avenue, east of the project site. The bike skills park project, however, would not include large new structures or buildings that could cast shadow on the golf course, and the proposed project, variant, and Alternative A would not cast shadow on the bike skills park.

There are no other reasonably foreseeable future developments in the project site vicinity that would result in substantial new shadow on these recreational features at other times of day. Although the project and cumulative development would result in increased shading on public sidewalks, this shading would be typical for built-out urban areas away from the downtown skyscraper core. Cumulative shadow effects would be ***less than significant*** under both NEPA and CEQA because no other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects would cast shadows on parks.

Alternative B

Alternative B's buildings would result in wind and shadow conditions almost identical to existing conditions. There would be ***no cumulative impact***.

Chapter 4: Recreation

Section 4.13, Recreation, page 4.13-4, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact RE-2: Effects Due to Construction

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire project—in this case, recreational facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Therefore, impacts from construction of recreational facilities are analyzed as part of the entire project and included in the applicable EIR/EIS sections, such as 4.08, Transportation and Circulation, 4.09, Noise, and 4.10, Air Quality.

CEQA: The proposed project would include the construction of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, the construction of which could have adverse physical effects on the environment. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.13-4, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact RE-3: Physical Degradation Effects

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires analysis of the availability of recreational resources and their capacity to serve the proposed project. This availability is analyzed under Impact RE-1. NEPA does not require a separate analysis of physical degradation from the analysis of recreational capacity.

CEQA: The proposed project would not physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.13-6, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-RE-2: Effects Due to Construction

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire alternative—in this case, recreational facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Therefore, impacts from construction of recreational facilities are analyzed as part of the entire alternative and included in the applicable EIR/EIS sections, such as 4.08, Transportation and Circulation, 4.09, Noise, and 4.10, Air Quality.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would include construction of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, the construction of which could have adverse physical effects on the environment. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.13-7, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-RE-3: Physical Degradation Effects

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of recreational resources and their capacity to serve the alternative. This availability is analyzed under Impact A-RE-1. NEPA does not require separate analysis of physical degradation from the analysis of recreational capacity.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.13-8, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-RE-2: Effects Due to Construction

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire alternative—in this case, recreational facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Therefore, impacts from construction of recreational facilities are analyzed as part of the entire alternative and included in the applicable EIR/EIS sections, such as 4.08, Transportation and Circulation, 4.09, Noise, and 4.10, Air Quality.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, the construction of which would have less-than-significant adverse physical effects on the environment. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.13-7, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some recreation impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-RE-3: Physical Degradation Effects

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of recreational resources and their capacity to serve the alternative. This availability is analyzed under Impact B-RE-1. NEPA does not require separate analysis of physical degradation from the analysis of recreational capacity.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

Chapter 4: Utilities and Service Systems

Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, page 4.14-8, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact UT-2: Effects Related to Construction of New Facilities

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the proposed project. These effects are analyzed under Impact UT-1 (wastewater), UT-3 (stormwater), and UT-4 (water). In addition, NEPA does not require separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire project—in this case, water distribution and wastewater and stormwater collection facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Any effects on the environment associated with construction of this infrastructure are identified in the relevant topic areas of this EIR/EIS, and they would be mitigated to less-

than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those sections.

CEQA: The proposed project would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant with ~~mitigation~~ Mitigation)

Page 4.14-12, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact UT-6: Effects Related to Regulations of Solid Waste

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require a separate analysis of whether a proposed project would comply with solid waste regulations. NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the proposed project. The provision of solid waste services and effects on the capacity of the solid waste system are analyzed under Impact UT-5.

CEQA: The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.14-14, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-UT-2: Effects Related to Construction of New Facilities

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the alternative. These effects are analyzed under Impact A-UT-1 (wastewater), A-UT-3 (stormwater), and A-UT-4 (water). In addition, NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire alternative—in this case, water distribution and wastewater and stormwater collection facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Any effects on the environment associated with construction of this infrastructure are identified in the relevant topic areas of this EIR/EIS, and they would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those sections.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.14-17, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-UT-6: Effects Related to Regulations of Solid Waste

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA does not require separate analysis of whether an alternative would comply with solid waste regulations. NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the alternative. The provision of solid waste services and effects on the capacity of the solid waste system are analyzed under Impact A-UT-5.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.14-18, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-UT-2: Effects Related to Construction of New Facilities

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the alternative. These effects are analyzed under Impact B-UT-1 (wastewater), B-UT-3 (stormwater), and B-UT-4 (water). In addition, NEPA does not require a separate analysis of impacts from construction of one component of the entire alternative—in this case, water distribution and wastewater and stormwater collection facilities—from the remainder of the analysis. Any effects on the environment associated with construction of this infrastructure are identified in the relevant topic areas of this EIR/EIS, and they would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those sections.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page 4.14-21, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why some utilities impacts are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-UT-6: Effects Related to Regulations of Solid Waste

NEPA: NEPA does not require a separate analysis of whether an alternative would comply with solid waste regulations. NEPA requires an analysis of the availability of utilities and service systems and their capacity to serve the alternative. The provision of solid waste services and effects on the capacity of the solid waste system are analyzed under Impact B-UT-5.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)

Chapter 4: Public Services

Table 4.15-1 on page 4.15-5 is revised, as follows (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

CHAPTER 5 TABLE 4.15-1
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND CAPACITY

	Capacity[1]	~~2010~~ 2013 Enrollment[2]	~~2010~~ 2013 Remaining Capacity	Potential Students from Proposed Project
Visitacion Valley Elementary School (K–5)	750	~~434~~ 443	~~260~~ 307	177
Visitacion Valley Middle School (6–8)	850	257 567	~~593~~ 283	88
June Jordan School for Equity High School (9–12)	1,250	~~240~~ 247	~~1,010~~ 1,003	59
Philip & Sala Burton High School (9–12)	1,925	~~749~~ 922	~~1,176~~ 1,003	59

SOURCE:
1 SFUSD, *Capital Plan FY 2010-2019*, September 2009
2 SFUSD, School Site ~~and List Summary~~ List & Summary, ~~October 6, 2010~~ October 1, 2014 (data from November 5, 2013).

Chapter 4: Geology and Soils

Section 4.17, Geology and Soils, page 4.17-3, is revised as follows to clarify that geologic effects on septic systems, and effects to unique mineral resources, are analyzed under NEPA:

Context and Intensity Evaluation Guidelines under NEPA

These thresholds encompass the factors taken into account under NEPA to determine the significance of an action in terms of the context and intensity of its effects. For geology and soils, the analysis considers whether the proposed project or alternatives would:

- Result in substantial risk of injury or death due to collapse of structures or damage to infrastructure because of ground failure or groundshaking;
- Result in substantial damage to foundations or other infrastructure due to liquefaction, differential settlement, lateral spreading, expansive soils, corrosive soils, or other adverse engineering properties of soils;
- Destabilize existing geologic conditions or accelerate adverse geologic processes;
- Expose people or structures to substantial threat of injury or damage from slope failure; or
- Cause substantial soil erosion.
- Allow for adequate site drainage for the installation and support of septic systems.

Effects to mineral resources as unique natural features are addressed in Section 4.20, Mineral and Energy Resources.

Page 4.17-9, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why expansive soils are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact GE-5: Effects from Expansive Soils

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ This is a CEQA-specific criterion, using a definition that is applicable in the State of California. The analysis of geologic effects under NEPA is presented under Impacts GE-1 through GE-4.

CEQA: The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18 of the *California Building Code*, creating substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-10, middle of the page, is revised as follows to analyze geologic effects on septic tanks under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact GE-6: Effects on Septic Tanks

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The proposed project would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include installation of septic systems. (No Impact)

CEQA: The proposed project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (No Impact)

The proposed project would not include any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems and therefore there would be no impact for this criterion.

There would be ***no impact*** under either NEPA or CEQA.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.17-10, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why effects on topography are not required to be separately analyzed in NEPA geology and soils analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact GE-7: Effects on Topography

NEPA: This topic is not required to be covered under NEPA in this section. For impacts to unique features or scenic resources, please see Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics. For impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features, please see Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Please also see Impact GE-3, which describes the earthwork activities that would affect the topography of the site.

