FINAL PLAN
ADOPTED DECEMBER 2018
PLAN PURPOSE
Central SoMa is a 230-acre area that sits adjacent to downtown, has excellent transit access, and contains numerous undeveloped or underdeveloped sites, such as surface parking lots and single-story commercial buildings. As such, the neighborhood is well positioned to accommodate needed employment and housing in the core of the city and Bay Area region. It is also a neighborhood with an incredible history and a rich, ongoing, cultural heritage. As it grows and evolves over the next 25 years, Central SoMa has the opportunity to become a complete, sustainable, and vital neighborhood without losing what makes it special and unique today. The Central SoMa Plan contains the goals, objectives, and policies to guide this growth and evolution such that the results serve the best interests of San Francisco – in the present and the future.

PLAN AREA BOUNDARY
The Central SoMa Plan Area runs from 2nd Street to 6th Street, Market Street to Townsend Street, exclusive of those areas that are part of the Downtown Plan (see Figure A in the Plan) which comprise much of the area north of Folsom Street. It is an “Eastern Neighborhoods Plan” comprised entirely of areas formerly part of the East SoMa Plan Area and Western SoMa Plan Area, whose boundaries has been adjusted accordingly. The Central SoMa Plan Area boundaries were created to include areas within easy walking distance (i.e., two blocks) of the Central Subway’s 4th Street alignment.

PLAN VISION
The vision of the Central SoMa Plan is to create a sustainable neighborhood by 2040, where the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The Central SoMa Plan seeks to achieve sustainability in each of its aspects – social, economic, and environmental. Additionally, achieving sustainability in Central SoMa should complement movements towards sustainability in the city, region, nation, and planet.

PLAN PHILOSOPHY, STRATEGY, AND GOALS
The Plan’s philosophy for achieving neighborhood sustainability is to maintain what is already successful about the neighborhood, and improving what is not. Doing so requires implementing the following three strategies:

- Accommodate growth
- Provide public benefits
- Respect and enhance neighborhood character

Implementing the Plan’s strategy will require addressing all the facets of a sustainable neighborhood. Doing so can be accomplished by meeting all of the Plan’s eight goals to achieve the following results:

- Accommodate a Substantial Amount of Jobs and Housing
- Maintain the Diversity of Residents
- Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center
● Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit
● Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities
● Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood
● Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood’s Cultural Heritage
● Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City

EXPECTED RESULTS

Under existing City rules, there is potential to build space for approximately 10,000 jobs and 2,500 housing units. With adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, there would be potential to build space for approximately to 32,000 jobs and 8,800 housing units - more than triple of today’s development capacity.

Increasing the population of the neighborhood requires significant investments in infrastructure. As such, the City places requirements on new development to help ameliorate and mitigate its impacts. As well, various land use controls are also put in place to ensure that new development in Central SoMa reflects the characteristics of the neighborhood and achieves the ideals put forward by the Plan. These requirements and controls would result in up to $2 billion in public benefits to serve the neighborhood – compared to the $300 million that would occur without the Plan. The public benefits expected in Central SoMa include:

● Affordable Housing: 33 percent of total units produced after Plan adoption;
● Transit: $500 million investment in both near and long term service and capacity enhancements to both local and regional transit;
● Parks and Recreation: Transformative investments in new facilities and enhancements to existing ones (e.g. parks, recreation centers, privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS));
● Complete Streets: Safe and comfortable conditions for people walking and biking on 100 percent of all major streets in the Plan Area;
● Production, Distribution, and Repair (including Arts): No net loss of space due to Plan;
● Environmental Sustainability: Investment towards becoming a sustainable, healthy, and resilient neighborhood;
● Cultural Preservation & Community Services: Funding towards preservation of the area’s historic buildings (including the Old Mint) and funding for services and community facilities, such as health clinics and job training centers; and,
● Schools and Children: Funding to support the expanding population.
The Central SoMa Plan is the result of eight years of intensive public engagement, involving over a thousand people and an untold number of conversations. We appreciate all the input we received and everyone’s willingness to share their concerns, insights, and dreams. The goal of this Plan is to reflect the collective wisdom of the community at this time in a way that sustains it far into the future.

We want to acknowledge the contributions of the late Mayor Edwin Lee, Mayor London Breed, and Supervisor Jane Kim, who provided leadership and guidance through the entire planning process. We would also like to thank all of the City departments who participated in its development to make sure that the City family will speak with one voice from the adoption to the implementation of this Plan. And most of all we would like to thank every member of the community who participated in the creation of this. This Plan would not be possible without the many days and evenings you spent coming to our community open houses, hosting us at your community groups, sending emails, making phone calls, answering surveys, and otherwise making sure your ideas were heard.
PART I: CENTRAL SOMA PLAN

Overview: Central SoMa, a Sustainable Neighborhood

Goal 1: Accommodate a Substantial Amount of Jobs and Housing
Goal 2: Maintain the Diversity of Residents
Goal 3: Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center
Goal 4: Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit
Goal 5: Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities
Goal 6: Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood
Goal 7: Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood’s Cultural Heritage
Goal 8: Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City

PART II: CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

A. Implementation Matrix
B. Public Benefits Package
C. Guide to Urban Design
D. Key Development Site Guidelines
E. Key Streets Guidance

Note: This document reflects the adopted policies and implementation measures at the time of the Plan’s adoption in December 2018, and is provided for reference only. For the most current policies, please refer to the online General Plan, the Planning Code, and related materials.
PART I:
CENTRAL SOMA PLAN

Photo by SF Planning.
PLAN PURPOSE

Central SoMa is a 230-acre area that sits adjacent to downtown, has excellent transit access, and contains a substantial amount of developable land. As such, the neighborhood is well positioned to accommodate needed employment, housing, and visitor facilities in the core of the city and Bay Area region. It is also a neighborhood with an incredible history and a rich, ongoing, cultural heritage. As it grows and evolves over the next 25 years, Central SoMa has the opportunity to become a complete, sustainable, and vital neighborhood without losing what makes it special and unique today. The Central SoMa Plan contains the goals, objectives, and policies to guide this growth and evolution such that the results serve the best interests of San Francisco – in the present and the future.
PLAN AREA BOUNDARY

The Central SoMa Plan Area runs from 2nd Street to 6th Street, Market Street to Townsend Street, exclusive of those areas that are part of the Downtown Plan (see Figure A) which comprise much of the area north of Folsom Street. It is an “Eastern Neighborhoods Plan” comprised entirely of areas formerly part of the East SoMa Plan Area and Western SoMa Plan Area, whose boundaries has been adjusted accordingly. The Central SoMa Plan Area boundaries were created to include areas within easy walking distance (i.e., two blocks) of the Central Subway’s 4th Street alignment.

PLAN VISION

The vision of the Central SoMa Plan is to create a sustainable neighborhood by 2040, where the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The Central SoMa Plan seeks to achieve sustainability in each of its aspects – social, economic, and environmental. Additionally, achieving sustainability in Central SoMa should complement movements towards sustainability in the city, region, nation, and planet.
PLAN PHILOSOPHY

Achieving neighborhood sustainability requires keeping what is already successful about the neighborhood, and improving what is not. On the sustainable side of the ledger, assets include the diversity of residents (in every sense), its central location complemented by abundant regional and local transit, the unique character of the collection of buildings that constitute the neighborhood, its rich economic heritage as an industrial center for a century and more recently a hub of innovation in media and technology, and the cultural and nightlife amenities that make this a regional and worldwide destination.

