



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

451 Seventh Street, SW

Washington, DC 20410

www.hud.gov

espanol.hud.gov

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

Project Information

Project Name: La Vista Residential

Responsible Entity: California Housing Finance Agency
500 Capitol Mall, Ste. 1400
Sacramento, CA 95814

Grant Recipient
(if different than Responsible Entity): Same as Responsible Entity

State/Local Identifier:

Preparer: Nik Kilpelainen, Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Tiena Johnson Hall, Executive Director
California Housing Finance Agency
500 Capitol Mall, Ste. 1400
Sacramento, CA 95814

Consultant (if applicable): Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Direct Comments to: Ashley Carroll
Loan Administrator
California Housing and Finance Agency

Project Location: The project site is approximately 4.6 acres located northeast of the intersection of Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard in the City of Hayward, Alameda County. The site consists of portions of accessor parcel number (APNs) 078C-0626-001-07, 078C-0626-003-16, and 078C-0626-003-09. Figure 1 shows the location of the project site within the region and Figure 2 shows the project site’s immediate location.

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

The proposed project includes construction of a mixed-use residential housing community including 176 units of affordable housing in two, five-story elevator serviced buildings (Building A and Building B). The project includes additional site amenities such as a ~1,655 square foot (sf) central courtyard, building common areas including an ~10,000 square foot children’s education center in Building B, a community room (~1,350 sf), flex room (~275 sf), computer lab (~175 sf) and leasing lobby (~930 sf). Other project amenities include community laundry rooms, a children’s playground (~1,079 sf) in the central courtyard, and an outdoor recreational facility with various exercise stations and fitness equipment (suitable for children ages 13-17). The project site plan is provided in Attachment A.

The 176 total residential units would be managed through on-site property management staff, residing in two, three-bedroom manager’s units. The proposed unit mix is as follows:

Table 1 – Unit Mix Summary

Number of Units	Bedrooms	Unit Size (approximate)
38	Studio	416 sf
47	1	547 sf
44	2	767 sf
45	3	986 sf
2 (Manager’s Units)	3	986 sf

Vehicle, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Access

The project site’s main access driveway entrance would be located on Tennyson Road, between the proposed residential and vacant land. One secondary driveway entrance to the site would be located at the northwestern property boundaries of the property from E. 16th Street. An internal driveway would connect the two site entrances, wrapping along the northeastern perimeter of the proposed multi-family residential building, as well as along each side of the commercial structure.

Existing Class II striped bicycle lanes are located on Tennyson Road and stretches as far west to Industrial Boulevard going east and west along both sides of Tennyson Road. The City’s Bicycle Master Plan designates Tennyson Boulevard along the project’s southern boundary as a Class II bicycle route as well, and extends west, connecting additional housing (source 1). Existing sidewalks in the project vicinity provide pedestrian access to the site along the north side of Tennyson Boulevard. The existing pedestrian sidewalks along the roadway frontages have landscaped barriers from vehicular traffic. In addition, the Hayward Bicycle Master Plan identifies improving the circulation and streetscapes in the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan An existing bus stop on the project boundary is located at Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard.

Figure 2 – Project Location/Area of Potential Effect



Imagery provided by Microsoft Bing and its licensors © 2022.

Parking

The project would provide 183 uncovered parking spaces for the residential building located behind the building and extending to E. 16th Street.

Utilities and Services

The project would include on-site sewer improvements and utility connections in accordance with requirements of the applicable utility providers for water, sewer, stormwater drainage, power, and telecommunications services. These utilities would connect to existing infrastructure in the vicinity of the project site. The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) would provide electrical power and natural gas service to the project site. The City of Hayward would provide water and sewer service, storm water, and sewer services to the project site. Two trash/recycling storage enclosures for the residential use would be located within each building, and a trash pick-up staging area will be located near the northern buildings near the parking structure that connects to E. 16th Street. Solid waste services for the project site would be provided by the City's exclusive contracted franchised hauler, Waste Management of Alameda County. The project would rely on existing public services including, but not limited to, Hayward Police Department and Hayward Fire Department, and parks and open spaces provided by the City of Hayward, the County of Alameda, and the State of California.

Construction Schedule and Characteristics

The project is planned for development in one phase. The project is anticipated to be constructed in twenty-four (24) months, beginning approximately December 2022 and ending December 2024. Project development costs include offsite improvements, consisting of public surface improvements (roads, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks). In order to level the site during grading, the project requires 63,568 cubic yards of excavated cut soil, and a net export of 47,484 cubic yards of soil. The project site is vacant; no relocation or demolition is required.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]: The proposed project is a 176-unit rental new construction project. The project is intended to provide affordable housing for families earning up to 70% of the area median income for Alameda County, with an average affordability of just under 60% AMI. The project is intended to meet the eligibility requirements of the large family housing type as identified in the TCAC Regulations Section 10325(g)(1)(A) through (I).

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

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The City of Hayward is located in Alameda County, as part of the East Bay region of the San Francisco Bay Area in the United States. Hayward is located in the center of Alameda County. Its neighbors include Dublin and Pleasanton to the east, Union City to the south and southeast, the San Francisco Bay to the west, and San Leandro to the northwest. Hayward is located approximately 20 miles southwest of downtown San Francisco. The population was 161,744 as of January 1, 2022 (Source 2).

The surrounding area is mostly residential, commercial, and open space, with planned single-family and multifamily residential developments. Surrounding land uses include the former La

Vista Quarry, planned for a future regional park, and undeveloped open grassland to the east; Calhoun Street and riparian woodlands to the north; and residential development to the south and west. The project site is bounded by East 16th Street to the west.

The City of Hayward General Plan Land Use Map designates the project site as Medium Density Residential (minimum lot area – 4,000 square feet) (RMB4). Permitted uses in the RM District include residential uses, home day cares, and public agency facilities, which include schools, churches, parks, playgrounds and other facilities for public use. The project site is also located within the Hayward Foothills Trail Special Design District (SD-7). The purpose of the Hayward Foothills Trail Special Design District is to ensure development of a continuous trail along the 238 Bypass Land Use Study properties. Specific development standards and design guidelines are outlined for the trail with a general location of the trail in the City of Hayward Zoning Ordinance.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Non-native grasslands cover the majority of the site. A few dirt roads lie within the grasslands, and portions of the site have been disced¹ and been previously graded. The site contains remnant construction debris and litter, particularly along the western edge of the site near East 16th Street. An internal barbed wire fence separates the northern part of the project site from the more heavily grazed southern portion of the site. A subsurface water line runs through the site, as indicated by a hydrant and concrete access vaults.

TRENDS

The following describes the local housing trends in the area:

- Housing Opportunities for Older Adults and Seniors: the City of Hayward 2040 General Plan Housing Element identifies that the population of older adults (55 to 64) and seniors (65 or older) has been rapidly rising (Source 3). This is an indication that residents are aging in place, and in part, as a result of an aging boomer generation. The City of Hayward will continue to approve senior and affordable senior housing developments.
- Housing Opportunities for Families: the City of Hayward 2040 General Plan Housing Element identifies that most households are occupied by families. In 2010, of the 44,380 households, 31,038 households were family households, totaling nearly 70 percent of the total households.
- Housing Opportunities for Low-Income Residents: the City of Hayward 2040 General Plan Housing Element identifies that approximately 45 percent of residents earn 80 percent of the area median income or less.
- Housing Opportunities for Special Needs Groups: the City of Hayward 2040 General Plan Housing Element identifies that 20 percent are large households, 18 percent of households have senior-headed households that are 65 years old or older; 15 percent of households are female-headed households; and 12.5 percent are households living in poverty. Housing cost burdens are especially prevalent amongst these groups.
- Aging housing stock: the City of Hayward 2040 General Plan Housing Element identifies that approximately half of the City's housing stock (34.2 percent) was built between 1960 and 1980.

¹ Cultivated with an implement (such as a harrow or plow) that turns and loosens the soil with a series of discs.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
121-98116	YHC - 542(c) HFA Risk Share -- FFB NC	\$24,300,000

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$24,300,000

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]: \$102,707,176

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

Record below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6		
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Hayward Executive Airport is the nearest civilian airport to the project site, located approximately 4 miles northwest. The nearest military airport to the site is the Moffett Federal Airfield, located approximately 14 miles southwest of the project site. The project site is not within a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-designated civilian airport Runway Protection or Accident Potential Zone. The project is not within 2,500 feet of a commercial civilian airport or 15,000 feet of the runway of a military airfield. In addition, the site is not located in an airport-related building height referral area and the project does not fall within the Oakland or Hayward Executive Airport’s Area of Influence. The proposed project would not result in adverse effects related to airport hazards. The proposed project would not result in adverse effects related to airport hazards. Source List:4

<p>Coastal Barrier Resources</p> <p>Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The Coastal Barrier Resources Act of the United States (CBRA, Public Law 97-348), enacted October 18, 1982, designated various undeveloped coastal barriers, depicted by a set of maps adopted by law, for inclusion in the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS). Designated areas were made ineligible for direct or indirect federal funding except for limited uses such as national security, navigability, and energy exploration. The Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 expanded these areas and added a new category of land called "otherwise protected areas," the majority of which are publicly held for conservation or recreational purposes. CBRS areas extend along the coasts of the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, and the Great Lakes and consist of 857 units.</p> <p>Since there are no Coastal Barrier Resources in California, the project would not conflict with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.</p> <p>Source List: 5</p>
<p>Flood Insurance</p> <p>Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project does not involve property acquisition, land management, construction or improvement within a 100-year floodplain (Zones A or V) or 500-year floodplain (Zone B) identified on a Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). Since the project site is not located in a Flood Zone, Flood Insurance is not required for the project.</p> <p>Source List: 6</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5</p>		
<p>Clean Air</p> <p>Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Air Quality Background</p> <p>The proposed project is in City of Hayward, Alameda County, and within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The SFBAAB is designated as nonattainment-marginal for the federal 8-hour ozone standard and nonattainment-moderate for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}). In addition, the SFBAAB is in nonattainment for the state 8-hour ozone, PM_{2.5}, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀). Air quality in the SFBAAB is managed and regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).</p> <p>The majority of ozone formation occurs when nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO) and reactive organic gases (ROG), react in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. For this reason, NO_x, CO, and ROG are called ozone precursors and are relevant</p>