CEQA: The proposed project would not change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why expansive soils are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-GE-5: Effects from Expansive Soils

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ This is a CEQA-specific criterion, using a definition that is applicable in the State of California. The analysis of geologic effects under NEPA is presented under Impacts A-GE-1 through A-GE-4.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18 of the *California Building Code*, creating substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-15, top of the page, is revised as follows to analyze geologic effects on septic tanks under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-GE-6: Effects on Septic Tanks

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include installation of septic systems. (No Impact)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (No Impact)

The Reduced Development/Density Alternative would not include any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, and there would be ***no impact*** under either NEPA or CEQA for this criterion.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.17-15, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why effects on topography are not required to be separately analyzed in NEPA geology and soils analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-GE-7: Effects on Topography

NEPA: This topic is not required to be covered under NEPA in this section. For impacts to unique features or scenic resources, please see Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics. For impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features, please see Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Please also see Impact A-GE-3, which describes the earthwork activities that would affect the topography of the site.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-18, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain why expansive soils are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-GE-5: Effects from Expansive Soils

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ This is a CEQA-specific criterion, using a definition that is applicable in the State of California. The analysis of geologic effects under NEPA is presented under Impacts B-GE-1 through B-GE-4.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18 of the *California Building Code*, creating substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.17-19, top of the page, is revised as follows to analyze geologic effects on septic tanks under NEPA (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-GE-6: Effects on Septic Tanks

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would allow for adequate site drainage, and it would not include the installation of septic systems. (No Impact)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (No Impact)

The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not include any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, and there would be ***no impact*** under either NEPA or CEQA for this criterion.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.17-19, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain why effects on topography are not required to be separately analyzed in NEPA geology and soils analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-GE-7: Effects on Topography

NEPA: This topic is not required to be covered under NEPA in this section. For impacts to unique features or scenic resources, please see Section 4.4, Visual Quality / Aesthetics. For impacts to paleontological resources as unique natural features, please see Section 4.7, Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Please also see Impact B-GE-3, which describes the earthwork activities that would affect the topography of the site.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (Less than Significant)

Chapter 4: Hydrology and Water Quality

Section 4.18, Hydrology and Water Quality, page 4.18-13, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA requires separate analysis of capacity and effects on water quality (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact HY-4: Effects on Stormwater Capacity

NEPA: This topic is not required to be separately addressed in the analysis of Hydrology under NEPA. The NEPA analysis of stormwater capacity is provided in Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, under Impact UT-3. The NEPA analysis of the effects of polluted runoff on water quality is provided under Impact HY-1, above.

CEQA: The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.18-15, bottom of the page, and page 4.18-16, top of the page, are revised as follows to include effects of any flooding in the NEPA analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact HY-6: Effects from Dam or Levee Failure

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

CEQA: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

The project site is not located within any dam inundation areas and is not otherwise protected by a levee system.[42]

There would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam.

[42] Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), *Dam Failure Inundation Hazard Map for San Francisco*, http://www.abag.ca.gov/cgi-bin/pickdamx.pl, accessed March 19, 2013. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2010.0305E.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact HY-7: Effects from Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

CEQA: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

The project site is located at an elevation of 75 to 250 feet above sea level and not subject to tsunami or seiche wave run-up. According to inundation hazard maps of the *San Francisco General Plan* (Maps 6 and 7 in the Community Safety Element), the project site is outside of any identified hazard areas.

Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

~~Therefore, there~~ There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.18-19, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA requires separate analysis of capacity and effects on water quality (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-HY-4: Effects on Stormwater Capacity

NEPA: This topic is not required to be addressed in the analysis of Hydrology under NEPA. The NEPA analysis of stormwater capacity is provided in Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, under Impact A-UT-3. The NEPA analysis of the effects of polluted runoff on water quality is provided under Impact A-HY-1, above.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.18-20 is revised as follows to include effects of any flooding in the NEPA analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-HY-6: Effects from Dam or Levee Failure

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

The project site is not located within any dam inundation areas and is not otherwise protected by a levee system.[43]

There would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact A-HY-7: Effects from Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

The project site is located at an elevation of 75 to 250 feet above sea level and not subject to tsunami or seiche wave run-up. The project site is outside of identified hazard areas.

Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

~~Therefore there~~ There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

[43] Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), 2013, *op cit*.

Mitigation: None required.

Page 4.18-23, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA requires separate analysis of capacity and effects on water quality (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-HY-4: Effects on Stormwater Capacity

NEPA: This topic is not required to be addressed in the analysis of Hydrology under NEPA. The NEPA analysis of stormwater capacity is provided in Section 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, under Impact B-UT-3. The NEPA analysis of the effects of polluted runoff on water quality is provided under Impact B-HY-1, above.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.18-24, bottom of the page, and page 4.18-25, top of the page, are revised as follows to include effects of any flooding in the NEPA analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-HY-6: Effects from Dam or Levee Failure

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.~~ The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (No Impact)

The project site is not located within any dam inundation areas and is not otherwise protected by a levee system.[44]

There would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from the failure of a levee or dam.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Mitigation: None required.

[44] Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), 2013, *op cit*.

Impact B-HY-7: Effects from Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

NEPA: ~~This topic is not separately covered under NEPA~~. The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

The project site is located at an elevation of 75 to 250 feet above sea level and not subject to tsunami or seiche wave run-up.

Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** under NEPA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to the path of a flood that would result from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Mitigation: None required.

Chapter 4: Hazards

Section 4.19, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, page 4.19-7, middle of the page after the first bullet list, is revised as follows to clarify NEPA requirements for air quality analysis (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

> Effects from toxic air contaminants (TACs) are analyzed, pursuant to 24 CFR Part 58, Section 5(i)(2), in Section 4.10, Air Quality.

Page 4.19-13, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects of hazardous materials on schools (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools

NEPA: This topic is not required to be separately covered under NEPA. NEPA impacts related to hazardous materials release are analyzed under Impacts HZ-1 and HZ-2 and include any effects on schools from hazardous materials.

CEQA: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-14, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects on emergency response plans (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact HZ-5: Effects on Emergency/Evacuation Plans

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The potential impairment of emergency response plans are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA in this section. Instead, this effect is discussed in context of both transportation (congestion effects) and provision of emergency services (public services). Please see Sections 4.08 and 4.15 for an analysis of the NEPA effects associated with provision of emergency services.

CEQA: The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-18, middle of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects of hazardous materials on schools (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools

NEPA: This topic is not required to be separately covered under NEPA. NEPA impacts related to hazardous materials release are analyzed under Impacts A-HZ-1 and A-HZ-2 and include any effects on schools from hazardous materials.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-19, bottom of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects on emergency response plans (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-HZ-5: Effects on Emergency/Evacuation Plans

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The potential impairment of emergency response plans are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA in this section. Instead, this effect is discussed in context of both transportation (congestion effects) and provision of emergency services (public services). Please see Sections 4.08 and 4.15 for an analysis of the NEPA effects associated with provision of emergency services.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-23, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects of hazardous materials on schools (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools

NEPA: This topic is not required to be separately covered under NEPA. NEPA impacts related to hazardous materials release are analyzed under Impacts B-HZ-1 and B-HZ-2 and include impacts upon schools.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Page 4.19-23, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain that NEPA does not require separate analysis of effects on emergency response plans (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-HZ-5: Effects on Emergency/Evacuation Plans

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ The potential impairment of emergency response plans are not required to be separately analyzed under NEPA in this section. Instead, this effect is discussed, in context of both transportation (congestion effects) and provision of emergency services (public services). Please see Sections 4.08 and 4.15 for an analysis of the NEPA effects associated with provision of emergency services.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Chapter 4: Mineral and Energy Resources

Section 4.20, Mineral and Energy Resources, page 4.20-6, top of the page, is revised as follows to explain that HUD does not analyze impacts to mineral resources (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Context and Intensity Evaluation Guidelines under NEPA

HUD guidance states that the opportunities for energy efficiency should be considered when evaluation environmental effects. The specific criterion used to evaluate the project's effect on energy resources is as follows:

- Incorporate insufficient energy efficiency measures or result in energy consumption requiring a significant increase in energy production for the energy provider.

Regarding mineral resources, HUD recommend that effects on such resources be analyzed as effects on unique natural features. Unique natural features are "primarily geological features which are unique in the sense that their occurrence is infrequent or they are of

special social/cultural, economic, educational, aesthetic, or scientific value. Development on or near them may render them inaccessible to investigators or visitors or otherwise limit potential future use and appreciation of these resources."[45] Mineral resources may qualify as unique natural features depending on their comparative rareness or informational content.

Pages 4.20-6 to 4.20-7 are revised as follows to include the applicable analysis of mineral resources (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact ME-1: Effects on Known Mineral Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary. (No Impact)

CEQA: The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. (No Impact)

The project site is mapped by the California Geologic Survey as either MRZ-1 or MRZ-4, indicating that substantial mineral resources do not occur at the site. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE-SF Master Plan project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

There is ***no impact*** under NEPA because there are no mineral resources present.

Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact ME-2: Effects on Mineral Resource Recovery Sites

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ Analysis of effects on mineral resource or recovery sites under NEPA is addressed under Impact ME-1.

Page 4.20-8, top of the page, is revised as follows to direct reader to the wind analysis in Section 4.12 (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

(LEED-ND) certification, which would reduce energy demand compared to traditional developments through building materials and fixtures selection, environmental systems design, and construction efficiency measures.

[45] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance*, available online: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/, October 2013.

The new, taller buildings would create surfaces that would increase the overall structural surface exposure to winds that travel across the project site. This exposure would be typical of buildings in San Francisco, and would not require a substantial increase in energy consumption for building heating. Please see Section 4.12, under Impact WS-1, for an analysis of the project's effect on wind speeds in public areas.

Pages 4.20-8 to 4.20-9 are revised as follows to include the applicable analysis of mineral resources (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact A-ME-1: Effects on Known Mineral Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary. (No Impact)

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. (No Impact)

The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would occur in the same location as the proposed project. Therefore, it would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

There is ***no impact*** under NEPA because there are no mineral resources present.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact A-ME-2: Effects on Mineral Resource Recovery Sites

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ Analysis of effects on mineral resource or recovery sites under NEPA is addressed under Impact A-ME-1.