On the non-sustainable side of the ledger include an equally impressive and daunting list of challenges: rents that are unaffordable to the vast majority of residents and businesses; streets that are unsafe and unpleasant for people walking and bicycling; a distinct lack of green coupled with a noisy and often polluted environment; and land that is not effectively being utilized to provide space for jobs and housing in a fashion that can greatly reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases per person and add to the stock of space to help meet demand.

neighborhood strengths

- Diversity of Residents and Jobs
- Transit-Served Central Location
- Diversity of Buildings and Architecture
- Culture and Nightlife

neighborhood challenges

- Rents
- Conditions for People Walking and Biking
- Lack of Parks and Open Space
- Inefficient Use of Land
PLAN STRATEGY

Utilizing the Plan’s philosophy to achieve the Plan’s vision will require implementing the following three strategies:

- Accommodate growth
- Provide public benefits
- Respect and enhance neighborhood character

This Plan asserts that Central SoMa should play a major role in accommodating the City’s share of anticipated regional growth in jobs and housing. Accommodating substantial growth here can help address the local and regional issues of high rents, sprawl, and congestion, and the global issue of greenhouse gas emissions. The addition of millions of square feet of residential and commercial space is certain to help relieve price pressure. Simultaneously, dense development in this transit-rich, temperate, and walkable neighborhood can drastically reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emission per person from both buildings (e.g., for heating and cooling) and transportation (in terms of the amount of miles traveled in private vehicles), while reducing pressures for growth in more outlying areas of the region.

While new growth can have economic and environmental benefits, new residents and workers also place a strain on the neighborhood’s infrastructure. In an era where other levels of government are either unwilling or unable to fund the needs of its urban communities, it is necessary that new growth address its own impacts. Fortunately, Central SoMa includes some of the world’s most valuable land. The rents commanded by this land enable new development to ameliorate and mitigate its impacts while meeting other City objectives. New development does so through the direct provision of public benefits, through the payment of impact fees, and through taxes. The public benefits created by new development can include affordable housing, transit service, parks and recreational amenities, safe and convenient streets for people walking and biking, child care, schools, community services, space for production, distribution, and repair jobs, preservation of cultural resources, and amenities to support environmental sustainability and resilience.

Given the desirability of land in Central SoMa, there’s likely demand for buildings of heights currently only seen in the downtown. While such heights could come with substantial public benefits, they could also come at the expense of what makes the neighborhood great in the first place – its character. And its character is a huge part of what makes the neighborhood socially and economically sustainable. Central SoMa should not be like downtown – just like it should not be like Mission Bay, or the Richmond, or any other neighborhood in San Francisco. It should just be the best Central SoMa it can be. Therefore, this plan attempts to both accommodate a substantial amount of growth and retain much of the character of the district. Respecting and enhancing the neighborhood’s character includes measures such as requiring active ground floors that promote positive social interactions and commerce, design requirements that ensure ample light and air reach all sidewalks, and banning the consolidation of certain lots so as to maintain the diversity of buildings and building styles in the neighborhood.
PLAN GOALS

Implementing the Plan’s strategy will require addressing all the facets of a sustainable neighborhood. Doing so can be accomplished by meeting all of the Plan’s eight Goals:

1. Accommodate a Substantial Amount of Jobs and Housing
2. Maintain the Diversity of Residents
3. Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center
4. Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit
5. Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities
6. Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood
7. Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood’s Cultural Heritage
8. Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City

Each of these eight Goals receives its own chapter in the Central SoMa Plan. For each Goal there is a context section intended to explain existing conditions – and why meeting the Goal is necessary. There is also a list of the Objectives and Policies whose implementation would enable the Plan to meet the Goal. And finally there is a summary section that shows how meeting the Goal would help fulfill the Plan’s vision.
OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS

The Central SoMa Plan is only one of many local and regional efforts intended to accommodate growth. In recent years, the City has completed a number of Area Plans, generally in the southeastern part of the city. As shown in Figure B, these include Rincon Hill (2006), Market & Octavia (2008), Central Waterfront (2008), East SoMa (2008), the Mission (2008), Showplace Square/Potrero Hill (2008), Transit Center (2012), and Western SoMa (2013). This time period has also seen a substantial build out of the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan (1998). The City is currently undergoing studies related to the future of the Caltrain station and yards at 4th and King Streets.

In addition to all of these local plans, there are many efforts being undertaken throughout the region. Most of these are in “Priority Development Areas” identified in the Bay Area’s regional planning strategy, Plan Bay Area (2013) (see Figure C). The preponderance of growth in the region is expected to occur in these Priority Development Areas.

Central SoMa should play a major role in accommodating the City’s share of anticipated regional growth in jobs and housing.
PLANNING PROCESS

The desire for a Central SoMa Plan began during the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process. In 2008 the City adopted the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, including new land use controls and proposed community improvements for the eastern part of the South of Market neighborhood (SoMa), as well as the Central Waterfront, Mission, and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhoods. At that time, the City determined that the development potential of the industrially zoned part of East SoMa, coupled with the improved transit provided by the Central Subway, necessitated a subsequent, focused planning process that took into account the city’s growth needs and City and regional environmental goals. The Central SoMa Plan is that subsequent process.

The process of creating the Central SoMa Plan began in earnest in 2011, just as the public and private sectors were climbing out of the Great Recession. From its inception, the Planning Department has prioritized listening, engagement, and dialogue. As of the Plan’s adoption in December 2018, this included: 15 public workshops, charrettes, and walking tours; 17 hearings at the Board of Supervisors; 20 hearings at the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission; additional hearings at the Arts Commission, Youth Commission, and Capital Planning Committee; a “technical advisory committee” consisting of multiple City and regional agencies; an “Eco-District Task Force” comprised of public and community stakeholders; a “storefront charrette” (where the Planning Department set up shop in a retail space in the neighborhood); two community surveys; an online discussion board; meetings with the neighborhood’s community groups, homeowners associations, merchants’ associations, and activist groups; and thousands of individual meetings, phone calls, and emails with stakeholders ranging from developers, property owners, business owners, renters, workers, media members, and anyone else who has interest in the Plan. Throughout the planning process, the Planning Department’s policy towards engagement has always been “anywhere, anytime.” If a community group or individual wants to talk about Central SoMa the answer is always say yes. To ensure people feel free to speak their mind, the Planning Department has always agreed to meet on people’s own turf, with their own rules, format, and questions.

The final Plan you are reading is the culmination of all of this intensive public engagement, involving over a thousand people and an untold number of conversations. The City appreciates all the input received and everyone’s willingness to share their concerns, insights, and dreams. The goal of this Plan is to reflect the collective wisdom of the community at this time in a way that sustains it far into the future.
This moment reflects the culmination of major environmental, economic, and social trends that are simultaneously working at multiple geographic levels and timeframes.
Since its inception, San Francisco has seen more than its share of tumultuous economic times: the Gold and Silver Rushes (and busts), the earthquake and fire of 1906, the influx of World War II, population decline due to suburbanization, the Dot Com boom and bust. They have all left lasting shrines and scars on this city.

As of the writing of this Plan in 2017, San Francisco is having another one of those “moments”. This moment reflects the culmination of major environmental, economic, and social trends that are simultaneously working at multiple geographic levels and timeframes.

Environmentally, there is an increasing awareness of the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in recognition of the consequences of climate change. At the State level, this led to the adoption of Senate Bill (SB) 375 in 2008. SB 375 mandated the State’s regions identify how they would combine transportation investments and land use policy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. At the regional level, this mandate led to the adoption of Plan Bay Area in 2013, which determined that meeting the State’s targets would require densification and investment in “Priority Development Areas” that exhibit and/or have the potential to combine density of development with excellent transit service. At the local level, the City identified a number of such “Priority Development Areas” that span much of the eastern half of the city.

Economically, there is the continuing national and regional shift from an economy based on things to one based on ideas. Nationally, in the aftermath of the Great Recession (2007-2009), job growth has been led by “knowledge” sector businesses such as high tech. These knowledge sector businesses tend to cluster in regions – and the Bay Area is the world’s leading knowledge region. The result is that job growth in the Bay Area the past several years has nearly doubled that of the rest of the nation, and commensurately so has the demand for housing. Bay Area job growth has been particularly high in the last six years (2010-2015), concurrent with the development of this Plan, as the region moved from the nadir to the peak of the current business cycle.
Socially, Americans are showing an increasing preference for an accessible and dynamic urban lifestyle.