		<p>criteria pollutants to evaluate nonattainment areas for ozone.</p> <p>Ozone is produced by a photochemical reaction (triggered by sunlight) between NO_x and ROG. NO_x is formed during the combustion of fuels, while reactive organic gases are formed during combustion and evaporation of organic solvents. Because ozone requires sunlight to form, it mostly occurs in substantial concentrations between the months of April and October. Ozone is a pungent, colorless, toxic gas with direct health effects on humans, including respiratory and eye irritation and possible changes in lung functions. Groups most sensitive to ozone include children, the elderly, people with respiratory disorders, and people who exercise strenuously outdoors.</p> <p>Atmospheric particulate matter is comprised of finely divided solids and liquids such as dust, soot, aerosols, fumes, and mists. The particulates that are of particular concern are PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. The characteristics, sources, and potential health effects associated with PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} can be different. Major man-made sources of PM₁₀ are agricultural operations, industrial processes, combustion of fossil fuels, construction, demolition operations, and entrainment of road dust into the atmosphere. Natural sources include windblown dust, wildfire smoke, and sea spray salt. The finer, PM_{2.5} particulates are generally associated with combustion processes as well as being formed in the atmosphere as a secondary pollutant through chemical reactions. PM_{2.5} is more likely to penetrate deeply into the lungs and poses a serious health threat to all groups, but particularly to the elderly, children, and those with respiratory problems. More than half of the small and fine particulate matter that is inhaled into the lungs remains there, which can cause permanent lung damage.</p> <p>Significance Thresholds</p> <p>The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) provides guidance to document Clean Air Act (CAA) Conformity Determination requirements. 40 CFR Part 93.153(b)(2) defines <i>de minimis</i> levels, which are the minimum thresholds for which a conformity determination must be performed for criteria pollutants based on the federal attainment status of the pollutant in the air basin. The federal <i>de Minimis</i> threshold for ROG and NO_x in nonattainment areas that are classified as marginal is 100 tons per year. In addition, nonattainment areas that are classified as moderate for PM_{2.5} is 100 tons per day. The federal <i>de Minimis</i> level for attainment/maintenance areas for CO, SO₂, and PM₁₀ is 100 tons per year. Table 2 presents the <i>de Minimis</i> levels for conformity</p>
--	--	--

determination for construction and operation activities. The project is subject to the *de Minimis* threshold to evaluate potential air quality impacts generated by construction and operation of the proposed project. CAA conformity thresholds applicable in the San Francisco Bay Area are 100 tons per year of ozone, PM_{2.5}, CO, SO₂, and PM₁₀. (40 CFR §93.153).

Table 2: Construction and Operational Air Pollution Emissions

	Maximum Construction and Operational Emissions (tpy)
Pollutant	CAA Conformity Thresholds
Ozone ¹	100
PM _{2.5}	100
CO	100
SO ₂	100
PM ₁₀	100
¹ Highest of ozone precursors emissions (reactive organic gases or nitrogen oxides) tpy = tons per year	

Methodology

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2020.4.0 was used to estimate construction and operational emissions. Project details under *Description of Proposed Project* were included in CalEEMod.

Construction emissions modeled include emissions generated by construction equipment used on-site and vehicle trips associated with construction, such as worker and vendor trips. The modeled project construction equipment list was provided by the applicant and the equipment is assumed to be diesel-powered. The project would comply with applicable regulatory standards, such as the BAAQMD Basic Mitigation Measures for criteria pollutants and Regulation 8 Rule 3 for architectural coating VOC limits.

Operational emissions modeled include mobile source emissions (i.e., vehicle emissions), energy emissions, and area source emissions. Mobile source emissions are generated by vehicle trips to and from the project site. CalEEMod assumptions for trip generation rates were used to estimate mobile emissions. Emissions attributed to energy use include natural gas consumption by appliances and space and water heating. The project's residential buildings would exceed 2019 Title 24 standards by approximately 15 percent. In addition, area source emissions are generated by landscape maintenance equipment,

consumer products, and architectural coatings. The project would not include fireplaces or woodstoves.

Impact Analysis

Construction Emissions

Emissions generated during construction of the project are shown in Table 3. As shown, emissions generated during project construction would not exceed the *de Minimis* threshold for both ROG, NOx, PM_{2.5}, CO, SO₂, and PM₁₀.

Table 3: Construction Air Pollution Emissions

Maximum Construction Emissions (tpy)			
Pollutant	CalEEMod Estimate	CAA Conformity Thresholds	Exceed?
ROG	1	100	No
NOx	3	100	No
PM _{2.5}	<1	100	No
CO	4	100	No
SO ₂	<1	100	No
PM ₁₀	<1	100	No
tpy = tons per year			

Operational Emissions

Emissions generated during operation of the proposed project are shown in Table 4. As shown, emissions generated during project operation would not exceed the *de Minimis* threshold for both ROG, NOx, PM_{2.5}, CO, SO₂, and PM₁₀.

Table 4: Annual Operational Air Pollution Emissions

Maximum Operational Emissions (tpy)			
Pollutant	CalEEMod Estimate	CAA Conformity Thresholds	Exceed?
ROG	1	100	No
NOx	1	100	No
PM _{2.5}	<1	100	No
CO	6	100	No
SO ₂	<1	100	No
PM ₁₀	1	100	No
tpy = tons per year			

Development of the proposed project would not generate emissions exceeding CAA conformity thresholds for construction and operational activity. The project would be in conformance with the Clean Air Act.

Source List: Attachment B

<p>Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>This project is not located within or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan and does not involve the acquisition of undeveloped land in a Coastal Zone Management area. The project would not conflict with the Coastal Zone Management Act.</p> <p>Source List: 7</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances</p> <p>24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The following summarizes the findings of a Fault Hazard Evaluation, a Geotechnical Exploration, and a Phase I ESA conducted for the La Vista Residential site located northeast of the intersection of Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard in Hayward, California (project site).</p> <p>Fault Hazard Investigation (2020) – ENGEO, Inc. (ENGEO)</p> <p>ENGEO conducted a fault hazard evaluation at Parcel 3 of the La Vista Residential Development (site) in 2019 (report dated 2020). Based on Rincon’s review of ENGEO’s site descriptions and site maps, the current project site appears to comprise most of the western and central portions of ENGEO’s study area.</p> <p>ENGEO excavated two exploratory trenches on Parcel 3, portions of which appeared to be located on the current project site. As discussed in ENGEO’s report, serpentine soils, which may contain asbestos, were encountered on the project site. ENGEO stated that “...given the serpentinite encountered, the site may require a Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) approved monitoring plan prior to construction. A design-level geotechnical exploration should be performed as project planning progresses, which should include borings and/or test pits, and as-needed laboratory testing to provide data for preparation of specific recommendations regarding site grading, corrective grading measures, foundations, and drainage for the proposed residential development.”</p> <p>Additionally, ENGEO noted that, “Artificial fill was mapped in the northern portion of the site, and are anticipated to consist of on-site materials. These areas are outside of the current proposed development area.” Based on this description, it does not appear that artificial fill was encountered at the project site during ENGEO’s investigation.</p> <p>ENGEO’s fault hazard evaluation report is included in the appendices of Adanta’s Phase I ESA report (summarized below).</p> <p>Geotechnical Exploration (2021) – ENGEO</p> <p>ENGEO conducted a geotechnical investigation in 2021 at the Parcel Group 3 project site (Group 3), an</p>

	<p>approximately 28-acre parcel located north of Tennyson Road and east of East 16th Street.</p> <p>According to ENGEO’s 2021 report, serpentinite was encountered in bedrock on Parcel Group 3. Based on this finding, ENGEO stated, “As part of compliance with the ATCM [Airborne Toxic Control Measure], an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) should be prepared by a qualified representative for approval by the BAAQMD and for inclusion in the contract documents. Our [ENGEO’s] experience indicates that dust monitoring during ground disturbing activities may be required.”</p> <p>Based on ENGEO’s 2021 report, artificial fill was encountered in test pits located on the project site. However, based on ENGEO’s descriptions of the encountered fill material, the fill was derived from onsite materials and did not appear to contain hazardous materials. ENGEO’s report does not mention the presence of petroleum hydrocarbon odors or other hazardous materials encountered at Group 3.</p> <p>A copy of ENGEO’s geotechnical exploration report is included Appendix I</p> <p>Phase I ESA (2021) – Adanta, Inc. (Adanta)</p> <p>Adanta conducted an American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM)-compliant Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) at Group 3 and Group 4 of the “Route 238 Properties” in 2021.. Group 4 is an approximately 80-acre parcel and appears to be located approximately 0.2 miles to the north-northwest of the current project site. Because the project site comprises the southwestern portion of Group 3, this section only includes a summary of environmental conditions pertaining to Group 3 of Adanta’s report. This report is included as Attachment C.</p> <p>Adanta’s Phase I ESA did not reveal evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) at Group 3, and Adanta did not recommend further investigation. Based on a review of geotechnical analyses prepared for Group 3 and Group 4 (author[s] not specified), Adanta stated that they agree “with the analyses’ recommendation of checking with BAAQMD [Bay Area Air Quality Management District] regarding having an approved Monitoring Plan prior to construction and conducting design-level geotechnical exploration as project planning progresses.”</p> <p>During the site visit of Group 3, Adanta observed “small debris piles” along the onsite gravel road at the western portion of Group 3. One of the debris piles reportedly “contained a length of embedded 4 inch galvanized steel pipe.” Adanta reported that, “It could</p>
--	--