CEQA: The Reduced Development / Density Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. (No Impact)

Page 4.20-10 is revised as follows to include the applicable analysis of mineral resources (deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~; new text is shown in double underline):

Impact B-ME-1: Effects on Known Mineral Resources

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ There are no mineral resource or recovery sites present at the project site, and therefore analysis of such resources is unnecessary. (No Impact)

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. (No Impact)

The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would occur in the game geographic extent as the proposed project. The alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

There is ***no impact*** under NEPA because there are no mineral resources present.

There would be ***no impact*** under CEQA because the One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Mitigation: None required.

Impact B-ME-2: Effects on Mineral Resource Recovery Sites

NEPA: ~~This topic is not covered under NEPA.~~ Analysis of effects on mineral resource or recovery sites under NEPA is addressed under Impact B-ME-1.

CEQA: The One-for-One Replacement Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. (No Impact)

This page intentionally left blank

ATTACHMENT 1
Draft EIR/EIS Comment Letters

This page intentionally left blank

US DOI

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
Pacific Southwest Region
333 Bush Street, Suite 515
San Francisco, CA 94104

IN REPLY REFER TO:
(ER 14/0794)

Filed Electronically

17 February 2015

Sarah B. Jones,
Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), **Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project,** Development at Sunnydale and Velasco Public Housing Developments, San Francisco, CA

Dear Ms. Jones:

The Department of the Interior has received and reviewed the subject document and has no comments to offer.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project.

Sincerely,

Patricia Sanderson Port
Regional Environmental Officer

cc:
OEPC Staff Contact: Lisa Treichel; (202) 208- 7116; Lisa_Treichel@ios.doi.gov

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

US EPA

FEB 13 2015

Sarah Jones
Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94103

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement for the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan, San Francisco, California (CEQ# 20140358)

Dear Ms. Jones:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

Based on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, EPA understands that the existing housing stock in the Sunnydale and Velasco public housing complexes is substantially deteriorated, does not comply with current building standards, and is isolated from surrounding neighborhoods by the street network. The Draft EIS proposes the replacement of all 785 housing units by 1,700 new units – including one-for-one public housing replacement units and a mix of other rental and for-sale units – as well as new community and retail facilities, transportation and water infrastructure, and open space. EPA applauds the integration of sustainability principles into the project design, construction and operation, including plans to meet Leadership in Energy and Environment Design for Neighborhood Development standards.

Based on our review, we have rated the Draft EIS as *Lack of Objections (LO)* (see enclosed "Summary of Rating Definitions"). While we do not have objections to the project, we offer recommendations in our enclosed detailed comments to further: reduce air emissions from construction, protect children from truck traffic, mitigate traffic congestion, disclose environmental justice impacts, promote environmental sustainability and ensure that NEPA analysis is robust and complete. GC-2

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Draft EIS. When the Final EIS is released for public review, please send one copy to the address above (mail code: ENF-4-2). If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 972-3521, or contact Jen Blonn, the lead reviewer for this project, at 415-972-3855 or blonn.jennifer@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Connell Dunning

for Kathleen Martyn Goforth, Manager
Environmental Review Section

Enclosure: Summary of EPA Rating Definitions
EPA's Detailed Comments

cc: Ernest Molins, Regional Environmental Officer, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS*

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

"LO" (Lack of Objections)

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

"EC" (Environmental Concerns)

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EO" (Environmental Objections)

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

Category "1" (Adequate)

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category "2" (Insufficient Information)

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category "3" (Inadequate)

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From EPA Manual 1640, Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment.

Construction Air Quality

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, which is designated as a nonattainment area for the 8-hour ozone and 24 hour $PM_{2.5}$ National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Sensitive receptors, such as children and elderly people, would be located in the project area during both construction and operational phases. Given existing air quality challenges and the presence of sensitive receptors, EPA strongly encourages the San Francisco Planning Department and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to require all feasible measures to avoid, reduce and mitigate construction impacts to air quality. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 states that off-road engines must meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. Major infrastructure projects, such as the California High-Speed Rail project, are requiring Tier 4 engines, to the extent that they are available. We strongly encourage the San Francisco Planning Department and HUD to do the same. AQ-2

Recommendations for the Final EIS

Mobile and Stationary Source Controls:

- Employ periodic, unscheduled inspections to limit unnecessary idling and to ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained, tuned and modified consistent with established specifications.
- Prohibit any tampering with engines and require continuing adherence to manufacturer's recommendations.
- Commit to the best available emissions control technologies for project equipment.
  - *On-Highway Vehicles:* On-highway vehicles used for this project should meet or exceed the U.S. EPA exhaust emissions standards for model year 2010 and newer heavy-duty on-highway compression-ignition engines (e.g., long-haul trucks, refuse haulers, shuttle buses, etc.).[1]
  - *Nonroad Vehicles & Equipment:* Nonroad vehicles and equipment used for this project should meet or exceed the U.S. EPA Tier 4 exhaust emissions standards for heavy-duty nonroad compression-ignition engines (e.g., construction equipment, nonroad trucks, etc.).[2]
  - *Low Emission Equipment Exemptions:* The equipment specifications outlined above should be met unless: 1) a piece of specialized equipment is not available for purchase or lease within the U.S.; or 2) the relevant project contractor has been awarded funds to retrofit existing equipment, or purchase/lease new equipment, but the funds are not yet available.

Advanced Technology Demonstration & Deployment:

- Demonstrate and deploy heavy-duty technologies that exceed the latest U.S. EPA emission performance standards for the equipment categories that are relevant for this project (e.g., plug-in hybrid-electric vehicles, battery-electric vehicles, fuel cell electric vehicles, advanced technology locomotives, etc.).

Administrative controls:

[1] http://www.epa.gov/otaq/standards/heavy-duty/hdci-exhaust.htm
[2] http://www.epa.gov/otaq/standards/nonroad/nonroadci.htm

- Specify the means by which the San Francisco Planning Department and HUD will minimize impacts to sensitive receptors, such as children and elderly and infirm individuals. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners. AQ-2 cont.

Child Safety During Construction Activities TR-7

Executive Order 13045 on the Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks directs each federal agency to make it a high priority to assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and ensure that its policies, programs, activities and standards address disproportionate risks to children. Construction activities would result in temporary heavy truck traffic and altered transportation routes. Safety measures that offer additional protection to children who are walking in areas near construction activities should be included in the Construction Traffic Control Plan.

Recommendations for the Final EIS

Augment Mitigation Measure M-TR-6 to state that the Construction Traffic Control Plan will:

- Identify and assess the potential safety risks of project construction to children, especially in areas where the project is located near homes, schools, daycare centers, youth recreation facilities or parks.
- Promote child safety within and near the project area. For example, crossing guards could be provided in areas where construction activities are located near schools, daycare centers, youth recreation facilities, or parks.
- Commit to establish truck traffic routes away from schools, daycares, and residences, or at a location with the least impact if those areas are unavoidable.

Traffic Congestion Mitigation TR-8

Page 4.8-59 lists three mitigation measures that would require the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution toward roadway modifications if level-of-service declines at specific intersections. It is unclear whether level-of-service issues could, alternatively, be addressed through enhancing transit service. Further, the Draft EIS does not offer any measures to monitor or mitigate impacts to transit in case the project induces higher transit ridership than expected.

Recommendations for the Final EIS

- Include a transportation mitigation measure to monitor transit. If induced ridership is higher than expected and significantly declines the quality of transit service, require the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution toward improving transit service.
- In addition to requiring the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution toward roadway improvements if needed, consider requiring the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution toward enhancing transit service to alleviate traffic, which could have the added benefit of reducing long term air emissions from vehicles.

Environmental Justice EJ-1

Page 4.6-3 states that the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable project-level impacts and, therefore, disproportionate impacts to low-income and minority populations would not occur. This is inconsistent with Page 5-1, which states that the project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to level-of-service at local intersections.

Recommendation for the Final EIS

Analyze whether low income and minority populations would be disproportionately affected from transportation and traffic impacts from the proposed project. While drivers from other parts of San Francisco would pass through newly congested areas, it seems that those living near the project area would be most affected. EJ-1 cont.

Sustainability

EPA applauds the measures that the San Francisco Planning Department and HUD are taking to make this project environmentally sustainable, such as striving for Leadership in Energy and Environment Design for Neighborhood Development certification. EPA recommends taking additional measures, such as incorporating renewable energy into the site, addressing urban heat island effects, and promoting water efficiency. As the first national specification for water-efficient new homes, EPA's WaterSense New Home Specification sets criteria for indoor and outdoor efficiency, while allowing flexibility for regional landscaping preferences and green add-ons. Given the current drought in California and uncertainty over future water supply under climate change scenarios, we strongly encourage the San Francisco Planning Department and HUD to take all reasonable measures to conserve water. PD-2

In addition, President Obama issued a federal memorandum in June 2014 entitled *Creating a Federal Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators*[3] which directs federal agencies to take steps to protect and restore domestic populations of pollinators. To help achieve this goal, the Council on Environmental Quality issued an addendum to its sustainable landscape guidance on October 22, 2014 entitled *Supporting the Health of Honey Bees and other Pollinators*[4] which provides guidance to help federal agencies incorporate pollinator friendly practices in new construction and landscaping improvements.