After rapid suburbanization in the decades after World War II, cities such as San Francisco have seen long-term population and job growth since the 1980s, despite temporary peaks and dips along the way. This trend has accelerated in recent years, as both “Millennials” and Baby Boomers have shown a strong preference for cities. This trend has focused demand on those portions of the Bay Area where jobs can be easily accessed by transit, daily needs can be met by walking, and there are a range of amenities and options nearby. In this largely suburban and auto-dependent region, many of the accessible and dynamic urban neighborhoods are in San Francisco.

Cumulatively, these trends have created an ongoing and strong demand for space in San Francisco. Accommodating this demand would require building additional space for jobs, housing, and other needed facilities. However, building in San Francisco is a challenging and time-consuming process. New buildings often require years of review and deliberation before they are even allowed to be constructed, and construction itself can take one to three years, depending on the size of the building.

Housing prices have risen to a level that is socially unsustainable.

When demand is high relative to supply, the price inevitably goes up. In 2017, prices have risen to a level that is socially unsustainable – rents for housing are the highest in the country, and greatly exceed what can be afforded by the majority of today’s San Franciscans. Rents for commercial space are similarly unaffordable, pushing out non-profit organizations, mom-and-pop businesses, artists and industrial businesses.

To some degree, the intensity of this “moment” will pass when the current business cycle inevitably cools. However, the other environmental, economic, and social factors that have created this moment are likely to persist over a longer timeframe than the typical 5-10 year business cycle. They are also national or even global forces exogenous to San Francisco – and thus the demand they exert are beyond the ability to control locally.
The City has been planning for growth over the last 20 years; however, there is still substantial demand for jobs and housing in transit-rich, walkable, amenity-laden neighborhoods.

By contrast, what is within our ability to control locally is increasing the capacity for jobs and housing in San Francisco, and to ensure that new growth provides public benefits to improve the lives of residents and workers. The City has been planning for such growth over the last 20 years, through major Redevelopment and Area Plans as Mission Bay, Hunters Point, Rincon Hill, Eastern Neighborhoods, Market & Octavia, and the Transit Center District. The results of these Plans can be seen in the cranes and construction sites dotting San Francisco. However, there is still substantial demand for development of space for jobs and housing in transit-rich, walkable, amenity-laden neighborhoods.

Central SoMa is an appropriate location for development, served by some of the region’s best transit.

Fortunately, Central SoMa is an appropriate location for such development. The area is served by some of the region’s best transit, including BART and Caltrain, Muni Metro and many bus lines, in addition to the Central Subway currently under construction. Flat streets and a regular grid pattern can make destinations easy to reach for people walking and bicycling (as facilitated by improvements discussed in Goal #4). There is already an incredibly strong cluster of technology companies that new and growing companies want to locate near. There is also a diversity of other uses, including thousands of residential units, local- and regional-serving retail, cultural and entertainment facilities, hotels, and production/distribution/repair businesses. Simultaneously, there is substantial opportunity to increase density in Central SoMa. There are numerous undeveloped or underdeveloped sites, such as surface parking lots and single-story commercial buildings.
OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the Plan’s Goal of increasing the capacity for jobs and housing in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 1.1

ENSURE THAT THERE IS SUFFICIENT LAND AREA WHERE SPACE FOR JOBS AND HOUSING CAN BE BUILT

Central SoMa includes two types of areas: one that has always allowed development of new residential and non-residential space (including office), and one that has prevented the creation of new space since the late 1980s. To be able to increase the capacity for jobs and housing in Central SoMa, it is necessary to increase the area where new development can occur.

Policy 1.1.1 Retain existing zoning that supports capacity for new jobs and housing.

Central SoMa has large areas where development has historically been allowed to occur. The City should maintain the ability for development to occur in these areas.

Policy 1.1.2 Limit zoning that restricts capacity for new jobs and housing.

The Plan Area includes a substantial amount of area whose zoning generally does not allow either new housing or new commercial space such as office. These districts should be replaced with zoning that permits new housing and office uses, except in limited locations as discussed in Goal #3.
Figure 1.1
EXISTING ZONING (GENERALIZED)

Figure 1.2
ADOPTED ZONING (GENERALIZED)
Figure 1.3
EXISTING ZONING

- MUO (Mixed Use Office)
- MUR (Mixed Use Residential)
- WS MUG (Western SoMa Mixed Use General)
- WS MUO (Western SoMa Mixed Use Office)
- WS SALI (Western SoMa Service Arts Light Industrial)
- RED (Residential Enclave)
- SLI (Service Light Industrial)
- SPD (South Park)
- NCT (SoMa Neighborhood Commercial Transit)
- M-1 (Light Industrial)
- SSO (Service Secondary Office)
- C-3-O (Downtown Office)
- P (Public)
ADOPTED ZONING

CMUO (Mixed Use Office)
MUG (Mixed Use General)
MUR (Mixed Use Residential)
SALI (Service Arts Light Industrial)
SPD (South Park)
NCT-SOMA (SoMa Neighborhood Commercial Transit)
C-3-O (Downtown Office)
P (Public)

1,000 Feet
**OBJECTIVE 1.2**

ENSURE THAT DEVELOPABLE LAND HAS, COLLECTIVELY, SUFFICIENT CAPACITY FOR JOBS AND HOUSING

The amount of development allowed on a piece of land is controlled in a number of ways, foremost being the limits on how tall and how bulky a building can be, and secondarily through strict density controls.

**Policy 1.2.1** Set height limits on parcels as appropriate to fulfill this Objective.

In Central SoMa, the typical height limit on the major streets has been 65-85 feet, although it has been up to 130 feet on a handful of parcels adjacent to the downtown. However, there are several areas along major streets where height limits have been held substantially lower – including as low as 30 feet along the freeway. Despite this, there are numerous locations where the wide streets and urban context support higher densities and building heights above 85 feet, as long as they are complemented by appropriate controls on building massing. To be able to increase the capacity for jobs and housing in Central SoMa, it is necessary to increase the allowable heights at these locations.

**Policy 1.2.2** Allow physical controls for height, bulk, setbacks, and open space to determine density.

Throughout much of Central SoMa, residential developments are not subject to such density controls, and the controls for non-residential uses are not a substantial impediment to the amount of development that can occur. However, where heights are proposed to increase above 85 feet, existing density controls for non-residential uses would likely restrict development. To be able to increase the capacity for jobs in Central SoMa, it is necessary to lift these density controls in a way that supports development but still fulfills all of the design controls for new buildings articulated in Goal 8 of this Plan.

333-345 Brannan, an example of new office buildings in Central SoMa. Photo by Google Street View.
**Figure 1.5**
EXISTING HEIGHT LIMITS (GENERALIZED)

**Figure 1.6**
ADOPTED HEIGHT LIMITS (GENERALIZED)

New housing development in the Plan Area. Photo by Google Street View/Images.
For bulk controls, reference Planning Code Section 270.
For bulk controls, reference Planning Code Section 270.
Overall Change in Development Capacity

The maps below are intended to convey how the zoning controls and height limits interact to result in development capacity. The “Existing Development Capacity” map (Figure 1.9), shows the substantial amount of area where new space for housing and most jobs are not allowed, and the lower height limits in the preponderance of the Plan Area. The “Adopted Development Capacity” map (Figure 1.10), shows the increase in the area that is available for jobs and housing, as well as the increase in the amount of development allowed – particularly in the northeast and southwest portions of the Plan Area.

The change of development capacity in the Plan Area could lead to the development of space for 32,000 jobs and 8,800 housing units.

The diagrams on the right convey where this new development potential may occur, based on the proposed zoning, height limits, and bulk controls (discussed in Goal 8). Figure 1.11 conveys existing buildings. Figure 1.12 shows where new development may occur in Central SoMa (yellow), as well as projects outside the Plan Area that are either already under construction or that have submitted an application for development to the Planning Department (blue).
This image is intended to visualize the overall development capacity of the Central SoMa Plan. It is not meant to be a precise assessment of potential at the individual parcel level. It is certain that eventual development at these locations will look differently than rendered in this image.
FULFILLING THE VISION

Increasing the capacity for jobs and housing in Central SoMa (as shown in Figures 1.10) would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:

Supporting **social sustainability** by helping address the supply/demand imbalance that has caused rents to become unaffordable.