	<p>not be determined if the pipe connected to a UST [underground storage tank], though there were no surface vents or other indications of this.” In addition, Adanta indicated that, “Odors, surface staining, or other indications of past hazardous material spills or leakage were not observed near the pipe.” It is unknown whether the pipe was located on the current project site; however, if on the project site, based on Adanta’s descriptions, the pipe is not expected to have impacted the project site.</p> <p>Although not required by ASTM, it should be noted that research pertaining to the potential presence of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in drinking water wells in the vicinity of the project site; the potential presence of oil and gas wells on the project site, on adjacent properties, or on nearby properties; the potential presence of pipelines on the project site or adjacent to the project site; and nearby pipe-line related accidents was not conducted as part of Adanta’s Phase I ESA.</p> <p>There are no sites that may be potential sources of PFAs, no oil or gas wells, pipelines, or pipeline-related accidents within ½-mile of the project site.</p> <p>Cortese List Review</p> <p>A review of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Cortese List of Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites found that the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site.</p> <p>Solid Waste Facility Database Review</p> <p>A review of the CalRecycle online SWIS database indicates that no solid waste facilities, including landfills, transfer stations, composting sites, in-vessel digestion sites, engineered municipal solid waste conversion facilities, transformation facilities, and closed disposal sites, are located within 2,000 feet of the project site.</p> <p>Since there is no evidence of existing contamination or other hazardous materials which pose a threat to future residents or constructions at the site. As discussed in <i>Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff</i>, recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation related to soil stability and coordination with BAAQMD regarding potential naturally occurring asbestos removal during construction, are required in Mitigation Measure GEO-1.</p> <p>Source List: 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; Attachment C</p>
--	---

<p>Endangered Species</p> <p>Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Rincon Consultants prepared a Biological Resources Inventory Memorandum in July 2022, which evaluated potential impacts of the proposed Project to federally listed species protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and waters and wetlands protected under the Clean Water Act. The memorandum documents the existing biological conditions at the project site, summarizes the field reconnaissance survey for the study area (project site plus a 100-foot buffer) and assesses the potential for effects on federally protected biological resources. The memorandum is included as Attachment D.</p> <p>Literature Review</p> <p>The memorandum includes relevant agency databases and literature for baseline information on biological resources potentially occurring within the study area and vicinity (within a five-mile radius of the study area). The review included agency and public databases containing occurrences for special-status biological resources such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) <i>Information for Planning and Consultation</i> (IPaC) site, the USFWS <i>Critical Habitat Portal</i>, and the USFWS <i>National Wetlands Inventory</i>. Additionally, the memorandum includes a review of aerial photographs, topographic maps, soil survey maps, geologic maps, and climatic data for the study area and regional vicinity. Rincon also reviewed the Biological Resources Assessment prepared for the larger 29-acre parcel by LSA in August of 2020 for specific background information on conditions in the study area.</p> <p>Field Reconnaissance Survey</p> <p>Rincon biologist Beth Wilson conducted a reconnaissance-level field survey of the study area on June 30, 2022, between the hours of 12:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. The temperature ranged between 62- and 65- degrees Fahrenheit (°F) and conditions were partly cloudy with winds between approximately five and ten miles per hour. A pedestrian survey of the study area (project site and a 100-foot buffer, where accessible), was conducted to assess the habitat suitability for potential federally listed flora and fauna, and to document all plant and wildlife species observed.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>The project area consists of undeveloped non-native annual grasslands with a few native and non-native trees scattered throughout the site and along the boundary with East 16th Street. No natural vegetation communities are present within the study area. Based on the results of the desktop review, Rincon identified one federally listed plant species: [Santa Cruz</p>
---	---	---

Tarplant (*Holocarpha macradenia*) – Threatened] and ten federally listed wildlife species that occur in the region surrounding the study area [Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*) – Threatened, Monarch Butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) – Candidate, Delta Smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) – Threatened, California Red-legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*) – Threatened, California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) – Threatened, Alameda Whipsnake (striped Racer) – Threatened, California Clapper Rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*) – Endangered, California Least Tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*) – Endangered, Western Snowy Plover (*Charadrius nivosus nivosus*) – Threatened, and Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*) – Endangered] (Attachment D). No critical habitat for any federally listed species occurred in the project area, although critical habitat for Alameda whipsnake (=striped racer; *Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*) is designated approximately one mile to the east of the study area.

Listed Plant Habitat Requirements

As discussed in the memorandum, Federally listed plant species are not expected to occur within the study area. Santa Cruz tarplant requires native grasslands on coastal terraces below 300 feet and is primarily found along the coast from Marin to Monterey County. No coastal habitats occur within the study area and therefore this federally listed species is not expected to occur within the study area (Attachment D).

Listed Wildlife Habitat Requirements

Of these eleven federally listed species, only one species (Alameda whipsnake) has low potential to occur within the study area and is discussed further below. The remaining ten species can be eliminated based on the lack of suitable habitat or micro-habitat conditions within the study area. These ten species have specific habitat requirements and/or geographic distributions that exclude them from occurring within the confines of proposed work areas and would not be expected to occur within proposed work areas even incidentally during dispersal due to lack of suitable habitats within the study area and fragmentation by development from other proximal habitats where these species are known to occur (Attachment D).

Alameda Whipsnake

The Alameda whipsnake is a federally listed threatened species that primarily occurs in areas that support scrub communities, including mixed chaparral, chamise-redshank chaparral, and coastal scrub. This species also occurs in annual grassland and oak woodlands that lie adjacent to scrub

	<p>communities. This species only has low potential to occur within the study area, as it is less likely to be found in nonnative annual grasslands. The short grasses and lack of dense shrubs due to grazing do not provide the Alameda whipsnake cover from predators such as raptors and coyotes. The presence of feral cats also reduces the likelihood for Alameda whipsnake and their prey to occupy the site.</p> <p>Although the potential for Alameda whipsnake is considered low within the study area, there is potential for this species to use the site during dispersal. Additionally, several small rodent burrows were observed which may provide marginal habitat for Alameda whipsnake. Vegetation removal and ground disturbance in the non-native annual grasslands could result in the injury or death of individual Alameda whipsnakes if they are present when these activities occur. For federally listed species (e.g., Alameda whipsnake), the loss of habitat is also considered “harm” under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Injury, mortality, or harassment of even a single individual would be a violation of the federal ESA. After construction, the increased vehicle traffic on East 16th Street could result in an increase in the potential for Alameda whipsnakes to be killed or injured by vehicle strikes. New residences could also result in an increase in free-roaming cats and dogs, which could harass or kill individuals. As such the project may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the species. Recommendations are included in the Biological Resources Inventory Memorandum related to avoidance measures to the Alameda Whipsnake. These recommendations are included as Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, which include a Worker Environmental Awareness Program prior to initiation of construction activities and a preconstruction survey for the presence of Alameda Whipsnake.</p> <p>With implementation of avoidance Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, the project would have “no effect” on the Alameda Whipsnake or other federally listed species known to occur in the region and would not destroy or adversely modify any federally designated critical habitat.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>BIO-1: Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). Prior to initiation of construction activities (including staging and mobilization), all personnel associated with project construction shall attend a WEAP training, conducted by a qualified biologist, to aid workers in recognizing special-status species, native birds and other biological resources that may occur in the construction area. The specifics of this program shall include identification and habitats of special-status species with potential to</p>
--	--

	<p>occur at the project site, a description of the regulatory status and general ecological characteristics of sensitive resources, a review of the limits of construction, and an explanation of the mitigation measures required to reduce impacts to biological resources within the work area. A fact sheet conveying this information shall also be prepared for distribution to all contractors, their employers, and other personnel involved with construction. All employees shall sign a form provided by the trainer indicating they have attended the WEAP and understand the information presented to them.</p> <p>BIO-2: Alameda Whipsnake Pre-construction Survey and Impact Avoidance. A qualified biologist shall conduct a focused pre-construction survey within 14 days prior to initiation of construction activities. The USFWS shall be notified should any Alameda whipsnake be observed within the project site. Additionally, the following measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to the Alameda whipsnake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Prior to the start of construction, wildlife exclusion fencing (e.g., Animex or Ertec brand fencing) will be installed along the project footprint boundary. The location, extent, and specifications of the wildlife exclusion fencing will be identified by a qualified biologist and included on the final project plans. The fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction activities and will be regularly inspected and fully maintained. Repairs to the fence will be made within 24 hours of discovery. Upon completion of construction activities, the fence will be completely removed; the area cleaned of debris and trash and returned to natural conditions.▪ The construction crew shall be trained during the WEAP training to check beneath the staged equipment each morning prior to commencement of daily construction activities. Should Alameda whipsnake occur within the staging areas, construction activities shall be halted until the Alameda whipsnake vacates the project site on its own and approval to begin again is provided by the USFWS.▪ A qualified biologist shall be present during grading activities. Should Alameda whipsnake be observed within the project site, the USFWS shall be notified, and construction shall be halted until the Alameda whipsnake exits the site and approval to begin again is provided by the USFWS.▪ To prevent the entrapment of Alameda whipsnake and other wildlife, monofilament plastics shall not be used for erosion control.▪ All construction activities shall take place during daylight hours or with suitable light so that
--	---