Recommendations for the Final EIS

- Assess the feasibility, impacts and benefits of incorporating renewable energy, such as roof-top solar, into the project design. Renewable energy could reduce or avoid the need for onsite natural gas and associated air emissions. If found to be feasible, add renewable energy components to the project alternatives.
- Analyze urban heat island effects from the proposed development, and consider strategically placing trees, selecting appropriate building materials and/or adding green roofs on select buildings to minimize effects.
- Assess the feasibility and benefits of developing the project to meet EPA's WaterSense New Home Specification.[5]
- Include a landscape plan that promotes pollinator-friendly plant species and incorporates pollinator-friendly practices into site landscape requirements, particularly regarding the use of pesticides, and ensure all maintenance personnel are made aware of these practices.

Scope of the National Environmental Policy Act Evaluation

The Draft EIS states that numerous environmental resource impacts are not covered under NEPA and are only evaluated under the California Environmental Quality Act portion of the combined Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Draft EIS. We believe the scope of NEPA analyses is broader than the Draft EIS suggests. The Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Regulations require the GC-3

[3] See http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/06/20/presidential-memorandum-creating-federal-strategy-promote-health-honey-b

[4] See http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/supporting_the_health_of_honey_bees_and_other_pollinators.pdf

[5] See http://www.epa.gov/watersense/new_homes/building.html

environmental consequences section of an EIS to discuss both direct and indirect environmental effects and their significance (40 CFR 1502.16). It is unclear why certain environmental effects are excluded from the NEPA analysis for this project, such as (1) criteria pollutant impacts during operations, (2) air toxics contaminants, (3) effects of hazardous materials on schools, (4) paleontological resources, among many others. Environmental impact areas that are not covered under NEPA for this project are commonly covered within other EISs. GC-3 cont.

Recommendations for the Final EIS
Please revisit the rationales for determining whether environmental impact assessments are covered under NEPA. Each time the document concludes that an evaluation is not covered under NEPA, please provide a thorough explanation.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
On December 18, 2014, the Council on Environmental Quality released revised draft guidance for public comment that describes how Federal departments and agencies should consider the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in their NEPA reviews. The revised draft guidance supersedes the draft greenhouse gas and climate change guidance released by CEQ in February 2010. This guidance explains that agencies should consider both the potential effects of a proposed action on climate change, as indicated by its estimated greenhouse gas emissions, and the implications of climate change for the environmental effects of a proposed action. GG-1

Recommendation for the Final EIS
Update the discussion of the Council on Environmental Quality's 2010 greenhouse gas and climate guidance on page 4.11-9 so that it reflects the 2014 guidance.[6]

[6] The Council on Environmental Quality's new Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change Draft Guidance is available at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/nepa_revised_draft_ghg_guidance_searchable.pdf

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 4
P.O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-5528
FAX (510) 286-5559
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Caltrans

Serious Drought.
Help save water!

February 2, 2015

SF101190
SF-101-PM 0.77
SCH# 2012122040

Mr. Kansai Uchida
Planning Department
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Uchida:

Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project – Draft Environmental Impact Report

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and have the following comments to offer.

Lead Agency

As the lead agency, the City and County of San Francisco is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to State highways. Given the project's high vehicle trip generation, fair share contribution financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures. TR-1

This information should also be presented in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) of the environmental document, a draft of which should be included in the DEIR. Please send the draft MMRP for our review before finalizing the Final Environmental Impact Report.

Traffic Forecasting

The DEIR report should include AM and PM trip generation, its turning traffic per study intersection and associated traffic impact analysis under Proposed Project Only, Variant Scenario, Alternative 1 Conditions, and 2030 Cumulative Conditions for our further review. While peak PM traffic would result from residential, retail, and the community center, peak AM traffic may be caused from residential and community center trips in opposing directions. The DEIR only includes PM trip generation and its turning traffic per study intersection (Figures 18 & 19). TR-2

Project Impacts / U.S. Highway 101

TR-3

The City/County should work with Caltrans and other agencies to develop a co-operative agreement to fund the extension of Geneva Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard to U.S. 101 and the U.S. 101 and Harney Way interchange improvements as identified in the Bi-County Transportation Study (pg. 4.8-6). Similar to the transit improvement projects planned in the vicinity of the project site, considered roadway improvement projects incorporated into the project's future cumulative conditions should have a scheduled year of implementation. A reasonable worst-case analysis assumes only those improvements that are fully funded and scheduled to be operational prior to opening day of the proposed project. The cumulative analysis should be consistent with this approach.

Vehicle Trip Reduction

TR-4

1. Provide additional details on the vehicle trip reducing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures identified in the Project. Financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring of the TDM Program should be included in the draft MMRP provided for our review. The TDM Plan should include appropriate documentation for monitoring TDM measures, including annual reports to demonstrate the ongoing reduction of vehicle trips while continuing to survey the travel patterns of residents within the Project area.

2. Secondary impacts on pedestrians and bicyclists resulting from any traffic impact mitigation measures should be analyzed. The analysis should describe any pedestrian and bicycle mitigation measures and safety countermeasures that would in turn be needed as a means of maintaining and improving access to transit facilities and reducing vehicle trips and traffic impacts on State highways.

Transportation Permit

TR-5

Project work that requires movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on State roadways requires a transportation permit that is issued by Caltrans (pg. 4.8-1). To apply, a completed transportation permit application with the determined specific route(s) for the shipper to follow from origin to destination must be submitted to: Caltrans Transportation Permits Office, 1823 14th Street, Sacramento, CA 95811-7119. See the website below for more information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/permits.

Encroachment Permit

Please be advised that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto the State ROW requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. Where traffic restrictions and detours affect State highways, a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) or construction TIS may be required. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five (5) sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW must be submitted to the following address: David Salladay, District Office Chief, Office of Permits,

California Department of Transportation, District 4, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660. See the website below for more information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits. TR-5 cont.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Sherie George at 510-286-5535 or sherie.george@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA MAURICE
Acting District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse

San Francisco Planning Department
Written Comment Form

Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

If you wish to submit written comments on the above project, you may do so on this sheet (although use of this form is not required). Please submit written comments in person to Planning Department staff at today's public hearing, or by mail to Sarah B. Jones, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103. Comments may also be submitted to Sarah B. Jones by e-mail at sarah.b.jones@sfgov.org. **All comments must be received no later than 5:00 PM P.S.T., February 17, 2015.**

Write your comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement here. Use the back of the sheet or additional pages if necessary.

Concern about asthma effects on children during construction

AQ-1

Name: Anthony Billups

Organization (if any):

Address: 281 Blythe Dale

Gutierrez

From:	Uchida, Kansai (CPC)
To:	Range, Jessica (CPC); Flannery, Eugene (MYR); Jonathan Carey
Subject:	FW: Sunnydale Comment
Date:	Tuesday, February 17, 2015 4:39:58 PM
Attachments:	Residents are concern of the high amount of section8.docx

Hi Everyone,

I received this Sunnydale comment today.

Thanks,
-Kansai

From: NELSON GUTIERREZ [mailto:pres_117@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2015 1:54 PM
To: Uchida, Kansai (CPC)
Cc: Nelson Gutierrez
Subject: Hi Nelson

Hi Mr Uchida Nelson please see attachment for my comments concerning Sunnydale housing redevelopment. Thank you. Nelson

Gutierrez

Residents are concern of the high amount of section8/low income housing in Visitacion Valley. Mercy want to increase low income household from 785 to 1,006. Take into account Heritage homes, Britton Court, Carter Terrace and John King senior Housing the total amount of section8/low income housing in Visitacion Valley is 1,500. It my understanding San Francisco have about 4,000 section8/low income housing Visitacion Valley will account about 40% of the these homes. Visitacion Valley SHOULD NOT be the capital of section8/low income housing. This is reflected on the neighborhood, Leland Ave site serves as the neighborhood's primary commercial corridor is nonexistent. Vacant store fronts lack of thriving businesses. Grocery outlet is struggling, original owner Derek and Gina Navarro have left in 6 months because of lack of sales and theft. I was told by Grocery Outlet workers and police officers they might be closing. This community have struggle for many decades there needs to be reduction of section8/low income housing. We are aware of Schlage lock redevelopment 85% market rate housing but we need more to support businesses on Leland Ave, grocery store and for safe, clean and thriving community. PD -1

Mercy or whomever develops in Sunnydale projects needs to hire professional exterminators to kill the rats and roaches huge problem in Sunnydale housing projects. Each and every one of these projects needs to be individually taken care of to properly rid of these nasty pest. This would prevent neighboring homes from being infested by rats and roaches. Developers and City of San Francisco is liable if our homes become infested. HZ -1

Mercy or whomever develops in Sunnydale projects needs to individually wrap every single housing projects (a tent over entire building) to safety remove the hazardous materials (LEAD BASE PAINT, ASBESTOS AND POLYCHLORINTED BIPHERYLS PCBs) prevent dangerous materials from getting airborne specially since Visitacion Valley can be very windy. GC -1

What are changes to bus route and frequency? As of right now bus traffic is very busy, noisy and air pollution and roads are crumbling. TR -6

Visitacion Valley exhibits visual character that is diverse, slope and topography reflecting the characteristics of its natural elements, these features set Visitacion Valley apart visually from other neighborhood. The developers need to take these natural assets into account and try not to grade out natural contours and shape of hill side. This is very important to the open feel and natural aesthetics of Visitacion Valley. AE -1