Supporting **economic sustainability** by providing space for the knowledge-sector jobs that are a key driver of the city’s economy, and for other jobs that support economic diversity.

Supporting **environmental sustainability** by enabling dense urban development that requires less greenhouse gas emissions per person (from both buildings and vehicles) and reduces demand to convert natural areas and/or farmlands into areas for human habitation.
SoMa has always played an important role in housing low- and moderate-income San Franciscans.
SoMa has always played an important role in housing low- and moderate-income San Franciscans in various forms, from the single-room occupancy (SRO) hotels that historically primarily housed single men and residential towers dedicated to housing seniors, to the modest family-oriented housing that has lined the alleys. In more recent decades, a substantial amount of market-rate housing (generally affordable to those with higher incomes) has been created, as well as conversions of older warehouses. These buildings included condominiums, apartment buildings, and live-work lofts. The neighborhood also includes a homeless population, many of whom come to the neighborhood to use the services available here, including a large shelter currently located at 5th and Bryant Streets.

The result is that today SoMa has an incredibly diverse population, in terms of race, income, and unit size. This diversity is a critical part of its neighborhood character. Respecting this neighborhood character requires that the variety provided by the existing residents should be maintained, and that future development would replicate this pattern to the highest degree possible.

However, doing so will be a substantial challenge, given current market conditions that favor those with higher incomes in the competition for both existing units and new units.
OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of maintaining the diversity of residents in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 2.1

MAINTAIN THE EXISTING STOCK OF HOUSING

In the effort to address San Francisco’s lack of housing, it is important to preserve as many of the existing units as possible.

Policy 2.1.1 Continue implementing controls that maintain the existing supply of housing.

The City’s current policy is to limit the loss of housing due to the merger or demolition of units and the conversion of units to non-residential uses. The City should continue to implement these policies, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal.

Policy 2.2.1 Continue implementing controls and strategies that help maintain the existing supply of affordable housing.

The City seeks to maintain the existing supply of affordable housing through measures that keep people in their homes, such as rent control and eviction protections. The City also seeks to ensure that affordable units stay both affordable and habitable, through such strategies as the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program. The City should continue to implement such policies and programs, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal.

Policy 2.2.2 Support the conversion of existing housing into permanently affordable housing.

Through the “Small Sites” program, the City is currently seeking to expand the existing supply of affordable housing by purchasing units and making them permanently affordable. The City should continue to implement such programs, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal.

OBJECTIVE 2.2

MAINTAIN THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK

Central SoMa contains a substantial stock of affordable housing, including 100 percent affordable buildings (mostly clustered around the Moscone Center in the former Yerba Buena Redevelopment Area) and rent controlled buildings (including many in the more residentially-focused area west of 5th Street and north of the freeway). The Plan supports the preservation of this housing and the protection of tenants who occupy this housing. It also supports programs to expand the stock of affordable housing.

Policy 2.2.1 Continue implementing controls and strategies that help maintain the existing supply of affordable housing.

The City seeks to maintain the existing supply of affordable housing through measures that keep people in their homes, such as rent control and eviction protections. The City also seeks to ensure that affordable units stay both affordable and habitable, through such strategies as the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program. The City should continue to implement such policies and programs, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal.

Policy 2.2.2 Support the conversion of existing housing into permanently affordable housing.

Through the “Small Sites” program, the City is currently seeking to expand the existing supply of affordable housing by purchasing units and making them permanently affordable. The City should continue to implement such programs, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal.
OBJECTIVE 2.3
ENSURE THAT AT LEAST 33 PERCENT OF NEW HOUSING IS AFFORDABLE TO VERY LOW, LOW, AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

Through the adoption of Proposition K in 2014, San Francisco has set a target that 33 percent of all new housing is affordable to very low, low, and moderate income households. The Central SoMa Plan aims to ensure that new housing development meets this target through a number of mechanisms, including affordability requirements on new market-rate housing development and non-residential development and development of publicly-owned sites.

Policy 2.3.1 Set affordability requirements for new residential development at rates necessary to fulfill this Objective.

Housing in San Francisco is some of the most expensive in the nation, and new housing is unaffordable to a large percentage of the population. To promote income diversity of residents living in new housing, the City requires market-rate housing projects to provide affordable housing by paying a fee or, in the alternative, providing on-site or off-site affordable housing. Within the Plan Area, these affordable housing requirements should be set to ensure that that market-rate housing projects contribute their fair share towards meeting the City’s overall affordability targets.
**Policy 2.3.2** Require contribution to affordable housing from commercial uses.

Commercial uses, such as offices, hotels, and retail, generate a demand for a range of housing types, including affordable housing. The City already requires commercial development of 25,000 square feet or more to contribute to the development of affordable housing (typically through the payment of a fee). The City should continue requiring that these commercial developments contribute to the development of affordable housing, and facilitate additional mechanisms to do so, such as provision of land for affordable housing.

**Policy 2.3.3** Ensure that affordable housing generated by the Central SoMa Plan stays in the neighborhood.

New residential and commercial development in the Central SoMa Plan area will generate a substantial amount of affordable housing, either by paying a fee to the City, building it directly (within the building or nearby) or dedicating land for the City to build on. To fulfill the goal of maintaining the diversity of residents, it is necessary that any fees collected by the City be invested within or near the neighborhood. Additionally, any land dedicated to the City for affordable housing should similarly be within or near the neighborhood.

**Policy 2.3.4** Allow affordable housing sites to sell any unused development rights.

Affordable housing development typically is built to heights of 85 feet or below, where it can benefit from cheaper construction costs. In areas where height limits exceed 85 feet, this means that the affordable housing is not utilizing its full development capacity. The City should support the financial feasibility of affordable housing developments by allowing affordable housing developments to sell their unused development rights.
The lack of availability and production of housing affordable to these households is a large factor in the decrease in San Francisco’s middle class in recent years.

**OBJECTIVE 2.4**

**SUPPORT HOUSING FOR OTHER HOUSEHOLDS THAT CANNOT AFFORD MARKET RATE HOUSING**

There is a large swath of the population whose income disqualifies them from “affordable” housing under existing programs at the federal, state and local levels, but who often cannot afford prevailing prices for market-rate housing. The lack of availability and production of housing affordable to these households is a large factor in the decrease in San Francisco’s middle class in recent years.

**Policy 2.4.1** Continue implementing strategies that support the development of “gap” housing.

The development of housing above moderate income is challenging, because such housing lacks access to federal tax incentives – often making it more expensive to build than affordable housing. That being said, the City has developed strategies to create more housing in this “gap,” including through funding created through 2015’s Proposition A, the 2017 revisions to the affordable housing requirements for market-rate housing development, and down payment assistance loan programs. The City should continue to implement such strategies, and continue to seek new ways that accomplish their goal.

**OBJECTIVE 2.5**

**SUPPORT HOUSING FOR A DIVERSITY OF HOUSEHOLD SIZES AND TENURES**

The diversity of SoMa’s housing is not just about incomes, but the size and tenure of households as well. The Central SoMa Plan aims to ensure that new units are reflective of this broad mix.

**Policy 2.5.1** Continue requiring family-sized units.

Central SoMa has traditionally been a neighborhood with a diverse mix of housing sizes, from small single-room-occupancy units to larger homes for families. By contrast, new development often wants to provide mostly smaller units (studios and one-bedrooms) that do not meet the needs of families. The City’s current policy in Central SoMa is to require that new residential development contain a high percentage of family-sized units with two or more bedrooms. The City should continue to implement this policy, and seek new strategies that accomplish its goal.
To maintain a diversity of residents it is necessary to provide the services they need; including schools, child care, and community services.

Policy 2.5.2 Continue to incentivize rental units.