		<p>whipsnakes can be seen. Vehicle speeds on the construction site shall not exceed five miles per hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site vegetation management shall take place prior to tree removal, grading, excavation, or other construction activities. Construction materials, soil, construction debris, or other material shall be deposited only on areas where vegetation has been mowed. Areas shall be re-mowed if grass or other vegetation on the project site becomes high enough to conceal whipsnakes during the construction period. <p>Source List: Attachment D</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Residential land uses typically do not use or store large quantities of hazardous materials. The proposed project would not involve the use, storage, transportation, or disposal of hazardous materials. Potentially hazardous materials such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents would be used during project construction, and therefore, temporary in nature. The transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during the project construction would be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Materials Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22.</p> <p>Rincon conducted a review of potentially flammable or explosive hazardous substances listed in 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C within one mile of the site (Attachment E). As discussed in detail in the review, potentially explosive and flammable substances are all located at HUD's acceptable distances from the project and future residents.</p> <p>Source List: Attachment E</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land, according the Department of Conservation's (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (DOC 2016). Because the project site does not contain agricultural land, the project would not convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.</p> <p>Source List: 13</p>

<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is not located in Flood Hazard Area or floodplain based on FIRM Map Number 06001C0293G, effective on 08/03/2009. Because the project is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area or floodplain, residents would not be exposed to floodplain related hazards and the project would not conflict with provisions related to floodplain management. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.</p> <p>Source List: 6</p>
<p>Historic Preservation</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Background</p> <p>To support compliance with Section 106, Rincon prepared a Cultural Resources Technical Report dated September 2022, which included delineation of an Area of Potential Effects (APE), expansion of a (California Historical Resources Information System) CHRIS search radius from 0.25 to 0.50 mile, support with interested party/historical group and Native American outreach and consultation, and an archaeological field survey of the APE.</p> <p>Area of Potential Effects</p> <p>The APE was delineated in consultation with CalHFA to identify resources in the area that have potential for historic significance, that should be evaluated for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and that may be directly or indirectly affected by the undertaking, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.16(d). The APE includes the direct project footprint located on approximately 4.6 acres of vacant land, located northeast of the intersection of Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard in Hayward, Alameda County.</p> <p>CHRIS Search</p> <p>A search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records from the Northwest information Center ([NWIC] 19-1809) was conducted by LSA in May 2020 for a 20-acre parcel encompassing the APE. LSA's record search included a 0.25-mile search radius around the 20-acre parcel. Rincon reviewed the records search results from LSA and requested an additional search of the NWIC for the APE on June 30, 2022, to determine whether additional resource records or reports have been recorded within a 0.5-mile radius surrounding the 4.6-acre APE, since the 2020 records search. Rincon also reviewed the NRHP, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Historical Landmarks list, and the Built Environment Resources Directory, as well as its predecessor the California State Historic Property Data File. Additionally, Rincon reviewed the Archaeological Determination of Eligibility list. The CHRIS records search did not</p>

	<p>identify any known resources within or adjacent to the APE.</p> <p>Native American Outreach</p> <p>CalHFA previously retained LSA to conduct a cultural resources study for a larger 20-acre parcel encompassing the current APE. On April 16, 2020, LSA contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File search of the 20-acre parcel. On July 18, 2022, Rincon sent letters from CalHFA to seven Native American contacts affiliated with the APE and surrounding area provided to LSA by the NAHC to request information on potential cultural resources in the vicinity of the APE that may be impacted by the undertaking. Rincon conducted follow up calls and emails on August 4, 2022.</p> <p>CalHFA received one response from local Native Americans contacted: On July 20, 2022, Corrina Gould of the Confederated Villages of Lisjan responded via email to confirm that the tribe would like to be consulted further on the undertaking. Consultation between CalHFA and the Confederated Villages of Lisjan resulted in an agreement that CalHFA notify the Tribe of any unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources and/or human remains. Consultation was closed on September 21, 2022.</p> <p>CalHFA did not receive any other tribal responses regarding the project.</p> <p>Local Interested Parties/Historical Group Outreach</p> <p>Rincon sent letters to local historical groups as part of the process of identifying cultural resources within or near the APE. Rincon contacted the Alameda County Historical Society, the City of Hayward Planning Division, and the Hayward Area Historical Society on July 18, 2022, to request any information that they may have regarding historic properties within the APE. No responses were received.</p> <p>Site Survey and Building Evaluation</p> <p>The Cultural Resources Assessment included a pedestrian survey of the site on August 2, 2022 using transect intervals spaced 10 meters and oriented generally from east to west. No cultural resources were observed during the field survey. No built environment properties were identified within or adjacent to the APE that would be considered a historic property under Section 106 of the NHPA.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Based on the information summarized above, Rincon recommended a Section 106 finding of No Historic</p>
--	---

		<p>Properties Affected for the proposed undertaking. CalHFA requested concurrence of the No Historic Properties Affected finding from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on September 27, 2022. SHPO concurred with the finding in a letter dated October 24, 2022 (Attachment F). As a result of Section 106 consultation with the Confederated Tribes of Lisjan, Rincon recommended best management practices in the unlikely event of an unanticipated discovery during project construction. Consistent with recommendations in the Cultural Resource Study (best management practices for unanticipated discovery), these recommendations have been included as Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>CUL-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area shall halt and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's <i>Professional Qualifications Standards</i> for Archaeology (NPS 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If the discovery is of Native American origin, the Confederated Tribes of Lisjan shall be contacted and given the opportunity to evaluate the find and consult with CalHFA on the discovery. If the discovery proves to be eligible for the NHRP, additional work such as data recovery excavation and further Native American consultation may be warranted.</p> <p>CUL-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains. The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety code section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall complete the inspection of the site and provide recommendations for treatment to the landowner within 48 hours of being granted access.</p> <p>Source List: Attachment D</p>
--	--	--

<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Noise Background</p> <p>Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound pressure levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz).</p> <p>Sound pressure level is measured on a logarithmic scale with the 0 dBA level based on the lowest detectable sound pressure level that people can perceive. Based on the logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy is equivalent to an increase of 3 dBA, and a sound that is 10 dBA less than the ambient sound level has no effect on ambient noise. In general, a 3 dBA change in community noise levels is noticeable, while 1-2 dBA changes generally are not perceived.</p> <p>Noise levels typically attenuate (or drop off) at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance from point sources (such as industrial machinery). Noise from non-point sources, such as roadways, typically attenuates at a rate of 4.5 dBA per doubling of distance over soft ground and 3 dBA per doubling of distance over hard ground. Noise levels may also be reduced by intervening structures. Generally, a single row of buildings between the receptor and the noise source reduces the noise level by about 5 dBA, while a solid wall or berm that breaks the line-of-sight reduces noise levels by 5 to 15 dBA.</p> <p>The time period in which noise occurs is also important since noise that occurs at night tends to be more disturbing than that which occurs during the day. Community noise is usually measured using Day-Night Average Level (Ldn), which is the 24-hour average noise level with a 10-dBA penalty for noise occurring during nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) hours, or Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), which is the 24-hour average noise level with a 5 dBA penalty for noise occurring from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. and a 10 dBA penalty for noise occurring from 10p.m. to 7 a.m. Noise levels described by Ldn and CNEL typically do not differ by more than 1 dBA. In practice, CNEL and Ldn are often used interchangeably.</p> <p>The project site is located near the intersection of Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard in the City of Hayward, Alameda County on an undeveloped lot of land. The project site's noise environment is dominated by distant vehicle traffic activity attributable to Tennyson Road to the south and Mission Boulevard to the west. To characterize</p>
---	---	--

ambient noise levels at and near the project site, two 15-minute and one long-term (24-hour) noise level measurements were conducted on August 1 to 2, 2022. The results of these measurements are shown in Table 5. The noise measurement locations were conducted along the proposed project's southern boundary north of Tennyson Road. The measured DNL at LT-1 was 52 dBA DNL.

Table 5: Noise Measurement Results

ID	Time	Location	L_{eq} (dBA)	L_{max} (dBA)
ST-1	11:54 a.m. – 12:09 p.m.	Approximately 400 feet north from the centerline of Tennyson Road and 145 feet east of Mission Heights Apartments.	46	51
ST-2	12:16 p.m. – 12:31 p.m.	Approximately 410 feet north from the centerline of Tennyson Road and 240 feet east of the Mission Heights Apartments.	48	59
LT-1	8/1/2022 11:41 a.m. – 8/2/2022 11:41 a.m.	Approximately 375 feet north from the centerline of Tennyson Road and 40 feet east of Mission Heights Apartments.	47	76.9

Methodology

The traffic noise analysis is based on the noise levels at exterior use areas and at building façades using the HUD Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) Calculator. The effective distance of the source was measured from the centerline to the nearest sensitive area of the project site. Tennyson Road is nearest roadway to the project site and has a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour. Traffic volumes on Tennyson Road were based on the traffic report for a development project at 26601 Mission Boulevard in Hayward, California. A typical vehicle mix of 94 percent autos, 4 percent medium trucks, and 2 percent heavy trucks was applied in the DNL Calculator. An assumption of 15 percent nighttime split and a 2 percent road gradient for heavy trucks was used.

HUD Noise Criteria

HUD's environmental noise regulations are set forth in 24 CFR Part 51, Sub-part B. Exterior noise goals from Section 51.101, Policy 8 establish the following Site Acceptability Standards.

Table 6: Site Acceptability Standards

	Day-night Average Sound Level	Special Approvals and Requirements
Acceptable	Not Exceeding 65 dB ¹	None.
Normally Unacceptable	Above 65 dB but not exceeding 75 dB	Special Approvals ² Environmental Review ³ Attenuation ⁴
Unacceptable	Above 75 dB	Special Approvals ² Environmental Review ³ Attenuation ⁵

¹ Acceptable threshold may be shifted to 70 dB in special circumstances pursuant to §51.105(a).
² See § 51.104(b) for requirements.
³ See § 51.104(b) for requirements.
⁴ 5 dB additional attenuation required for sites above 65 dB exceeding 70 dB and 10 dB additional attenuation required above 70 dB but not exceeding 75 dB. (See § 51.104(a).)
⁵ Attenuation measures to be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for CPD for approval on a case-by-case basis.