Gutierrez

There’s a proposal Urban Riders to put in an extreme bike facility.
They said they're going to have 300 to 500 cars coming in when they have their events. It's not serving our community. Do not want this in our community, and been no transparent process

TR-3

There’s a creek/spring I think called Sunnydale Creek, runs in Sunnydale projects it would great if landscape architecture can incorporate this into green space and or entire redevelopment project. Would be a natural beautiful feature for the community

PD-2

Gutierrez

Jonathan Carey

From: Uchida, Kansai (CPC) <kansai.uchida@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 5:31 PM
To: Range, Jessica (CPC); Jonathan Carey; Flannery, Eugene (MYR)
Subject: FW: Hi Nelson

From: NELSON GUTIERREZ [mailto:pres_117@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 18, 2015 6:22 PM
To: Uchida, Kansai (CPC)
Subject: Re: Hi Nelson

Hi Mr. Uchida Nelson I forgot to include Mercy and San Francisco Planning dept have not communicated with the residents in Visitacion Valley about meetings/hearing dates concerning Sunnydale project redevelopment. No notice or mailed notice. GC-4
Additionally, Impact Fees how much Mercy will be paying to the Visitacion Valley community? This was ever mention in the report. GC-6

Thank you Mr Uchida. Nelson

On Tuesday, February 17, 2015 3:15 PM, "Uchida, Kansai (CPC)" <kansai.uchida@sfgov.org> wrote:

Thank you Nelson. We'll include these comments and our responses in the Final EIR/EIS.

-Kansai

Kansai Uchida, AICP
Environmental & Transportation Planner

Planning Department | City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-9048 | Fax: 415-558-6409
Email: kansai.uchida@sfgov.org
Web: www.sfplanning.org

From: NELSON GUTIERREZ [mailto:pres_117@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2015 1:54 PM
To: Uchida, Kansai (CPC)
Cc: Nelson Gutierrez
Subject: Hi Nelson

Hi Mr Uchida Nelson please see attachment for my comments concerning Sunnydale housing redevelopment. Thank you. Nelson

ATTACHMENT 2
Draft EIR/EIS Hearing Transcripts

This page intentionally left blank

SUNNYDALE-VELASCO HOPE SF

MASTER PLAN PROJECT

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE

JOINT DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT,

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

---o0o---

January 20, 2015 - 5:00 o'clock p.m.

Sunnydale Community Room

1652 Sunnydale Avenue

San Francisco, California

REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR #12948

A P P E A R A N C E S

PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF:

Jessica Range, Senior Environmental Planner

Kansai Uchida, Environmental Coordinator

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATES:

Karl Heisler

Jonathan Cary

MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Eugene Flannery

MERCY HOUSING:

Ramie Dare

ALSO PRESENT:

San Francisco Planning Commissioner Cindy Wu

SPANISH INTERPRETER:

Cindy Hogan

CANTONESE INTERPRETER:

Hwo Sing Bah

---o0o---

I N D E X

PUBLIC COMMENT

---o0o---

Tuesday, January 20, 2015 5:05 o'clock p.m.

---o0o---

P R O C E E D I N G S

JESSICA RANGE: Good evening, everyone. Hello. Welcome.

We're going to go ahead and start the public hearing. I'm Jessica Range, a senior environmental planner with the San Francisco Planning Department. And you are here for a public hearing on the Joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, or Joint EIR/EIS, for the Sunnydale Hope SF Project.

Before we begin, I'd like to introduce our translators. We have Christy.

CHRISTY HOGAN: Hi. My name is Christy Hogan. I'm a Spanish interpreter.

(Speaking in Spanish)

HWO SING BAH: (Speaking in Cantonese)

JESSICA RANGE: All right. Thank you. And with that, I'd like to introduce the rest of the staff who is here today.

We have Kansai Uchida with the San Francisco Planning Department. And he's the environmental coordinator for the project.

We also have in the back Karl Heisler and

Jonathan Cary with Environmental Science Associates. And they prepared the Joint EIR/EIS.

And we also have Eugene Flannery. He's with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. And they are the NEPA lead for this project. So it's a joint CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act, and NEPA, National Environmental Protection Act. Both of our offices are working together on this.

And then we have Ramie Dare here with Mercy Housing. And she represents the project sponsor team.

And lastly, we have in the audience Vice President Planning Commissioner Cindy Wu.

Before we begin, there will be a brief presentation presented by project sponsor team, followed by a presentation from Kansai regarding the format of tonight's meeting. And I would just like to remind everyone to turn off or silence your cell phone. And be respectful of each speaker.

So with that I'll bring up Ramie.

RAMIE DARE: Good evening, everybody. My name is Ramie Dare, and I'm with Mercy Housing of California, which are the project sponsors for the Sunnydale development. I'm just going to briefly describe it to you because I know that many of you have -- are

familiar with this. And the purpose of tonight's meeting is to really hear comments from you about the environmental study that the City is conducting.

So the development would be for all of the Sunnydale-Velasco Public Housing site, which is in this photo. It's about 50 acres and 785 units. The proposed plan would be to take the site -- and this is just one diagram. There are several diagrams in the study. But this would basically show you that there would be all new streets in Sunnydale that would include landscaping and greenery. There would also be new housing, which is what these yellow areas represent. And they would been built with different building types, which are drawn here.

And there would also be new amenities for the neighborhood, including a new hub for the neighborhood that would include a community center with community programs and more space across the street for neighborhood services, including retail.

And there are new park spaces -- like for here, here, and up here and then up here [indicating] -- that would be included within the Sunnydale-Velasco Public Housing site. And would complement the McLaren Park area that surrounds it.

The housing that's being proposed would be a

maximum of 1700 units. And that would be a mix of replacement housing for households who are currently residing in Sunnydale as well as new affordable housing and new market rate housing. And again, all of the housing would be different building types and different architecture throughout the site.

And then the park spaces -- and there also may be open spaces within the buildings -- would total about 11 acres of new open space for the neighborhood and for the residents of this development. And up to 72,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving space is proposed.

So those are the maximums that are being studied by the city.

Is there anything else that I've forgotten?

(No comment)

RAMIE DARE: Okay. Than you.

KANSAI UCHIDA: Thank you.

So I am Kansai Uchida. I'm the Planning Department Environmental Review Coordinator for this project. So now we'll move into the formal public hearing portion of the meeting.

I'm going to start by summarizing the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project, and then I'll go over the rules and procedures

for the meeting. And then we'll start hearing your comments because the main reason we're here tonight is to hear from you.

So we have copies of the Draft EIR/EIS which Jessica had mentioned on the back table for your review if you'd like.

We also have CDs that you can take with you as well as copies of the Notice of Availability explaining where else you can view the document or download it online.

You can also request to have a hard copy or CD sent to you as well.

You may have seen the poster we have that shows the development process overview. It shows where we are in the process, steps we've already completed, the steps still ahead of us.

The bright purple box shows where we currently are in the environmental review process. As you can see, a lot of steps have already been accomplished and there's still substantial work to be done.

This effort builds on the earlier, initial planning efforts to develop the Master Plan. And then the next step after this is the Final EIR/EIS, which will incorporate and respond to comments we receive during the comment period, including the comments you

give us this evening.

So after that, there would be further City and HUD detailed -- approvals, detailed design and construction. Feel free of to have a closer look before you leave if you haven't had a chance.

So we published the Draft EIR/EIS on December 19th, 2014 and have circulated it for public review and comment. Many of you probably received the notice in the mail.

You have until February 17th, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. to submit written comments. Your comments and any other information you provide in writing will be recorded into the project record.

I should clarify that this is not a hearing to consider approval or disapproval of the project. Approval hearings will be held after the Final EIR/EIS is completed. Comments referring to the merits of project will not be responded to in detail and are more appropriately directed at decision makers.

Comments should be focused on the adequacy and accuracy of the environmental analysis. We're also holding two public hearings to receive spoken comments. One of them is this meeting we're at right now. And the second one will be this Thursday at City Hall.

We will not provide responses to comments

today. Instead, we'll prepare written responses in a Responses to Comments document. And that document, along with the Draft EIR/EIS and any text changes to address the comments we've received will be the Final EIR/EIS that's circulated later.

The Draft EIR/EIS found potentially significantly impacts related to the following topics: traffic delay at local intersections during construction and operations; disturbance of archeological and paleontological resources during construction; noise exposure during construction and operations; construction effects on special status animal species; exposure to hazardous materials during construction; exposure to air contaminants during construction; construction impacts of new utilities and service systems required to serve the proposed project.

All of the impacts can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels except traffic delay at one intersection, which is the intersection of Sunnydale Avenue and Persia Avenue, up here in Mansell Park.

So if you'd like to give spoken comments here at this meeting, please fill out a speaker card. Jessica has some. We have to at the back table. And give it to Nabiha. We'll be accepting speaker cards

until 6:00 p.m. And we'll call them up in the order received. Each speaker will have three minutes to give comments.

We have a court reporter here to provide an accurate transcript of all the spoken comments received today. So please speak slowly and clearly so that the court reporter can transcribe your comments.

Also we request that commenters state their name for the record so that they may be properly identified and so that we may inform you when the responses to comments document is issued.