Rental housing provides greater access to the housing market than for-sale units, which typically require large down payments and long bank loans. Much of San Francisco’s housing diversity is attributable to the fact that it is predominantly a rental city – almost two-thirds of households rent their homes. Yet in new housing, for-sale units are often more profitable, which drives the market to produce more of them. Recognizing this, the City has created incentives to produce rental housing, including having lower affordable housing requirements. The City should continue to implement this policy, and seek new strategies that accomplish its goal.

Policy 2.6.1 Help fund public schools.

The San Francisco Unified School District already collects impact fees from new development. This funding is utilized for capital improvements of existing schools and for new ones, including the proposed new school in Mission Bay. Development in the Plan Area should continue to contribute to the School District’s funding.

Policy 2.6.2 Help facilitate the creation of childcare facilities.

San Francisco is suffering from a lack of licensed childcare. This is due to a lack of funding and a difficulty in finding space that meets the strict requirements for childcare centers. From the funding.
FULFILLING THE VISION

Maintaining the diversity of residents in Central SoMa would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:

- **Supporting social sustainability** by ensuring a wide range of San Franciscans have the opportunity to live in the neighborhood.
- **Supporting economic sustainability** by supporting the housing of a diversity of people near jobs, thereby supporting the hiring needs of those organizations and the access to opportunity of those residents.
- **Supporting environmental sustainability** by placing a diversity of people near the diversity of jobs, thereby reducing car trips.

From a space standpoint, the City currently supports the creation of childcare through both the Child Care Impact Fee and the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee. Development in the Plan Area should contribute to child care via these fees. From a space standpoint, the City should work with development in the Plan Area to promote the creation of new, appropriately designed childcare centers.

**Policy 2.6.3** Help facilitate the creation of new community services.

“Community services” include space for non-profit and government organizations that provide services to the community, such as health clinics and job training. The City should support these uses in Central SoMa, including creation of an impact fee on new development to help provide community facilities and working with the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development to site those resources.
SoMa has been a commercial center for San Francisco for well over a century.
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GOAL THREE

Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center

CONTEXT

SoMa has been a commercial center for San Francisco for well over a century. Historically an industrial district, such businesses now sit cheek by jowl with offices, retail, hotels, and entertainment venues. This combination creates an environment that is both incredibly lively and unique in San Francisco.

Moving forward, Central SoMa is also well positioned to be a center for job growth. As discussed in Goal #1, it is well located, being served by some of the region’s best transit and having a lot of developable land. Much of that demand will be for office-oriented jobs, particularly in the “knowledge-sector” industries that drive our economy. However, in allowing for that growth it is important that the neighborhood maintains and grows its other sectors. By doing so it can sustain its unique diversity of economic activities and the liveliness that SoMa is known for.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of facilitating an economically diversified and lively jobs center.

OBJECTIVE 3.1

ENSURE THE PLAN AREA ACCOMMODATES SIGNIFICANT SPACE FOR JOB GROWTH

As discussed in Goal #1, San Francisco has an affordability crisis for both residential and non—residential uses. This crisis is due to robust regional economy and commensurate demand for commercial space for those jobs and housing for the workers. Previous City planning efforts have attempted to address the housing crisis by identifying areas to meet our housing needs – including over 100,000 units by 2040.

By contrast, previous planning efforts have not identified areas to meet the expected jobs growth of at least another 100,000 jobs in the same timeframe. Accommodating these jobs in transit-rich job centers has important social, economic, and environmental benefits. Being in job centers enables the companies
and workers to benefit from the synergies of co-location and infrastructure. Locating jobs near transit reduces car usage and thus greenhouse gas emissions and traffic congestion – even to a higher degree than locating housing near transit (commuters are most likely to use transit when stations are very close to their jobs than when transit is very close to their homes but their jobs are more distant).

Central SoMa is well positioned to accommodate a substantial amount of jobs that would otherwise go to more suburban, car-oriented locations. The Plan Area has some of the best transit in the region, being proximal to two regional train lines (BART and Caltrain), Muni Metro (including the under-construction Central Subway), and myriad regional and local bus lines. By being located between the existing jobs centers of downtown and Mission Bay, the Plan Area not only is proximal to other jobs, but actually better ties those two areas together. The 2017 update to Plan Bay Area even more greatly emphasizes San Francisco as a preferable place regionally to grow jobs as well as housing, and within the City this Plan Area sits within a regionally-recognized Priority Development Area that is particularly ideal for jobs compared to other parts of the City and region. The success of the region in meeting its state-mandated environmental (i.e., GHG) goals and its mobility goals hinges on directing job growth to these transit-served areas.

While accommodating the growth of jobs is important, it is just as important that these are “good jobs” that pay a living wage. Many of the office jobs in the tech sector and even the PDR jobs are certain to be good jobs, particularly in that they pay well relative to education. However, it is important that the City supports good jobs across all sectors, including construction workers, hotel workers, and other professions.

**Policy 3.1.1** Require non-residential uses in new development on large parcels.

Many of the parcels of land in Central SoMa are quite large – reflecting its industrial heritage. And like industrial development of the past, modern companies seek buildings with large floors, which facilitate flexibility and intra-company communication. Given the limited availability of such large parcels in the city near excellent local and regional transit, and the need to identify appropriate transit-served space for job growth, the City should promote non-residential development at these locations. Even if circumstances, such as market or broader regulatory factors, require forgoing near-term development on these major parcels, ensuring that these parcels are “land-banked” for significant jobs-oriented development is a necessary long-term strategy for the economic and environmental health of the city and region. These large parcels need not be exclusively non-residential, but they should feature a significant percentage (e.g. at least half) of non-residential and job space.

**Policy 3.1.2** Limit restrictions on non-residential development.

Central SoMa includes areas whose zoning precludes non-residential development beyond ground floor.
retail, so as to direct new development towards being residential. While housing is still appropriate in these locations, the City should support the development of significant non-residential uses in these areas as well, given their adjacency to the downtown and to excellent transit (including Central Subway and Caltrain).

**Policy 3.1.3** Support living wage jobs across all sectors.

The City already implements multiple programs that facilitate living wage jobs for workers. This includes job training programs to help prepare local residents for jobs in growing sectors such as construction, health care, hospitality, and technology. This also includes the City’s First Source Hiring Program (which requires that developers, contractors, and employers utilize good faith efforts toward employing economically disadvantaged San Franciscan residents in new entry-level positions on applicable projects) and Local Hire program (that requires hiring of local residents for locally-funded construction projects). The City should continue to implement such policies and programs, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal, such as working to support unionization of hotel workers and implementation of 2017 Assembly Bill 73, which allows streamlined approval of certain residential projects that pay prevailing wage to construction workers.

**OBJECTIVE 3.2**

**SUPPORT THE GROWTH OF OFFICE SPACE**

About 60 percent of all jobs in the city are located in offices – and the percentage is growing (in keeping with national trends). There is a wide range of jobs that utilize office space, including technology, non-profits (civic, advocacy, community service, research), legal, finance, and the administrative side of all industries, just to name a few. Additionally, a lot of other jobs, including many scientific and “hands-on” kinds of jobs depend on significant amounts of office space as part of their operations to function effectively.

**Policy 3.2.1** Facilitate the growth of office.

The City should support the development of office space in Central SoMa. Office space typically has a high amount of jobs per square foot, and thus benefits from proximity to the neighborhood’s excellent transit. This office space can also support the success of these knowledge-sector companies that are driving the overall economy (including the need for local-serving jobs throughout the city, like health care, education, and retail). Increasing the supply of office space will also support non-profits and other organizations that have been challenged to find space in the city, forcing some to move elsewhere in the Bay Area (such as Oakland) or out of the region altogether.
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In the past 10 years the City has exhibited renewed commitment to its PDR sector.

**OBJECTIVE 3.3**

ENSURE THE REMOVAL OF PROTECTIVE ZONING DOES NOT RESULT IN A LOSS OF PDR IN THE PLAN AREA

The production, distribution, and repair (PDR) sector is critical to San Francisco. Companies in the PDR sector tend to provide high-paying jobs for people without a four-year college degree. PDR also provides economic diversity and therefore greater ability to weather recessions. PDR companies also serve the needs of local residents and businesses – after all, you cannot offshore your auto repair or your parcel delivery service.