Section 51.101, Policy 9 establishes that for HUD projects “the interior auditory environment shall not exceed 45 dB DNL.” Attenuation measures to meet these interior goals shall be employed where feasible. Emphasis shall be given to noise sensitive interior spaces such as bedrooms. It is assumed that with standard construction techniques buildings provide sufficient exterior-to-interior noise attenuation to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA DNL or less if the exterior level is 65 dBA DNL or less.

Impact Analysis

For the exterior noise analysis, noise levels were estimated at the project’s nearest building façade and exterior use area. The nearest building façade and exterior use area to Tennyson Road are Building B and the multi-family playground. The DNL Calculator estimated the noise level at Building B from Tennyson Road would be approximately 44 dBA DNL. In addition, the noise level at the multi-family playground from Tennyson Road would be approximately 42 dBA DNL. Generally, any large structure blocking the line of sight will provide at least a 5 dBA reduction in source noise levels at the receiver. The multi-family playground is located at the center of the project site and would be partially attenuated from Tennyson Road traffic noise by Building A and B, east and west of the multi-family playground. This attenuation at the project site is not captured in the DNL Calculator, which is a simple two-dimensional calculator that does not incorporate existing buildings or topography into its calculations. The partial shielding would conservatively reduce the

		<p>noise exposure from Tennyson Road by approximately 3 to 5 dBA. Additionally, ambient noise monitoring in the project area at the approximate southern project boundary indicates that the DNL is 52 dBA DNL. Pursuant to Table 6, this indicates that noise levels at nearest building façade or exterior use area of the proposed project would be acceptable.</p> <p>Therefore, noise levels at the exterior areas of the project are within acceptable range of below 65 dBA DNL. No exterior noise mitigation is required for the project.</p> <p>For the interior noise analysis, noise levels were estimated at the project's Building B façade assuming unshielded noise exposure to Tennyson Road and measured at the project southern boundary. The DNL Calculator estimated ambient noise level from Tennyson Road would be approximately 44 dBA DNL. Ambient noise monitoring in the project area at the approximate southern project boundary indicates that the DNL is 52 dBA DNL.</p> <p>It is assumed that with standard construction techniques buildings provide sufficient exterior-to-interior noise attenuation to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA DNL or less if the exterior level is 65 dBA DNL or less. Therefore, as building façade noise levels is 52 dBA DNL or less, interior noise levels at project buildings would not exceed 45 dBA DNL and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Source List: 14; Attachment G</p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers</p> <p>Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is located over 35 miles from the nearest sole source aquifers, Santa Margarita Aquifer to the southwest and Fresno County Aquifer 140 miles to the southeast. The project site is not served by a United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)-designated sole-source aquifer. Therefore, the project would have no effect on a sole-source aquifer subject to the HUD-USEPA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).</p> <p>Source List: 15</p>
<p>Wetlands Protection</p> <p>Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>According to the Biological Resource Inventory Memorandum, no wetlands or aquatic resources were identified within the study area during the reconnaissance survey (Attachment D). A Biological Resources Assessment prepared for the larger 29-acre parcel identified a potential seep at the center of the larger property and a seasonal swale that originates at the seep and runs to the west. The reconnaissance survey confirmed that these potentially jurisdictional features fall outside of the project area and would not be impacted by project activities (Attachment D). The project would not adversely affect wetland features</p>

		and the project would not conflict with provisions under Executive Order 11990. Source List: Attachment D
Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The nearest wild and scenic river to the site the Big Sur Wild and Scenic River, located approximately 90 miles southwest of the project site. Since the project would not affect a wild and scenic river, the project would not conflict with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Source List: 16
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project is intended to provide affordable housing opportunities in Hayward. The project site is located in an area characterized by existing residential uses and is part of a planned mixed-use community with a school, and access to additional schools through the growing Mission Boulevard corridor. The affordable residential units would result in beneficial long-term social and economic impacts for low-income populations. Based on the U.S. Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool, the project site is located in a census block group (060014351041) where the demographics are 9 percent low income and 83 percent People of Color The generated EJ Screen Report is attached as Attachment H. As discussed above under <i>Clean Air</i> , the project would be consistent with the Clean Air Act. Further, as discussed under <i>Noise Abatement and Control</i> , <i>Contamination and Toxic Substances</i> , and <i>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</i> , the project would not expose the surrounding community to adverse environmental hazards. Because the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse environmental effects, it would not result in disproportionately high adverse effects on minority or low-income populations, and the proposed project is not expected to create any environmental justice concerns. Source List: Attachment H