Jessica will give you this hand signal when you have one minute remaining and then this hand signal when your three minutes are up. So your time will begin after you say your name. You don't have to use your entire three minutes, but in order to be fair to everyone, we have to stop everybody right at three minutes.

You're welcome to submit further comments in writing if you're not finished, or you can present additional spoken comments at Thursday's public hearing, which will be at City Hall.

That's 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400. And that will be starting at noon or later.

Written comment forms are available in the

back if you'd like to provide written comments, although you're not required to use the form. You can either give your written comments to any of us wearing name tags here at the meeting or mail them or e-mail them to us at the address shown on the form.

So again, all comments must be received at the Planning Department by 5:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time on February 17th, 2015.

And with that, we can start calling speakers, although I don't think we have any speaker cards.

If you'd like to speak, I mean, the main point of the meeting is to hear your comments. So, you know, people are more than welcome.

KARL HEISLER: You can comment first and fill out a card later if you want.

KANSAI UCHIDA: Sure. So, you know, we will be here until 6:00 o'clock in case anybody wants to give comments. You know, it's kind of an open microphone situation. Everybody can have three minutes. We'll record them into the record and respond in the final document.

So with that, unless -- we don't have any speakers cards yet. We will be here. Feel free to look at the boards and development process as well. We'd be happy to answer questions about that.

Unidentified Speaker

Thank you.

JESSICA RANGE: If you do wish to speak, please come up to the microphone.

GC-4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question. Myself included, I can't speak for everyone, but I feel like I'm still trying to figure out where this whole meeting is going towards.

I mean, I was talking to -- I should kind of clarify. I just want to address it because I may not be the only one who's feeling that way. So if you could be a little more clear about your intention, like, the meeting kind of like a -- what are your options that you're looking for?

KANSAI UCHIDA: So the main point of the meeting is we've prepared an environmental document. It contains an analysis of what the potential environmental impacts of the project are, a variety of topics like air quality, traffic, hazardous materials, and so forth.

And so this meeting is really to hear, you know, for those of you who've had a chance to read it, if you had feedback about the document, either concerns, comments, questions -- although we can't answer detailed questions here -- or to hear any other environmental-related concerns about the project or,

you know, we would also -- I mean, any comments are welcome. Although, in general, we would only respond in detail to ones that are about the environmental document. The rest would go in the project record. But those would be passed along to decision makers, but they wouldn't necessarily end up resulting in changes to the final environmental analysis.

JESSICA RANGE: So just to summarize briefly, we're here to take comments on the environmental analysis of the project. And that analysis is contained in this document which we published in December of this year.

KARL HEISLER: Hi, I'm Karl Heisler. I work for the consulting firm that works with Planning that helped put the document together.

So if you haven't been through this process before, it's a little bit confusing. It's still confusing to me. I've been doing this for 25 years.

These reports are required by law. There's a law in California called the California Environmental Quality Act. There's also a federal version, which is called the National Environmental Policy Act. And they're similar.

They require that, when a major change is going to be made -- whether it's a single new building,

you know, a high rise downtown or, in this case, essentially reconstructing the entirety of Sunnydale and the little Velasco piece also -- that all of the -- the number of issues be analyzed. And there's a standard list of issues. They include transportation, traffic, and so on, air quality, noise, biology, hazardous materials, geology, hydrology, and about ten other issues.

And so they're all analyzed in this document. You don't have to read the entire thing if you don't want to. It's a little bit intimidating. But it does have a summary.

So the document's available. We have CDs if you want to take one with you and you want to read it. You have until February 17th to send in written comments. And as Kansai said, you can also make comments before the Planning Commission day after tomorrow.

There's a summary at the beginning that gives a brief explanation of what the conclusions are. But there's a lot of information in the document. But you still have another month, if you want to try and read the entire thing. Anyway, that's just a little summary of how this whole process works.

So an integral component under both CEQA and

NEPA is that there's both a public review and comment of the document. And that's the period we're in now. As Kansai and Jessica said, this document was published about a month ago in mid December. So the public has two months, until February 17th, to read it, to make comments on it, to say if something seems inaccurate or if something else to be covered among the issues that are in there.

After that, the document gets revised, if necessary. We will prepare a separate document that includes responses to comments that are made in writing as well as these comments that are made tonight and on Thursday. And then the entire thing gets certified in California. And I don't remember what the term is, the federal term, but it's something similar.

Only when -- once all that is finished, then the Planning Commission and other City agencies will start talking about the actual change, the project itself, and whether that should go ahead and whether it gets approved and if things get changed in it.

So this is all the examination up front of the potential impacts. Then there's a whole second phase which will be later on this year where the actual project itself will come. There will be hearings. You'll have a chance to comment that as well.

Unidentified Speaker

So that's sort of a summary of where we are.

PD-1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The summary says there's going to be up to 1700 units. What determines how many there will wind up being?

KANSAI UCHIDA: That would be more of a question for -- Ramie, would you like to -- you know up to 1700 is what we advised in the environmental document, if you want to go further into -- so.

RAMIE DARE: So her question was -- so I had stated earlier that there's going to be a maximum of 1700 units as part of the development.

And your question was what determines what's the actual number of housing units that's going to be built.

So the affordable housing units that are -- we want to maximize, the number of those, particularly, you know, having replacement units for people who are already living here.

The market rate housing would be determined by the market rate developers, which we're not; we're affordable housing developers. So we're going to find other market rate developers to actually build the actual sites. And they're the ones that are going to figure out, "Oh, I want to put X number of units here because that's what makes sense."

Unidentified Speaker

Does that answer your question?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd kind of like to follow up to hers a little bit?

KANSAI UCHIDA: That's fine. I mean, in reality, we probably should have had a question after your introduction anyway, so...

PD-1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just like to follow up to hers. Like you mentioned earlier, like 1700 total units. Is there like a breakdown of the numbers? And if it's like a majority would be replacement -- from my understanding, I believe Sunnydale is over 1,000 units, probably like the largest in San Francisco. Like, what's the number breakdown?

RAMIE DARE: So your question is, of the 1700 units, what's the breakdown?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As far as like the market rate ones, lower income housing, the replacement housing.

RAMIE DARE: Right. So 1,006 of the units -- again this is all maximum, right. So 1,006 of the units would be affordable housing, which would include replacement housing. And those would all be affordable rental units. And then 694 of maximum would be market rate units.

Any other questions? Yes, sir?

Unidentified Speaker

PH-1

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How would you determine who goes and who stays in these buildings?

RAMIE DARE: So the idea is that the existing Sunnydale households who are in what the Housing Authority has determined good standing, maybe you've been lease compliant, would move into a new unit that would be built within Sunnydale.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What determines who lives there? And those that are not accepted will be moved out? Or where will they be placed?

RAMIE DARE: I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The ones that are not accepted in the program that you're talking about rebuilding, those that are not accepted in that, are they just replaced out? Or they have no way of getting back in or what?

RAMIE DARE: So my understanding is that, as long as you're compliant with your current lease, then you will be able to move into a new unit in the Sunnydale development.

PD-1

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If the -- until the place is being done, where will they move to?

RAMIE DARE: Oh, during construction you mean.

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

RAMIE DARE: Sorry.

Unidentified Speaker

So we're going to be building it in what we call phases. We can't do the whole thing at once, too big. So the document, the big study, shows three phases of construction.

And we might actually -- probably we'll break that down even smaller. So the folks who leave in a particular construction phase, we would relocate you into other vacant units that are in Sunnydale because, you know, there's always vacancies. And of course they'll be fixed-up units -- other vacancies in the area or in the neighborhood or, if there are units in the city or, if there are subsidies available from HUD, then you might move to other areas of the city during construction.

AQ-1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is the probability of the hazard, once they start -- you know, like little kids that has asthma, and what is the ratio for each set as you tear it down?

KANSAI UCHIDA: That is more of an environmental comment so that kind of falls under one of the topic areas that is covered in the environmental document.

So for this, I would strongly urge you to submit that as a comment. And we would respond to it in the final environmental document, which will be prepared later this year.

Unidentified Speaker

So you can come speak up here into the microphone, or you could submit it in writing as well if you'd like.

HZ-1

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I also want to know what is the ground that they're tearing up? Is it hazardous at all?

KANSAI UCHIDA: Again, that's -- the environmental document has to speak for it. You know, during the comment period, we --

(Sotto voce discussion between Mr. Heisler and unidentified speaker)

KANSAI UCHIDA: I mean, in general, during this -- Eugene?

EUGENE FLANNERY: Is it appropriate to give an answer to that question to -- or to identify it for --

KANSAI UCHIDA: We can show in the document where you can find the information that you're asking about. But, you know, at this point, we have to let the document speak for itself during this formal comment period that we're in.

You know, if you have further questions --

EUGENE FLANNERY: Do I mention housing, HUD housing --

KANSAI UCHIDA: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Speaker

Eugene, if you can come up here, just so the court reporter can get it.

EUGENE FLANNERY: As a HUD-funded project, there's HUD rules that the environmental conditions may not pose a risk of harm to human beings.

So within the document, we could not elucidate any significant impacts that could not be mitigated related to hazardous or toxic materials. That doesn't mean that there aren't any on this site.

We all know that there's lead in the paint here. And we all know that there's asbestos because of when the buildings were built. So these issues will be mitigated. You can be assured to the project will be implemented and no one will be exposed to any risk of harm to their health.