As discussed above, SoMa’s legacy is as a home for blue-collar jobs. Over the decades, the nature of the economy – local, regional and national – has changed, being more service-oriented than production-oriented. The PDR sector in Central SoMa is emblematic of the neighborhood’s cultural history.

**Policy 3.3.1** Maintain existing zoning that restricts non-PDR development in certain locations.

Central SoMa contains substantial areas that protect PDR uses by not allowing office or housing. As discussed in Goal #1, the Plan is proposing to allow new development in much of this area. However, the City should maintain some of this PDR-protective zoning along the freeway west of 4th Street, because of its proximity to other PDR areas to the west and lot configuration and location that is challenging for other development.

**Policy 3.3.2** Limit conversion of PDR space in formerly industrial districts.

The Central SoMa Plan is intended to facilitate the development of new construction of housing and office in areas where they currently are not allowed. However, where existing buildings are to remain in these areas, the City requires (through approval of Proposition X in 2016) that some amount of PDR space are maintained. Similarly, when new buildings are constructed, the City requires that some amount of replacement PDR space is provided. The City should continue to maintain the requirement to maintain and/or provide PDR space.

**Policy 3.3.3** Require PDR space as part of large commercial development.

Given the amount of new development expected, maintaining the existing PDR presence in Central SoMa will necessitate requiring PDR space as part of new development, regardless of whether PDR space exists on the site prior to redevelopment. Such PDR space can be designed to be highly compatible with large commercial space, given the larger floors, building materials that are less conductive of sound and vibration, and higher tolerance for truck deliveries at all hours. The City should consider alternative means of satisfying this requirement, such as allowing...
off-site construction of PDR space and/or protection of existing PDR space at risk of displacement due to being located in districts that do not protect PDR.

**Policy 3.3.4** Provide incentives to fund, build, and/or protect PDR.

Existing measures to support PDR include protecting industrial land, providing technical and real estate assistance to PDR businesses, funding arts organizations and programs through the existing 1% Art Program’s Public Art Trust, and supporting new construction through creative mechanisms that leverage local and federal funding. The City should continue its commitment to the PDR sector, and explore new strategies to build and/or protect PDR space, such as requiring higher ceiling heights in development containing PDR.

**OBJECTIVE 3.4**

**FACILITATE A VIBRANT RETAIL ENVIRONMENT THAT SERVES THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY**

Central SoMa already contains a diversity of retail uses, including stores, restaurants, and personal services like beauty salons and dry cleaners. These help meet the needs of residents, workers, and visitors. They also provide a level of positive activity on the streets that make them safer and more pleasant.

**Policy 3.4.1** Allow retail throughout the Plan Area.

Currently, retail uses can be located anywhere in the Plan Area, and this allowance should continue.

**Policy 3.4.2** Require ground-floor retail along important streets.

Retail uses are currently required at the ground floors of buildings on 4th Street between Bryant and Townsend Streets, and on 6th Street between Market and Folsom Streets. The City should extend this requirement along important pedestrian thoroughfares, including Folsom Street and the rest of 4th Street.

**Policy 3.4.3** Support local, affordable, community-serving retail.

One of the many unique characteristics of the neighborhood is its diversity of retail offerings, in terms of types, prices, and independence. By contrast, new development often will seek to fill its retail space with chain stores, businesses aimed at higher income clientele, and/or businesses that cater to tourists and other visitors. While such uses have a place in the neighborhood, the City should ensure that there is also space for those retail uses that are local, contribute to neighborhood character, affordable, and/or community serving. This should be done by considering limitations on formula retail and stand-alone big box stores and by requiring micro-retail in larger development sites.

Hotels can make very good neighbors, providing lively ground floors, near 24-hour activity, and customers for local shops and restaurants.
Policy 3.5.1 Allow hotels throughout the growth-oriented parts of the Plan Area.

Currently, there are parts of the Plan Area where hotels are not permitted, even if they otherwise allow residential and commercial growth. Where hotels are permitted, they are typically restricted to “boutique” sizes of 75 rooms or less. However, the City is in need of multiple new hotels to meet demand, particularly new “conference sized” hotels of at least 500 rooms plus meeting facilities. As such, the City should support increasing the area where hotels are permissible to include those areas where new growth is anticipated, and to remove the cap on room count.

Objective 3.6 Recognize the importance of nightlife uses in creating a complete neighborhood

Nightlife is an essential part of what makes San Francisco a lively, world-class city. SoMa has a long tradition of being a destination for nightlife, reflecting its central location and industrial legacy with flexible building types, historically cheaper rents and relatively fewer residential neighbors. Even as the neighborhood evolves, it is important to ensure that these uses can continue to thrive as a place for people to have fun, while being mindful of the potential for conflicts between these and sensitive uses like housing.

Objective 3.5 Support development of hotels

Hotels are important to the wellbeing of San Francisco – enabling our tourism sector to flourish while also supporting important civic functions through room taxes. Simultaneously, hotels can make very good neighbors, providing lively ground floors, near 24-hour activity, and customers for local shops and restaurants. Hotels are particularly important in Central SoMa, given the area’s proximity to the Moscone Convention Center and its transit accessibility.
FULFILLING THE VISION

Creating an economically diversified and lively jobs center in Central SoMa would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:

Supporting **social sustainability**
by ensuring a range of jobs for people of many backgrounds, education levels, and interests.

Supporting **economic sustainability**
by providing a diversified economy while simultaneously supporting our two biggest economic engines – knowledge-sector office jobs and tourism.

Supporting **environmental sustainability**
by providing a neighborhood where people can get to their jobs without driving and can meet nearly all of their needs locally, thereby minimizing the need for auto use.

---

**Policy 3.6.1** Allow nightlife where appropriate.

Currently, many nightlife uses are permitted in much of the Plan Area, including restaurants, bars, and venues for arts performances. Nightclubs are permitted in the area west of 4th Street and south of Harrison, and are permissible with a Conditional Use Permit in much of the rest of the neighborhood. The City should support continuing allowances for nightlife uses.
The present design of the major streets does not serve pedestrians well and will certainly not accommodate the pedestrian needs of the new residents, workers and visitors contemplated by this Plan.
Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit

CONTEXT

Central SoMa is served by a widely spaced grid of major streets that form large blocks, often subdivided by narrow streets and alleys in patterns that vary from block to block. While the narrow streets and alleys typically serve only very local needs, the continuous grid of major streets connects city neighborhoods and links the city to the region via Interstates 80, 280 and 101. The major streets in SoMa have multiple lanes, widely spaced traffic signals, and are often one-way – all strategies to move automobiles and trucks through the district at rapid speeds.

While the existing street pattern still works for traffic circulation in off-peak hours, as traffic congestion has worsened over the decades, these streets are now often snarled with automobiles, trucks, transit, and taxis/ridesharing services. The resulting traffic is a substantial source of air and noise pollution and disproportionate rates of traffic injury, degrading the quality of life for residents, workers and visitors to the area.

Whether at congested times or not, the present design of the major streets does not serve pedestrians well and will certainly not accommodate the pedestrian needs of the new residents, workers and visitors contemplated by this Plan. Design that primarily accommodates the needs of motor vehicles relegates the needs of people walking to a secondary status. The result is unsafe and unpleasant conditions for pedestrians: many sidewalks do not meet minimum city standards; signalized or even marked crosswalks are few and far between; many crosswalks at major intersections are closed to pedestrians; and long crossing distances increase exposure to traffic. The combination of high traffic speeds and volumes and poor pedestrian infrastructure is reflected in the high rate of pedestrian injuries seen throughout the Plan Area.