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

attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

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

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

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	<p>The project site is located within a residential area of Hayward, and nearby the Mission Boulevard Mixed-Use Corridor, a designated Priority Development Area to the west, and open space and residential uses to the east. The project site is located on the northeastern corner of Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard in Hayward. The site is designated as Medium Density Residential which applies to suburban and urban areas that contain a mix of housing types, where future changes are expected to enhance neighborhoods that create complete, walkable, and sustainable neighborhoods.</p> <p>The 2040 Hayward General Plan has a total of 19 land use designations to implement policies applicable to development through the City' zoning regulations. General Plan Policies and land use designations related to the project and a discussion of consistency are as follows:</p> <p><i>Medium Density Designation/Hayward Foothills Trail Special Design District</i></p> <p>This designation is generally applied to suburban and urban areas which contain a mix of housing types. The allowable uses range from detached single-family homes to multi-family homes and include home day cares, and public agency facilities, which include schools, churches, parks, playgrounds and other facilities for public use. Supporting uses include parks, recreation, open space, trails, community gardens, and compatible neighborhood commercial and neighborhood mixed-uses. The project site is also located within the Hayward Foothills Trail Special Design District (SD-7). The purpose of the Hayward Foothills Trial Special Design District is to ensure development of a continuous trail along the 238 Bypass Land Use Study properties. Specific development standards and design guidelines are outlined for the trail with a general location of the trail in the City of Hayward Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p><i>Consistent:</i> Proposed multi-family residential uses and the education center are permitted uses in the RM zoning district. The overall project development would include trail connections consistent with the requirements of the Hayward Foothills Trail Special Design District (SD-7). The applicant is requesting a Density Bonus as part of project approvals, which would allow the applicant to deviate from certain</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>zoning requirements (e.g., increased density, reduced parking, reduced open space, increased height).</p> <p><i>2040 General Plan Policies:</i></p> <p>Policy LU-1.6. Mixed-Use Neighborhoods. The City shall encourage the integration of a variety of compatible land uses into new and established neighborhoods to provide residents with convenient access to goods, services, parks and recreation, and other community amenities.</p> <p><i>Consistent.</i> The project site is located in a residential area nearby to a Priority Development Area which intends to accommodate and encourage growth within compact, mixed-use, and walkable neighborhoods (Goal LU-2). The project is part of a mixed-use community that would serve future residents and students in the Mission Boulevard Mixed-Use Corridor.</p> <p>Policy LU-3.1 Complete Neighborhoods. The City shall promote efforts to make neighborhoods more complete by encouraging the development of a mix of complementary uses and amenities that meet the daily needs of residents. Such uses and amenities may include parks, community centers, religious institutions, daycare centers, libraries, schools, community gardens, and neighborhood commercial and mixed-use developments.</p> <p><i>Consistent.</i> The project is part of a mixed-use community that would provide residents access to schools, and a ground floor courtyard amenity that connects the buildings to promote physical activity and social opportunities for residents, creating neighborhoods that provide the daily needs of residents. The project includes a computer lab, and a children’s playground, with various exercise stations for ages 13-17. The project is situated near the future La Vista Park and would provide pedestrian connection to the park for both residents and school staff and students.</p> <p>LU-4.4 Design Strategies for Corridor Developments. The City shall encourage corridor developments to incorporate the following design strategies: locate parking lots to the rear or side of buildings or place parking within underground structures or above-ground structures located behind buildings.</p> <p><i>Consistent.</i> The project is on the northeastern corner of Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard. Mission Boulevard is a Mixed-Use Corridor, where strategies would apply to the Priority Development Area. The project includes parking in the northern section of the parcel, separated from the Tennyson and Mission Boulevard frontage, behind the buildings.</p> <p>In addition to the policies outlined above, the project is consistent with the general criteria laid out within the City’s Housing Element. The project is generally consistent with applicable comprehensive plans and zoning regulations for the reasons given above.</p> <p>Source List: 3</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	3	<p>According to the Department of Conservation, the project site is comprised of Urban and Built-Up Land on the western portion of the site, and “other” land on the eastern portion of the site. Adjacent land uses include vacant land and single-family residences, commercial, and multifamily residences. The site is currently vacant with substantial slopes. All new development is required to comply with the current adopted California Building Code (CBC, adopted by reference into the City of Hayward Municipal Code in Section 9-1.00), which includes design criteria for seismic loading and other geological hazards relating to seismicity, such as liquefaction. The CBC also includes design criteria for geologically induced loading that govern the sizing of structural members and provide calculation methods to assist in the design process. A Geotechnical Exploration was prepared by ENGEO on June 1, 2021. The report characterized the subsurface conditions at the site and reviewed relevant existing geotechnical information at the site to provide geotechnical recommendations for design. The report concludes that the project site is suitable for development, provided the recommendations in the report are incorporated into project design (Attachment I). The recommendations include, but are not limited to: earthwork, corrective grading, site drainage, settlement, and foundational support. To ensure the recommendations of the Geotechnical Exploration are followed, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is required.</p> <p>Furthermore, the CBC includes common engineering practices that would require special design and construction methods that reduce potential expansive soil and settlement-related impacts. Adherence to the City’s Municipal Code and the CBC would reduce potential adverse impacts associated with development on unstable soils.</p> <p>Erosion of top soil may occur during construction, however the project would be required to conform with the provisions of the applicable federal, state, county, and City of Hayward’s laws and ordinances which incorporates and implements the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and best management practices to reduce stormwater runoff. Adequate control of sedimentation and erosion must be incorporated into the project to address current legal requirements related to erosion control practices, including the use of standard soil erosion control measures during demolition and construction. Implementation of these standards would minimize potentially adverse effects from erosion.</p> <p>Upon completion of the project, the site would be covered with impervious surfaces, however, the project incorporates stormwater control measures and on-site retention to control and retain run-off. During construction and operation of the proposed residential uses, the project sponsor would be required to comply with all applicable federal and local water quality and wastewater discharge requirements that include compliance with the City’s NPDES permit and best management practices to reduce stormwater runoff.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>Mitigation Measure</p> <p>GEO-1: Geotechnical Recommendations. The Geotechnical Exploration prepared by ENGEO Inc dated June 1, 2021 provides recommendations that would ensure the project is suitable from a geotechnical standpoint, and would increase the safety and integrity of the project. The recommendations address, but are not limited to: coordination with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District regarding natural occurring asbestos during grading, earthwork, corrective grading plans, seismic hazards and foundation support, landslide removal, expansive soils, site drainage, placement of fill, settlement, footings and slabs on grade, and retaining walls. The project applicant shall incorporate and follow these recommendations during construction.</p> <p>Source List: 2, 17, 18; Attachment I</p>
<p>Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><i>Hazards/Noise</i></p> <p>As detailed in sections <i>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</i>, the project would not involve the use of, or subject residents to explosive or flammable materials. As discussed in <i>Contamination and Toxic Substances</i>, the project would not subject future residents or construction workers to hazardous materials. As discussed in <i>Noise</i>, the project would not expose residents to noise levels in exceedance of HUD’s interior or exterior noise thresholds.</p> <p><i>Geology and Seismicity</i></p> <p>The project site has landslide potential due to on-site slopes. Significant earthquakes have occurred in the Greater San Francisco Bay Area and are associated with crustal movements along a system of fault zones. Portions of the site are located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone for the active Hayward fault. The main creeping trace of the Hayward fault is mapped by the California Geological Survey approximately 900 feet east of the site, with two splays mapped west of the main trace directly through the adjacent open space parcel (Attachment I). Earthquake intensities vary throughout the area, depending upon the magnitude of earthquake, the distance of the site from the causative fault, and the type of materials underlying the site. Compliance with the requirements of the latest California Building Code and implementation of recommendations included in the project specific geotechnical report (Mitigation Measure GEO-1), would ensure the project is built in accordance with site specific design requirements to ensure adequate soil stability. Since the project would be built in accordance with CBC standards, fire codes, and seismic regulations, adverse effects from earthquakes on the project would be minimized.</p> <p><i>Site Safety</i></p> <p>The project would include the construction and operation of an apartment structure and parking on the project site. Vehicle access to the site would be provided via two driveways. The project would not introduce new hazards or nuisances related to site circulation as it would not substantially change ingress and egress for vehicles.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p><i>Odors</i></p> <p>Objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial uses such as agricultural facilities (e.g., farms and dairies), refineries, wastewater treatment facilities, and landfills. In urban areas, this may also include facilities with a high volume of diesel-fueled vehicles, such as bus depots. The project site is not located near a facility expected to result in nuisance odors, including diesel exhaust odors. In addition, proposed residential and education uses on-site would not be expected to generate objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.</p> <p>Source List: Attachment I</p>
Energy Consumption	2	<p>Energy would be required during project construction; however, construction would be temporary and energy use would not exceed available supplies. Project operation may incrementally increase the consumption of electricity and natural gas in the long term for lighting and use of household electronics by project residents, but the project site is in an area currently served by utility providers. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the energy conservation requirements of Title 24 of the California Administrative Code and CALGreen. The project would not result in foreseeable energy inefficiencies and would not have a substantial adverse effect on energy consumption.</p>
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	2	<p>The project would be expected to create temporary construction jobs and a nominal number of project management (two manager's units) and maintenance jobs. The minor number of temporary construction and operational jobs generated by the project would not substantially alter long-term employment or income patterns.</p>
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	<p>The project would involve the construction of 176 residential units. Based on average household size for the City of Hayward of 3.27 persons per household, this would represent an estimated 576 residents. The Department of Finance (DOF) estimated a population of 161,744 in January 2021 for the City of Hayward. The project would represent a net increase of approximately 0.4 percent to the City's population.</p> <p>The Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Growth Forecast projects a 2040 population in the City of Hayward of 178,270 persons. Based on the regional forecast, the City's 2015 population was 150,960. The project's estimated increase of 576 residents is approximately 2 percent of the regional growth forecasted between 2015-2040 (27,310 residents). The project's projected growth has been forecasted and accounted in local and regional forecasts and the project would not substantially change area demographics.</p> <p>Source List: 2, 19, 20</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p>The Hayward Unified School District provides public education in the City of Hayward, including the project site. Hayward Unified School District is comprised of 24 elementary schools, five middle schools, four high schools, and one adult education school. The project site would be served by Treeview and Tyrell Elementary Schools, Chavez Middle School, and Tennyson High School.</p> <p>Development on site could add approximately 576 residents (as described under subheading Socioeconomic, Demographic Character Changes). Based on the current City of Hayward's K-12 population percent of approximately 5.6 percent, the proposed project would result in the addition of approximately 32 K-12 aged residents (576 residents x 5.6%). This increase would not be expected to result in substantial adverse effects on local schools relative to existing overall enrollment. The project is part of a mixed-use community that includes future development of a school which serves up to 384 students from preschool through 6th grade. The applicant would be required to pay applicable school impact mitigation fees, which would ensure that the effects of the project on schools is not adverse.</p> <p>Cultural facilities are located within walking distance of the project site or accessible from the project site via public transportation and would be available to future project residents. Cultural facilities in the vicinity of the project include Matt Jimenez Community Center located 1 mile southwest of the site; Sorensdale Recreation Center located 1 mile northwest of the site; and Weekes Community Center Park located 1.5 miles west of the site.</p> <p>Source List: 21, 22</p>
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>The project site is located primarily within a commercial area, with residential areas to the north, east, and west. There are several restaurants in the project site vicinity. Within 0.5-mile of the site, there is Caravan Restaurant and Grocery Store, Los Dos Hermanos Restaurant, La Victoria Taqueria, Tandoor Indian, Red Chili Thai-Vietnamese, Burger King, Domino's Pizza, and Fiji Sweet and Snack. Commercial facilities are widely available within walking distance to the site and can also be accessed by bicycle or transit options.</p> <p>Source List: 23</p>
Health Care and Social Services	2	<p>There are five medical facilities within the vicinity of the project site. KAISER medical clinic is located approximately two miles west of the site. Hayward Family Care, Amcare Medical Group, and Bay Valley Medical Group are located approximately 1.8 miles west of the project site, and the St. Francis Urgent Care Center is located approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the project site. Because medical facilities are located in the vicinity of the project site, adequate health services are present in the area.</p> <p>The project site is approximately 3 miles southeast of government offices. There is one YMCA facility within three miles of the project site. Social services are located in the area to serve future residents.</p> <p>Source List: 23</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	<p>Refuse collection service would be provided to the project site by the Waste Management of Alameda County, the City's contracted franchise for garbage, organics and recycling services. Waste Management accepts most solid wastes, including refuse, construction and demolition debris, yard waste, and recyclables. Trash facilities would be provided to accommodate waste generated by the project.</p> <p>Waste in the City is transferred to the Altamont Landfill, which is located at 10840 Altamont Pass Road in Livermore. The Altamont Landfill has daily maximum throughput of 11,500 cubic yards, a disposal capacity of 124,400,000 through 2070 and a remaining capacity of 65,400,000 cubic yards as of 2016. Based on the land use and emissions modeling conducted for the project, the project would generate approximately 97 tons of solid waste per year, or approximately 359 cubic yards per year (0.98 cubic yards per day) (Appendix B). This represents less than 0.3 percent of the permitted daily tonnage and 0.0005 percent of the remaining capacity for the Altamont Landfill.</p> <p>In addition, the City of Hayward currently diverts solid waste by providing recycling and composting services. The project site would include facilities for recycling service and sufficient solid waste services are available in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>Source List: 24, 25; Attachment B</p>
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	<p>The City of Hayward provides wastewater collection and conveyance services to City customers through approximately 320 miles of sewer line of various diameter pipe, nine sewage pump stations, approximately 300,000 service connections, and a Water Pollution Control Facility. According to the City's Sewer System Management Plan, the City's system's permitted capacity is 18.5 million gallons per day (mgd) with an average of 11.4 mgd. The City's sanitary sewer lines feed into the Hayward Water Pollution Control Facility (WPCF), a wastewater treatment plant operated by the City. The WPCF currently has a remaining daily capacity of approximately 7.1 mgd, based on the permitted capacity and exiting average daily flows.</p> <p>Assuming wastewater would be approximately 80 percent of the estimated water use (see Water Supply) below, the project would generate approximately 16.3 million gallons per year or 0.04 million gallons per day. The project would generate approximately 0.6 percent of the estimated remaining 7.1 million gallons of daily capacity of the Hayward Water Pollution Control Facility. The wastewater generated under the project would be within applicable wastewater treatment provider's capacity.</p> <p>Source List: 26; Attachment B</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Water Supply	2	<p>The City of Hayward provides municipal water supply within city limits and serves about 34,000 connections and delivered over 15,000 acre feet of water in 2015. The City currently obtains nearly 100 percent of its water supply from San Francisco’s Hetch Hetchy system, owned and operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). The SFPUC has met demand in its service area in all year types from its watersheds that include the Tuolumne River watershed, Alameda Creek watershed, and San Mateo County watersheds. In general, 85 percent of the supply comes from the Tuolumne River through Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and the remaining 15 percent comes from the local watersheds through the San Antonio, Calaveras, Crystal Springs, Pilarcitos and San Andreas Reservoirs. The adopted Water Supply Improvement Program (WSIP) retains this mix of water supply for all year types. The vast majority of the City of Hayward is served water by the Hayward Water System. A very small portion of north Hayward, less than 3% of Hayward’s total population, is served by East Bay Municipal Utility District.</p> <p>The 2021 Hayward Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) found that there are uncertainties in future water supply, due to the implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment. Under the supply scenario with the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment, SFPUC appears not able to meet its water obligations during drought years. The uncertainty falls on the implementation of this plan amendment, as projections indicate without the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment, SFPUC would be able to supply 100 percent of projected water demands in all year types through 2040. In compliance with requirements for UWMP development, the City of Hayward developed and adopted an aggressive Water Shortage Contingency Plan in the event of water scarcity.</p> <p>Based on the land use and emissions modeling conducted for the project, the project would require approximately 20.4 million gallons of water per year or approximately 63-acre feet per year (Attachment B). The project would reduce water use relative to standard building practices by complying with Title 24 requirements. These water conservation measures would reduce the project’s burden on municipal water supply and wastewater systems.</p> <p>During the CEQA approval process for the project, the City of Hayward confirmed that forecasted water supplies identified in the UWMP are capable of accommodating the project’s anticipated water demands. New water lines would be installed provide water service to proposed on-site buildings. These water lines would connect to the existing 8-inch water main in Tennyson Road and the existing 6-inch water main in East 16th Street. These water lines would likely range from 6 to 8 inches in diameter. The City’s existing water entitlements would be sufficient to serve the proposed project, and the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities would not be required.</p> <p>Source List: 27; Attachment B</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	<p><i>Police Services</i></p> <p>The Hayward Department (HPD) provides police services to the City of Hayward. SVPD maintains approximately 191 sworn officers and over 112 civilian employees. The number of officers at a given time is dependent upon the time of day a given shift covers. The addition of 576 residential units is not anticipated to cause the hiring or new sworn officers or the necessity for infrastructure such as new Police Station, and the site is within the incorporated City boundaries and HPD service boundaries. Project impacts related to police protection services would not be adverse, and the project site would be sufficiently served by existing HPD services.</p> <p><i>Fire Services</i></p> <p>The Hayward Fire Department (HFD) provides fire protection services to the City of Simi Valley. HFD has approximately 124 sworn Fire personnel and 13 civilians. 120 of the 124 emergency response staff employed by the Department are licensed as Paramedics. HFD operates 9 districts with one fire station per district. Near the project site, HFD Station No. 7 is located 0.7 miles southwest, Station No. 5 is located 1.9 miles northeast, and Station No. 2 is located 2 miles northwest. These stations would provide direct fire protection service to the project. HFD would also review the building permit for the project for conformance with the California Fire Code, and applicable sections of the California Health and Safety Code, California Administrative Codes, Title 19 Public Safety, and Title 24 Building Standards, to assure installation of adequate fire sprinklers, fire wall protection, fire hydrants, smoke detectors, and other similar fire prevention measures.</p> <p>While HFD could receive a slight increase in calls for fire and emergency medical services as a result of the project, the project would have a minimum impact on these services at an individual level; additionally, the project site is located within the incorporated boundaries of the City, and the service area of HFD. HFD has adequate fire protection and emergency medical services to serve the project site, without the need for new or physically altered facilities or significant staff increases.</p> <p>Since the project would be required to comply with the Fire Code and other applicable fire protection regulations, the project would not result in adverse impacts on fire protection. As the project site is within an existing service area, proposed residents would be adequately served by existing first-responder/paramedic services.</p> <p>Source List: 28, 29</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	<p>There are several parks in the vicinity of the project site. Nuestro Parquecito is located approximately 1/4 mile north, Sorensdale Park and Haymont Mini Park approximately 1 mile north, Stonybrook Park located approximately 0.65 miles south, Fairway Greens Park approximately 1 mile south, Twin Bridges Park and Silver Star Veterans Park approximately 1 mile southwest, Stratford Village Park approximately 1.5 miles southwest, Tennyson Park less than one mile west, Weekes Park approximately 1.4 miles west, Eldridge Park located two miles west of the project site, and the future La Vista Park located at the project site.</p> <p>Residents of the project site would use local parks in the vicinity. According to the General Plan Draft EIR, there are approximately 4,550 acres of parkland and approximately 3,918 acres of open space in Hayward. Additionally, the Draft EIR estimates that the City population will be approximately 208,047 residents by 2040. By 2040 the parkland to population ratio would be approximately 21.87 acres per 1,000 residents. The proposed project would add up to 576 residents to the City of Hayward. The addition of these residents would not result in a substantial reduction in the parkland to population ratio Although the project would incrementally increase use of community and regional parks and recreation facilities, the City would continue to meet the National Recreation and Park Association’s standard of five park acres per 1,000 people. The project also includes a planned park on-site. The project would not result in a substantial increase in demand for park or recreation services in the vicinity, such that new facilities would be required to serve the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an adverse impact related to the provision of park and recreational facilities. There are sufficient recreational facilities within a reasonable distance to accommodate the residents’ needs.</p> <p>Source List: 23, 30</p>
Transportation and Accessibility	2	<p>Transportation impacts caused by the project vary depending upon the number of personal vehicle trips the project would generate, the availability of public transit, the bicycle network, and the completeness of the nearby pedestrian network. Close amenities serve to reduce the impacts to traffic.</p> <p><i>Public Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian</i></p> <p>The South Hayward Bart Station is located on the southwestern portion of the intersection of Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard. It is located less than a quarter mile from the project site, served by Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART).</p> <p>Existing sidewalks are located along Tennyson Road and Mission Boulevard Avenue, and other streets in the vicinity of the project site. Pedestrian access would be provided throughout the project site via internal walkways and sidewalks. In addition, the overall development of the project area, in conjunction with the future school, would include a connection to the Hayward Foothill Trail, extending up to a planned internal road. The project would provide short term bicycle spaces and long-term storage spaces. Existing bikeways in the project area include Class II bike lanes in both directions along Tennyson Road. The City of</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>Hayward Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan includes planned Class IV separated bike lanes along Mission Boulevard and along Tennyson Road west of Mission Boulevard. Bicyclists accessing the southern portion of the project site (primarily students accessing the school) can utilize the trail access off Tennyson Road.</p> <p>Existing vehicle, bicycle and transit facilities are sufficient to adequately serve the project. The project would not increase the demand for transportation substantially above current conditions.</p> <p><i>Trip Generation and Circulatory Network</i></p> <p>During the CEQA approval process for the project, the City of Hayward reviewed local intersection level of service, queuing, driveway operations, neighborhood cut-through traffic, and effects on pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit. Additionally, the City confirmed that forecasted vehicle trips would not exceed City thresholds for Vehicle Miles Traveled. The project would not significantly affect the local circulation system and existing roadways would operate at a satisfactory level of service under existing and future conditions.</p> <p>Vehicular access to the residential portion of the project site would primarily be via two driveways along East 16th Street connecting to the internal site roadway. The internal site roadway would run along the eastern portion of the project site, providing access to the residential parking area. The project would be required to comply with General Plan policies promoting a safe, multi-modal transportation system, the City's Design Guidelines, and the City's Hillside Design and Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines. The project would not generate design hazards and would not create issues with safety or conflict with existing flow along the surrounding circulation system.</p> <p>Source List: 1, 3, 30</p>
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	<p>There are no water courses, creeks, streams, seasonal wetlands or other water resources on the project site. The site is a mostly flat, rectangular-shaped parcel. No unique features are located on the site. There are no active agricultural lands on or near the project site.</p> <p>Source List: Attachment D</p>
Vegetation, Wildlife	3	<p>As discussed in <i>Endangered Species</i>, the project site was previously disturbed and the site does not contain wetlands, vernal pools, riparian habitat, or watercourses. The project applicant is required to implement avoidance Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, which include a worker's environmental awareness program and a preconstruction survey for the Alameda Whipsnake.</p> <p>Source List: Attachment D</p>
Other Factors	2	<p>There are no other factors applicable to the proposed project. The project would provide affordable housing for individuals and families. The project intends to provide a safe, clean, and ADA accessible place for future residents.</p>