And I can help you show you in the document where to find this.

HZ-1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If we're here while they're tearing it down or moving it, I just want to know, you know --

EUGENE FLANNERY: You would be moved out of harm's way. Absolutely.

KANSAI UCHIDA: It sounds like this is a concern. I would urge you to submit it as a comment because questions that you ask us here, they don't become part

of the project record and get responded to in the project document in the same way that a formal comment would. So I would urge you to submit a comment about it.

COMMISSIONER WU: Can I clarify what that means?

KANSAI UCHIDA: Oh, sure.

COMMISSIONER WU: I think when he says that you should submit it as a comment, you just either have to come up here and formally say it or write it down. So it doesn't need to be so difficult. Right?

So, for the gentleman that asked the question about asthma, it would be as simple as just saying -- coming up here and saying it into the microphone, and the Department can answer the question.

KANSAI UCHIDA: Thank you.

So, again, any other questions or concerns, we will be here until 6:00 o'clock. And, you know, you're welcome to make comments. You know, it can be very -- doesn't have to be long. You can just state what your overall concerns. And we'll respond to those in the final environmental document.

And we can answer questions about process or project description here, any of us with name tags can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to make sure he heard her answer.

Unidentified Speaker

Big brother, she had answered your question directly while you were talking. I wanted to make sure you heard her answer while you were talking.

KANSAI UCHIDA: Yes?

PD-3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If the construction is approved, when will it start?

KANSAI UCHIDA: The environmental document -- and anybody back there can show you. There is -- I think that the wording is that the construction would start earliest in 2017.

JESSICA RANGE: Yeah. It's up here.

GC-4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you have questions after this meeting, how would you be able to submit your questions?

KANSAI UCHIDA: That's a good point.

So on the cards in the back, there is an e-mail address as well as a phone number. Feel free to send your questions or comments to that e-mail address or to give us a call. Over the phone, again, we would be mostly just answering questions about the environmental document process.

But when it comes to the actual analysis, you know, we would take your comments in written form and respond to them in the final document that we'll be producing later this year. But, you know, if you don't

Unidentified Speaker

get a chance to make comments at this meeting, you can certainly submit them in writing, and we'll be answering them just the same.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And also, you have that bulletin that it's referring to. Is that online somewhere?

KANSAI UCHIDA: Yes. There's a copy of the notice over there, and it has the web link where you can download it.

Yes, go ahead?

PD-3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this a project that's really going to take? Because they've been saying for years that they're going to remodel out here. So is this something that's really going to take effect?

KANSAI UCHIDA: Well, the project approvals haven't occurred yet. As you can see in the development process, the project approvals are the step after the environmental review.

So the environmental document is a required step in the planning process. It's legally required, and we have to complete this analysis before a final decision can be made to proceed with the project.

So it's part of the planning process leading up to consideration for approval. But at this step, an approval hasn't been made yet. So this analysis is

Unidentified Speaker

part of the information that's supposed to inform that decision.

GC-4

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And those of us that's on your mailing list you will keep informed?

KANSAI UCHIDA: Yes. Our mailing list will keep you informed of the Planning Department approvals.

And, Ramie, there's probably -- you have your own, I guess, as well.

So you would receive updates regarding progress and approvals about the project as well as the upcoming hearings for those as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

KANSAI UCHIDA: So we're going to -- to question?

PD-4

TING FE CHEN: (Through Cantonese interpreter) I see the design. It was written. The street in front of my property.

It might affect the green zone in my property. So if there is an issue, how do I get in touch with you?

KANSAI UCHIDA: The best way, since it's a comment about the effects of the project, would be to submit a formal comment, either at the microphone here, or you can do it in writing or e-mail it to us before February 17th. And then we would respond to it in our final document.

TING FE CHEN: (Through Cantonese interpreter) So I will come up and use the microphone.

KANSAI UCHIDA: And then, if you could, please fill out a speaker card after.

TING FE CHEN: (Through Cantonese interpreter) I --

KANSAI UCHIDA: Could you state your name, please?

TING FE CHEN: (Through Cantonese interpreter) Ting Fe Chen, C-H-E-N is the last. T-I-N-G, F-E, C-H-E-N.

PD-4 Okay. The property belongs to my daughter and my husband. They -- they're not -- they're not free; that's why I'm here.

I reviewed the plan, and the street will be straight in front of my property. It might impact the green zone in the property in front of my house. If the project impact me, of course, I will -- you know, I would have issues. Otherwise, it's okay.

KANSAI UCHIDA: Thank you.

TING FE CHEN: (Through Cantonese interpreter) Okay. Thank you.

KANSAI UCHIDA: Thank you. If you could fill that out and give it back to us afterwards, that would be great, for the record.

Again, so if anybody else has comments, we're

here until 6:00 o'clock. Or if you have questions, I think -- the plan is to -- so in the meantime, we can answer questions individually. At the end we'll circle back and see if anybody has any comments that they'd like to make.

All right. So sort of informally, we'd be happy to answer questions for like the next ten minutes or so. And then around ten till 6:00, we'll circle back. If anybody has further comments, we can resume taking them then. And so in the meantime, feel free to flag one of us down if you have questions.

(Recess taken)

KANSAI UCHIDA: Hi, everyone. It is almost 6:00 o'clock, so at this point, we'll -- it's last call for spoken comments. If you don't want to give comments tonight, we can also get them on Thursday at the Planning Commission hearing.

It's -- it's going to be at noon at City Hall. Otherwise, feel free to give your written comments, or you know, come fill out a speaker card. We'll be here for a few more minutes to answer questions as well.

Again, I want to thank everybody for coming to the meeting. Really appreciate it.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 6:03 o'clock p.m.)

TATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MARIN)

I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct transcription of said proceedings.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

Dated the 10th day of February, 2015.

DEBORAH FUQUA
CSR NO. 12948

This page intentionally left blank

BEFORE THE

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

---o0o---

AGENDA ITEM 8, CASE NO. 2010.0305E

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SUNNYDALE-VELASCO HOPE SF MASTER PLAN PROJECT

January 22, 2015 - 12:00 o'clock p.m.

San Francisco Planning Commission Chambers

1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400

San Francisco, California

REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR #12948

A P P E A R A N C E S

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION:

Cindy Wu, Vice President

Michael Antonini, Commissioner

Richard Hillis, Commissioner

Christine Johnson, Commissioner

Kathrin Moore, Commissioner

Dennis Richards, Commissioner

Commission Secretary: Jonas P. Ionin

Planning Department Staff:

Kansai Uchida, Environmental Planner

Jessica Range, Senior Environmental Planner

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

---o0o---

Thursday, January 22, 2015 1:54 o'clock p.m.

---o0o---

P R O C E E D I N G S

SECRETARY IONIN: Commissioners, that will place you on Regular Calendar Item 8 for Case No. 2010.0305E, the Sunnydale-Velasco Hope SF Master Plan Project. This is a public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Please note that written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on February 17th, 2015.

KANSAI UCHIDA: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Kansai Uchida, Environmental and Transportation Planner.

The item before you is a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement or Draft EIR/EIS for the Sunnydale-Velasco Hope SF Master Plan Project.

This is a joint document that satisfies both the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

The document was prepared by the Planning Department and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development.

I am joined today by my colleague Jessica

Range, Senior Environmental Planner, and the project sponsor representatives are also here today.

The project site is a 48.8-acre site in Visitacion Valley, bounded by Hahn Street to the east, Velasco Avenue to the South and McLaren Park to the north and west. It is currently developed with 785 family and senior public housing units.

The proposed project includes demolition of all existing family and senior public housing units at the Sunnydale and Velasco Public Housing complexes and construction of up to 1700 housing units, including one-for-one public housing replacement units, affordable rental units, and market rate and affordable for sale units.

The project would also include up to 72,500 square feet of community service, recreational, and educational facilities; 11.5 acres of new parks and open spaces; a new and reconfigured street network; and up to 16,200 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail. Construction of the proposed project would occur over approximately 9 to 15 years in three phases.

The Draft EIR was issued on December 19th, 2014, and comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on February 17th, 2015. This is the second of two public hearings on the Draft

EIR/EIS. The first hearing was held earlier this week on Tuesday, January 20th, 2015, in the Community Room at the Sunnydale-Velasco housing complex.

The Draft EIR/EIS found potentially significant impacts related to the following topics: traffic delay at local intersections during construction and operations; disturbance of archeological and paleontological resources during construction; noise exposure during construction and operations; exposure to hazardous materials during construction; construction effects on special status animal species; exposure to air contaminants during construction; and construction impacts of new utilities and service systems required to serve the proposed projects. All impacts could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels except cumulative traffic delay.

I'd like to remind speakers that this is not a hearing to consider approval or disapproval of the proposed projects. Approval hearings will follow the Final EIR/EIS certification.

Comments should focus on the adequacy and accuracy of information and analysis within the Draft EIR/EIS. Comments on other topics will not be responded to in detail.

I would also like to request that commenters speak slowly and clearly so that the court reporter can produce an adequate transcript of today's hearing. Also, it would greatly help if commenters would state their name for the record when they begin speaking so that they may be properly identified in the hearing transcript. Also, commenters should please provide their addresses on their speakers cards so that we can inform them when the Responses to Comments document is available.