The existing conditions are also quite poor for people riding bicycles, and discourage others from cycling in this neighborhood. On most streets, bicycles are expected to share lanes with much heavier and faster moving motor vehicles. Where bicycle lanes exist, they place cyclists between moving traffic and parked cars and do not protect cyclists from right-turning vehicles at intersections. Insufficient facilities for people riding bicycles are reflected in the high rate of injuries to bicyclists seen throughout the Plan Area.
For people on transit, the story is more mixed. The Plan Area is well served by regional transit systems with dedicated rights-of-way, such as BART and Caltrain. Transit service to the neighborhood will be greatly improved with the completion of the Central Subway project, providing frequent and rapid north-south service through the heart of Central SoMa. Myriad local and regional bus lines serve the area. However, those buses that share the street network with other vehicles are often delayed by traffic.

As San Francisco continues to grow, conditions will only worsen unless substantial changes are made both to the design of the streets and to the way people travel. The Central SoMa Plan provides a timely opportunity to rethink how people get to and move through the neighborhood. Pedestrian improvements combined with traffic calming could enhance both livability and public health. With a comprehensive network of high-quality bicycle routes, the area’s flat topography and relatively good weather could encourage more bicycling, relieving some demand on transit and for additional car trips. The dense network of transit options makes the neighborhood a great candidate for even higher ridership, if proper measures are put into place to enhance the reliability and speed of transit. As well, while the neighborhood continues to grow, investment in additional capacity and new connections will be needed to enhance and expand the existing transit network to meet the needs of the future. All of these improvements rely on shifting the way people travel from private automobile into these other modes.

The goal of providing safe and convenient transportation in Central SoMa is admittedly daunting, considering the existing conditions. Fortunately, several other complementary strategies being implemented or undertaken by the City support this effort, in both the near and long term, including:

- The Better Streets Plan, which facilitates improvements to sidewalks and other pedestrian amenities;
- The Bicycle Plan, which delivers improvements in the bicycle network;
- Vision Zero, which provides infrastructure improvements at key locations designed to minimize conflicts between motor vehicles and people walking and bicycling;
- Muni Forward, which implements local transit improvements;
● The aforementioned Central Subway, which will connect BART and Caltrain (in addition to running from Chinatown to the Bayview)

● The electrification of Caltrain, which will facilitate more frequent service;

● The implementation of High Speed Rail service to San Francisco, creating convenient connections between the economic centers of the State; and

● The implementation of the City’s Transportation Demand Management program

Multiple major studies and transportation planning efforts will inform future transportation investment. These studies will identify future investments necessary to support the continued evolution of SoMa and prioritize the public benefit resources that come out of the Plan. These include:

● Connect SF: This effort, launched in 2016, will produce a 50-year vision of the City’s transportation network and will culminate in a new, updated Transportation Element of the General Plan and a refreshed set of major investment priorities.

● Core Capacity Study: This regional study led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was started in 2015. It is investigating near, medium and long-term strategies to meet the growing needs of transportation connections between San Francisco and the East Bay (i.e., the Transbay corridor) as well as core aspects of travel to and from the “Core” of San Francisco (which includes downtown, SoMa, and Mission Bay).
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EXISTING SIDEWALK WIDTHS

Diagrams are illustrative only and reflect the latest project designs as of the time of Plan adoption. Actual designs may change depending on future projects, and based on City and community feedback.
OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of providing safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit.

A transformation of the streets and sidewalk will be required to accommodate people on foot and give them enjoyable paths to travel, linger, shop, and socialize. Streets are not just for movement, but for slowing down to socialize and take in the rhythms of the City. A complete, high quality, walking network is necessary to make all aspects of the transportation system function well.

Policy 4.1.1 Ensure streets throughout the Plan Area are designed in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy.

Vision Zero is San Francisco’s road safety policy. The City adopted Vision Zero as a policy in 2014, committing to build better and safer streets, educate the public on traffic safety, enforce traffic laws, and adopt policy changes that save lives. The goal is to create a culture that prioritizes traffic safety and to ensure that mistakes on roadways do not result in serious injuries or death. The result of this collaborative citywide effort will be safer more livable streets as San Francisco works to eliminate traffic fatalities by 2024. Vision Zero recommends that streets be improved with safety treatments that include but are not limited to: new traffic signals; leading pedestrian intervals; paint treatments such as continental crosswalks; corner sidewalk extensions; turn restrictions; protected bicycle facilities and audible/accessible pedestrian signals. The City should implement all improvements in Central SoMa in keeping with the vision and strategies of Vision Zero, with particular focus on any High Injury Corridors.

Policy 4.1.2 Ensure sidewalks on major streets meet Better Streets Plan standards.

Adequate sidewalk width is an essential ingredient in making walking a safe, convenient, and attractive transportation option. In addition to accommodating pedestrian movement, sidewalks should be
Figure 4.2
ADOPTED CURB CUT RESTRICTIONS

Diagrams are illustrative only and reflect the latest project designs as of the time of Plan adoption. Actual designs may change depending on future projects, and based on City and community feedback.
wide enough for amenities such as trees or other landscaping and fixed or moveable seating. The Better Streets Plan recommends fifteen feet as the optimal sidewalk width for most major streets in the Plan Area, with twelve feet as the minimum. Some locations that attract extremely high pedestrian volumes (e.g., next to transit stops or large office buildings) should have even wider sidewalks than fifteen feet in order to maintain safe and pleasant walking conditions. Most major streets in the Plan Area do not meet even the minimum recommended sidewalk width. The City should improve the major streets such that they all meet Better Streets Plan standards.

Policy 4.1.3 Prohibit new curb cuts on key major streets and limit them elsewhere.

In sensitive places, access to parking and loading degrades the pedestrian experience, transit operations, bicyclist safety, and general circulation. Additionally, curb cuts remove valuable sidewalk space for trees, bicycle parking, landscaping, and other amenities. For these reasons, curb cuts should be limited along major streets, and off-street parking and loading should be accessed from alleys and narrow streets, where conflicts are reduced.

Policy 4.1.4 Provide signalized crosswalks across major streets.

Long distances between crosswalks inconvenience people walking and reduce the viability and attractiveness of walking as a transportation option. They also provide powerful incentives for some pedestrians to risk crossing against traffic, and are thus a serious safety concern. The current practice of providing signalized crosswalks at intersections of two major streets means that crosswalks are usually over 800 feet apart on major east-west streets, and 550 feet apart on major north-south streets. North of Market Street, an area renowned worldwide for its walkability, crosswalks are at most 425 feet apart in the east-west direction and not more than 275 feet apart in the north-south direction. To create a more pedestrian-friendly environment, the City should provide an additional signalized crosswalk roughly halfway between each major intersection, wherever possible. This would produce distances between crosswalks roughly equivalent to those found north of Market Street. In addition, providing crosswalks at the intersections of major and narrow streets would enhance the role of the narrow streets in the pedestrian network.

Policy 4.1.5 Ensure there are crosswalks at all signalized intersections.

Several signalized intersections of major streets in the area prohibit people walking from crossing one leg of the intersection, resulting in inconvenient and potentially unsafe detours for pedestrians in dense areas and along major corridors, such as 3rd and 4th Streets. Existing City policy recommends opening such closed crosswalks. The City should open closed crosswalks in the Plan Area whenever possible.
New crosswalk

New crosswalk proposed in other plans and projects

Closed crosswalks at existing signalized intersection, to be opened

Existing crosswalks across major streets at minor streets

(existing crosswalks at the intersection of two major streets are not shown)
Policy 4.1.6 Ensure there are safe intersections at freeway ramps.

The Plan Area has five freeway ramps: four serving I-80 at each intersection of 4th, 5th, Harrison, and Bryant Streets, and one serving I-280 at 6th and Brannan. Each of these intersections presents challenges, as cars used to traveling unobstructed at rapid speeds suddenly enter a street grid with more complex traffic patterns and must be attentive to people walking and bicycling. The City should work with Caltrans to improve these transitions to better serve the needs of all modes of transportation.

Policy 4.1.7 Provide corner sidewalk extensions to enhance pedestrian safety at crosswalks, in keeping with the Better Streets Plan.