Additional Studies Performed:

Attachment A – Project Site Plan

Attachment B – CalEEMod Output

Attachment C – Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Rincon Peer Review

Attachment D – Biological Resources Inventory

Attachment E – Explosives and Flammable Hazards Documentation

Attachment F – State Historic Preservation Office Letter

Attachment G – Noise Calculations

Attachment H – EPA EJSscreen Report

Attachment I – Geotechnical Study

Field Inspection (Date and completed by): June 30, 2022. Completed by Beth Wilson, Rincon Consultants, Inc.

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

1. Hayward, City of. 2020. Hayward Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. https://www.hayward-ca.gov/sites/default/files/Hayward%20BPMP_Final%20Plan.pdf. Accessed June 2022.
2. California Department of Finance. 2022. E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State – January 1, 2021 and 2022. Accessible at:
3. Hayward, City of. 2014. Hayward 2040 General Plan. Accessible at: hayward2040generalplan.com. Accessed June 2022.
4. County of Alameda. 2012. Hayward Executive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. https://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/HWD_ALUCP_082012_FULL.pdf. Accessed June 2022.
5. United States Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2019. Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper [map]. <https://www.fws.gov/cbra/maps/mapper.html>. Accessed June 2022.
6. Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2021. National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette. Accessible at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>. Accessed June 2022.
7. California Coastal Commission. 2019. Coastal Zone Boundary Maps: San Mateo. <https://www.coastal.ca.gov/maps/czb/>. Accessed June 2022.
8. California Department of Conservation, Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM). 2022. “Well Finder.” Last modified: 2019. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/calgem/Pages/WellFinder.aspx> (accessed June 2022).
9. California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) 2022. “Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese).” Last modified: 2022. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES,FUDS&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29 (accessed June 2022).
10. California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2022. “SWIS Facility/Site Search.” Last modified: 2019. <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Search> (accessed June 2022).