After hearing comments from the public, we will also take comments on the Draft EIR/EIS from the Planning Commission.

Staff are not here to answer comments today. The comments will be transcribed by the court reporter, made part of the project record, and responded to in the Responses to Comments document. This document will respond to all spoken and written comments received.

Revisions will also be made to the Draft EIR/EIS as needed to address these comments. The Responses to Comments document and the revised Draft EIR/EIS will comprise the Final EIR/EIS.

In addition to the spoken comments given at this public hearing, comments can be submitted in writing by mail or e-mail to the Planning Department at

the addresses shown on the Notice of Availability.

I should again emphasize that comments must be received at the Planning Department by 5:00 o'clock p.m. Pacific Standard Time on February 17th, 2015.

This concludes my presentation, and unless Commissioners have questions, I would recommend that the Commission open the public hearing on this item. Thank you.

COMMISSION CHAIR WU: Thank you.

Okay. Let's open the public hearing. Are there any public comments?

(No response)

COMMISSION CHAIR WU: Okay. Looks like no public comment.

Public comment is closed.

Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you. I just had a few questions that can be answered in the Comments and Responses as is the case, of course.

PD-1 I think one of the alternatives spelled out the breakdown of the different units -- how many market units there were market rate, how many there would be of -- obviously we have one-to-one replacement of the public housing.

And so I didn't see that -- maybe I didn't

Commissioner Antonini

PD-1 cont.

read carefully enough -- in the preferred project alternatives. So I'd like to have that spelled out in Comments and Responses.

GC-5

The other question I have is that -- again, in Comments Responses -- have the environmental impacts been analyzed if the project was done simultaneously? It's apparently going to be done in phases, which has a different -- a different environmental impact.

And I'm not advocating; I'm just saying that, you know, in Valencia Gardens, North Beach Place, I think many of the Hope projects that were done in the past were done all at once. The tenants were given housing elsewhere and then they were brought back after it was finished. And some of the impacts that we've talked about as far as noise and traffic and others are made more difficult by the fact that you still have some of the housing there while this is being done.

So anyway, I wonder if that has been looked at or was analyzed as any part of the thing, whether that alternative was thought about.

But I think it looks like it's going to be a very good project. Those are my two comments.

COMMISSION CHAIR WU: Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you.

For the court transcriber, I will actually

state when my comments directly related to the EIR start so that we don't have a whole bunch of comments that won't be responded to specifically.

I'm just going to call out people -- I see a whole lot of people here for 1601 Mariposa. And the fact that there's nobody here for Sunnydale is very upsetting. And I'm calling on everybody who's looking and cares about Sunnydale, if you're watching this broadcast and you're not here, you just got called out on TV.

It's just unbelievable to me. We are razing an entire public housing project that has issues with sewage back up, infrastructure problems you couldn't imagine. And the fact that nobody can seem to even read the summary of an EIR and kind of care about it -- okay. I'm done. So I'm off my soapbox. And I will talk about the EIR now, Mr. or Mrs. Court Transcriber.

So the first thing is there are a couple of areas where I really don't feel like the EIR is sufficient. And, luckily, it's a draft, so we can think about how to alleviate this for the next version.

So there's three specific areas that I think that the EIR does not do a very good job. The first is on displacement and environmental justice. The second is on public services, specifically schools. And the

Commissioner Johnson

third is on public utilities, specifically, a sustainability plan, even more specifically on gray water and other waste treatment opportunities that we have.

So I'll got through them one by one. And I'll try to be as specific as possible on what I think the issue is, and hopefully we'll get some changes in the Final EIR.

PH-1 So on displacement/environmental justice, the summary of impacts does not adequately -- I'll say this: The summary of the impacts does not adequately state how the City and the developer have thought about both the potential impact and the mitigation measures that have already been considered around displacement.

This is a one-for-one housing -- public housing replacement. But unlike in Alice Griffith, where there's actually a bunch of acres right next to the existing project and we're building new and people are moving in over time, we have to demolish sections of this project, move people to somewhere, and then they have to -- they can move back once that project is completed over somewhere between a 9- and 12- or 17-year -- I think a number in here project plan, project timeline.

So I would say that, taken together, that

Commissioner Johnson

PH-1 cont.

series of project details means that there is not -- there's more than a less-than-significant impact on -- for both -- under both NEPA and CEQA for displacement of existing residents.

The existing, I think, fill of units in the Sunnydale project is somewhere along the 70 or 80 percent -- and again, the percentages aren't here; so I'm trying to remember off the top of my head -- range, but you can't assume that every single unit that is not currently occupied is occupiable by another displaced individual or resident given the infrastructure problems there.

So I will say that, to summarize my first point, I think that the summary of impacts needs to say that that displacement is not less than significant. And I think that the mitigation measure needs to be called out as to the relocation and assistance plan which is actually described in summary level in the document. So I'll say that.

Getting to the actual mitigation itself, I think that there's not enough detail there. Like I said, based on the current rates of units being occupied, there is some percentage of unoccupied units that the assumption is made that every effort will be made to move people, as their units are demolished,

Commissioner Johnson

PH-1 cont.

1 into those other units.

2 But in no way -- number one, the numbers don't

3 work out, even if 100 percent of those unoccupiable

4 units were occupiable. And, two, I don't think 100

5 percent of those units are occupiable. So I think the

6 relocation and assistance plan or the mitigation

7 measure in general needs to have way more detail about

8 where these people are going to go.

9 Part -- and how this links directly back to

10 the environmental impact report is you have to analyze,

11 under CEQA, do you have environmental impacts related

12 to providing housing somewhere else for people that

13 you're displacing.

14 I think it's fantastic that we're doing this

15 project. I think it's necessary. But I think we have

16 to be realistic about where these people are going and

17 the environmental impacts, either in San Francisco or

18 regionally, of providing units for those people.

19 So that needs to show up somewhere. And

20 having "none required" as a mitigation measure is

21 totally insufficient.

EJ-2

22 I think environmental justice is an offshoot

23 of that to me because, under NEPA and CEQA, you kind of

24 look at environmental justice. And I think that,

25 because you're having people live on site during the,

Commissioner Johnson

EJ-2 cont.

you know, 9-to-15-year, something like that, project, we need to look at -- the mitigation measure needs to be the protections against construction methods that are already laid out here.

So, again, I think maybe on that piece it's not so much necessarily that the EIR in total isn't sufficient, but the mitigation measure is definitely not "none required."

And there are mitigation measures against noise and dust and transit impacts that are laid out here. And I think that they need to be added as specific mitigation measures under the environmental justice pieces.

PS-1

The second major area that I pointed out was public services. And, again, here, again, mitigation measure in the summary of impacts is "none required." I think that's insufficient.

I think we do have impacts fees coming from SB50 that will provide for new schools for some number of these families of this sort of doubling of density of this area -- or tripling, depending on which project we do -- that are going to need schools, and the area -- is insufficient for the number of children that are going to be coming to the area.

So the mitigation measure was laid out in

PS-1 cont.

whole in the EIR as SB50 fees and other impact fees that will come in that could provide for new facilities such as schools. And I think that needs to be noted specifically as a mitigation measure in the summary.

PH-2

And then the third major area is public utilities. Like Alice Griffith, we have a huge opportunity here to really implement the sustainability plans that the SFPUC has really looked at for some other major projects, particularly around gray water and waste treatment.

We are digging up whole streets. We are realigning them. We are providing almost fully new infrastructure for this project. And the fact that I see almost nothing about those plans other than a sort of slight reference to the fact that the PUC is spending a lot on their sewer improvement project, it seems not as sufficient as it probably could be. I won't go as far as saying it's insufficient.

I would love to see more about that. And I definitely with call out gray water because that's my thing. It's something that I've been on -- I've been on that horse for about ten years.

So those were my major comments that I really hope to see changes in the Final EIR.

PH-1

COMMISSION CHAIR WU: I will add a couple comments

PH-1 cont.

to say that, on the question of displacement, the EIR just refers again to the relocation assistance plan. But not all plans are created equal. So can there be some more consideration of criteria of what is a sufficient plan, criteria of looking at whether or not there are undue environmental impacts to moving people very far away from where they currently live and so on.

Commissioner Moore.

PH-2

COMMISSIONER MOORE: In follow-up to both Commissioners Johnson and Wu, I would like to ask about cumulative displacement. This project coincides with a number of very large projects which have a significant amount of displacement, Bay View-Hunter's Point together with Treasure Island.

And I'd like the EIR, if at all possible, to address what these large numbers of units require the City to do or to admit that they can't do it because we don't have affordable housing, leave alone housing for displacement of people who live in the areas just mentioned. I'd like to ask that we start being realistic about those as impacts.

COMMISSION CHAIR WU: Commission Johnson.

PH-2

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

I definitely agree. I would just sort of add, if that is something that we're going to have staff

Commissioner Johnson

PH-2 cont.

time to consider, that Hunter's Point, in my view, is not as much of an issue because most of the construction was on the shipyard and no one lives there other than a select few people that are being taken care of through the Community Benefits Plan.

SECRETARY IONIN: Commissioners, if there's nothing further, we can move on to your next item.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 2:10 o'clock p.m.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MARIN)

I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct transcription of said proceedings.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

Dated the 10th day of February, 2015.

DEBORAH FUQUA
CSR NO. 12948