11. California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2022. "California PFAS Investigations." Last modified: 2022. <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/pfas/> (accessed June 2022).
12. United States Department of Transportation (USDOT). 2022. "National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) Public Map Viewer." Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). Last modified: 2022. <https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/PublicViewer/> (accessed June 2022).
13. Department of Conservation. 2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program California Important Farmland Finder. Accessible at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed June 2022.
14. Hexagon Transportation Consultants. 2017. Appendix G Traffic Operation Analysis. <https://www.hayward-ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Appendix%20G%20Traffic%20Operations%20Analysis.pdf> (accessed August 2022).
15. United States Environmental Protection Agency. (USEPA). 2021. Map of Sole Source Aquifer Locations. Accessible at: <https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9ebb047ba3ec41ada1877155fe31356b>. Accessed June 2022.
16. United States Forest Service. 2022. National Wild and Scenic Rivers (Feature Layer). Accessible from: <https://data-usfs.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/usfs::national-wild-and-scenic-rivers-feature-layer/about>. Accessed June 2022.
17. Hayward Municipal Code Section 9-1.00.
18. California Building Code, Title 24 Section 1803A.7
19. Association of Bay Area Governments. Plan Bay Area 2040. Accessible at: <http://projections.planbayarea.org/>. Accessed June 2022.
20. U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey Table S1101. Accessed June 2022.
21. Hayward Unified School District. 2022. SchoolSite Locator. <https://portal.schoolsitelocator.com>. Accessed June 2022.
22. United States Census Bureau. 2020. ACS 1-Year Estimates, DP05 ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=1600000US0633000&tid=ACSDP5Y2020.DP05>. Accessed June 2022.
23. Hayward, City of. Open Data. Accessible at: <https://opendata.hayward-ca.gov/> (accessed July 2022).
24. California Department of Resource Recycling and Recovery. 2019. Hayward Transported Solid Waste. <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/DisposalReporting/Statewide/TransportedSolidWaste>. Accessed June 2022.
25. Calrecycle. 2022. SWIS Facility Search. Altamont Landfill. Accessible at: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/7?siteID=7>. Accessed October 2022.
26. Hayward, City of. Sewer System Management Plan. Accessible at: <https://www.hayward-ca.gov/sites/default/files/SSMP%202021.pdf> (accessed July 2022).

27. Hayward, City of. 2021 Hayward Urban Water Management Plan. Accessible at: https://www.hayward-ca.gov/sites/default/files/Hayward_2020%20UWMP_Public%20Release_2021%20July%2020.pdf (accessed July 2022).
28. Hayward, City of. Hayward Police Department. Accessible at: <https://www.hayward-ca.gov/police-department> (accessed July 2022).
29. Hayward, City of. Hayward Fire Department. Annual Report. Accessible at: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57e316ebe4fcb552628e782b/t/62097c257252ce26ea056a44/1644788780697/CH_fire_dept_annual_report.pdf (accessed July 2022).
30. Hayward, City of. Hayward General Plan Update Draft EIR. Accessible at: https://www.hayward-ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Hayward%20GPU%20Public%20Release%20Draft%20EIR_1-30-14.pdf (accessed July 2022).

List of Permits Obtained: The project would require Site Plan Review, Grading Permit and Building Permits through the City of Hayward

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]: None

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

Cumulative impacts may occur as a result of other planned and pending development in the project site vicinity. The proposed project would entail development of 176 residential units, which would incrementally contribute to cumulative environmental changes. As discussed in the *Clean Air and Transportation and Accessibility* sections, the project's air pollutant emissions would not cause an exceedance of threshold levels and the project would generate a nominal number of new vehicle trips. In addition, with mitigation incorporated, the project's site specific adverse effects would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to other issues (e.g., on-site geotechnical feasibility recommendations). Therefore, potential cumulative impacts would not be considerable.

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

Offsite Alternative:

Consideration of an offsite alternative is not warranted because there are no substantial adverse effects that would result from the project, or if potentially adverse effects were identified, mitigation has been required to reduce those potentially adverse effects to a less than significant level. The project would involve construction of a residential uses on the specific site being studied.

Reduced Project:

Reducing the number of units and/or the square footage of non-residential space would provide less affordable housing within the project area. A reduced project with fewer units in a smaller building and that would accommodate a smaller residential population would have similar environmental impacts as the proposed project, but slightly lower in magnitude. In particular, by decreasing the number of residents on-site, a reduced residential project would reduce impacts associated with air quality, utilities, and transportation, but none of these impacts are adverse under the existing project.

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

If the proposed project were not implemented, the project site would continue not to contribute to providing low-income housing. Because there would be no construction and no operational changes under the No Action Alternative, it would have no adverse environmental effects. However, the No Action Alternative would not support the City’s goals of increasing the availability of affordable housing units.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The project would involve construction of a two five-story residential building with 176 dwelling units located in the City of Hayward.

The project would not have any potentially significant environmental impacts to the extent that an Environmental Impact Statement would be required. The project would result in minor adverse but mitigable impacts for several environmental issue areas, including *Endangered Species*, *Historic Preservation*, and *Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff*. For social impacts, the project would benefit low-income populations in Hayward by providing affordable housing. For all remaining issue areas, the project is not expected to result in adverse effects.

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

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

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
Endangered Species	BIO-1 Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). Prior to initiation of construction activities (including staging and mobilization), all personnel associated with project construction shall attend a WEAP training, conducted by a qualified biologist, to aid workers in recognizing special-status species, native birds and other biological resources that may occur in the construction area. The specifics of this program shall include identification and habitats of special-status species with potential to occur at the project site, a description of the regulatory status and general ecological characteristics of sensitive resources, a review of the limits of construction, and an explanation of the mitigation measures required to reduce impacts to biological resources within the work area. A fact sheet conveying this information shall also be prepared for distribution to all contractors, their employers, and other personnel involved with construction. All employees shall sign a form provided by the trainer indicating they have attended the WEAP and understand the information presented to them.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
	<p>BIO-2 Alameda Whipsnake Pre-construction Survey and Impact Avoidance. A qualified biologist shall conduct a focused pre-construction survey within 14 days prior to initiation of construction activities. The USFWS shall be notified should any Alameda whipsnake be observed within the project site. Additionally, the following measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to the Alameda whipsnake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to the start of construction, wildlife exclusion fencing (e.g., Animex or Ertec brand fencing) will be installed along the project footprint boundary. The location, extent, and specifications of the wildlife exclusion fencing will be identified by a qualified biologist and included on the final project plans. The fencing will remain in place throughout the duration of the construction activities and will be regularly inspected and fully maintained. Repairs to the fence will be made within 24 hours of discovery. Upon completion of construction activities, the fence will be completely removed; the area cleaned of debris and trash and returned to natural conditions. ▪ Construction crew shall be trained during the WEAP training to check beneath the staged equipment each morning prior to commencement of daily construction activities. Should Alameda whipsnake occur within the staging areas, construction activities shall be halted until the Alameda whipsnake vacates the project site on its own and approval to begin again is provided by the USFWS. ▪ A qualified biologist shall be present during grading activities. Should Alameda whipsnake be observed within the project site, the USFWS shall be notified, and construction shall be halted until the Alameda whipsnake exits the site and approval to begin again is provided by the USFWS. ▪ To prevent the entrapment of Alameda whipsnake and other wildlife, monofilament plastics shall not be used for erosion control. ▪ All construction activities shall take place during daylight hours or with suitable light so that whipsnakes can be seen. Vehicle speeds on the construction site shall not exceed five miles per hour. ▪ Site vegetation management shall take place prior to tree removal, grading, excavation, or other construction activities. Construction materials, soil, construction debris, or other material shall be deposited only on areas where vegetation has been mowed. Areas shall be re-mowed if grass or other vegetation on the project site becomes high enough to conceal whipsnakes during the construction period.
Historic Preservation	<p>CUL-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area shall halt and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's <i>Professional Qualifications Standards</i> for Archaeology (NPS 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If the discovery is of Native American origin, The Confederated Tribes of Lisjan shall be contacted and given the opportunity to evaluate the find and consult with CalHFA on the discovery. If the discovery proves to be eligible</p>

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
	<p>for the NHRP, additional work such as data recovery excavation and further Native American consultation may be warranted.</p> <p>CUL-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains. The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety code section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall complete the inspection of the site and provide recommendations for treatment to the landowner within 48 hours of being granted access.</p>
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	<p>GEO-1: Geotechnical Recommendations. The Geotechnical Exploration prepared by ENGEIO Inc dated June 1, 2021 provides recommendations that would ensure the project is suitable from a geotechnical standpoint, and would increase the safety and integrity of the project. The recommendations address, but are not limited to: coordination with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District regarding natural occurring asbestos during grading, earthwork, corrective grading plans, seismic hazards and foundation support, landslide removal, expansive soils, site drainage, placement of fill, settlement, footings and slabs on grade, and retaining walls. The project applicant shall incorporate and follow these recommendations during construction.</p>

Determination:

- Finding of No Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.
- Finding of Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Preparer Signature:  Date: November 2022

Name/Title/Organization: Nik Kilpelainen, Environmental Planner, Rincon Consultants

Certifying Officer Signature: _____ Date: November 2022

Name/Title: Tiena Johnson Hall, Executive Director

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environmental Review Record (ERR) for the activity/project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).