Sidewalk corner extensions (“bulb-outs”) shorten the length of crosswalks and make pedestrians waiting to cross more visible to drivers. The Better Streets Plan recommends installing sidewalk corner extensions on certain street types to enhance safety and to provide additional space for amenities such as benches and landscaping. The City should work to implement this recommendation of the Better Streets Plan.

Policy 4.1.8 Ensure safe and convenient conditions on narrow streets and alleys for people walking.

SoMa’s narrow streets and alleys provide an important, quieter alternative to walking on the busier major streets. Yet many of these streets do not have inviting environments for people on foot, including insufficient (or even absent) sidewalks. On these streets, the City should enhance and improve the experience for people walking.

Policy 4.1.9 Ensure there are street trees and street furnishings on sidewalks wherever possible, in keeping with the Better Streets Plan.

Landscaping and street furnishings, such as fixed or moveable seating, are important in creating an inviting environment for walking and public life. The Better Streets Plan discusses strategies for locating amenities to create attractive and functional pedestrian environments. The City should continue implementing its recommendations in the Plan Area.
Figure 4.4
EXISTING AND PROPOSED BICYCLE LANES

Central SoMa Plan
- Proposed two-way bikeway
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Other Proposed Projects
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*Existing and proposed bicycle network assumes two-way Folsom and Howard streets.
Policy 4.1.10 Expand the pedestrian network wherever possible through creation of new narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections.

Existing City policy and zoning regulations require midblock paths through large lots in certain zoning districts. These requirements should be retained where they exist and extended to any new zoning districts created in Central SoMa.

Policy 4.1.11 Use public art, lighting, and other amenities to improve the pedestrian experience beneath elevated freeways.

The unwelcoming environment beneath the freeway creates an imposing physical and psychological barrier that divides the Plan Area into two halves. This noisy, dark, car-dominated environment makes walking from one side of the freeway to the other an uninteresting or even intimidating experience. The City should use public art, enhanced lighting, and other streetscape amenities to help improve this dreary condition. To facilitate the addition of art, the City should also encourage new development to locate their required public art in this area.

Central SoMa is well situated for bicycle travel, and has a much higher bicycle mode share than other parts of the City.

Objective 4.2

Make cycling a safe and convenient transportation option throughout the Plan Area for all ages and abilities

As a mode of transportation, bicycles have many advantages: they require no fuel, produce no emissions, and facilities to accommodate their use are generally less expensive and space intensive than other transportation modes. Central SoMa (and SoMa in general) is flat, sunny, and well situated for bicycle travel, and thus has a much higher bicycle mode share than other parts of the City despite poor cycling infrastructure. The use of bicycles can be increased with the provision of a comprehensive network of safe and convenient bike routes, as well as destination amenities such as secure parking and shower facilities.

Policy 4.2.1 Ensure that the bicycle network is in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy and Bicycle Strategy.

Within the Plan Area, as of 2017 there are bicycle lanes on 2nd, Howard, Folsom, and Townsend Streets. These bicycle routes within and leading to the Plan Area should be provided with best-practice safety features in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy and Bicycle Strategy, including but not limited to protected bicycle lanes, dedicated signals at signaled intersections, turn boxes, and high-performance pavement materials and signage.

Policy 4.2.2 Minimize gaps in the existing bicycle network by providing bicycle routes through the Plan Area, designed for safety in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy and Bicycle Strategy.

In order to ensure that cycling is an attractive transportation option, people must be able to cycle close to their destination safely. In the north-south...
Proposed dedicated transit lanes assume one-way Folsom and Howard streets, showing transit lines as proposed in the Transit Effectiveness Project. Transit on Market, Mission and Townsend Streets is not shown.

Diagrams are illustrative only and reflect the latest project designs as of the time of plan adoption. Actual designs may change depending on future projects, and based on City and community feedback.
direction, the bicycle network as of 2017 includes two-way facilities on 2nd and 5th Streets, which are more than half a mile apart. Given the density of housing, jobs and visitor destinations in the area, this gap should be filled with new routes on 3rd and/or 4th Streets. In the east-west direction, the bicycle network as of 2017 includes two-way facilities on Townsend Street and on the Folsom/Howard couplet, which similarly are more than half a mile apart. This gap should be filled, potentially with a new two-way route on Brannan Street. All new bicycle routes should be provided with state-of-the-art safety features in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy and Bicycle Strategy, with particular focus on any High Injury Corridors, including but not limited to protected cycle tracks, dedicated signals at signaled intersections, turn boxes, and high-performance pavement materials and signage.

**Policy 4.2.3** Minimize gaps in the existing bicycle network by providing bicycle routes through the Plan Area, designed for safety in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy and Bicycle Strategy.

In addition to safe and convenient cycling routes, increasing the proportion of trips taken by bicycles depends on other supportive facilities including bicycle parking. The City should study additional methods for increasing on- and off-street bicycle parking. Space needs for bike-sharing stations should also be considered a key component in the design of streets as well as major new developments and open spaces.

Public transportation is fundamental to accommodating the movement of large populations of workers and residents to, within and through the City.

**Policy 4.3.1** Provide a robust network of lanes that are exclusively for transit.

Dedicated transit lanes expedite surface transit movement, improve transit travel time, and support more efficient operating costs by allowing for more reliable and consistent headways, especially during peak hours. Existing dedicated transit lanes within the plan area are located along portions of 3rd, 4th...
and Mission Streets. The City should provide new dedicated transit lanes on other major streets in the Plan Area as necessary. Such dedicated transit lanes should be designed with “self-enforcing” elements, wherever possible, to discourage or prevent use by unauthorized private vehicles. These include curbs, channelizers and colored or textured pavements.

**Policy 4.3.2** Support funding for maintaining a state of good repair of the existing fleet and infrastructure.

As the Plan Area develops, it will contain a higher percentage of the city’s jobs and residents than it does today. As such, it should contribute commensurately to ensuring that the existing fleet and infrastructure is able to move those workers and residents throughout the city.

**Policy 4.3.3** Support funding to implement the Muni Forward program.

The Muni Forward program is the City’s ongoing effort to modernize and rationalize the transit system, including an emphasis on the most heavily traveled lines. Many of these heavily traveled lines serve Central SoMa. As such, new development in the Plan Area should contribute their share towards implementing the Muni Forward program.

**Policy 4.3.4** Support funding to meet future needs for local and regional transit service to the Plan Area.

As a jobs center, a substantial portion of workers coming to Central SoMa will do so from the surrounding counties. Many of these workers will rely on transit systems that even today are facing capacity constraints – including BART, which is the regional transit workhorse, especially in the Transbay corridor. Caltrain too, which directly serves the Plan Area, is straining under booming ridership. As such, development in Central SoMa should support necessary transit investments, serving as a source of local money to advance critical improvements in expanding service and capacity to serve SoMa and to leverage larger regional, state, and federal contributions for major projects.

**Policy 4.3.5** Study adjustment of transit services to serve the demand from the increase in jobs and housing in the neighborhood.

As the area develops, transit service needs are likely to evolve as well. As such, the City should study adjustments to the transit network and levels of service to the Plan Area to ensure that it adequately serves evolving needs, particularly in the area south of the freeway, which is expected to experience the most growth and transformation from low-intensity to high-density uses.

**Strategies should also provide incentives to choose more sustainable modes of transportation.**

**OBJECTIVE 4.4**

**ENCOURAGE MODE SHIFT AWAY FROM PRIVATE AUTOMOBILE USAGE**

Implementing the Objectives above can provide the physical improvements necessary to encourage efficient and environmentally sustainable modes of transportation, and commensurate reduction in private automobile trips. This mode shift will also require providing only as much parking as is appropriate for the urban context and availability of transportation alternatives. Other strategies should also provide incentives to choose more sustainable modes of transportation.
**Policy 4.4.1** Limit the amount of parking in new development.

The availability and price of parking play an important role in individual mode choice – plentiful and cheap parking encourages automobile use. Existing off-street parking maximums should be retained and strengthened, reflective of the plentiful availability of transit options and investments planned and underway.

**Policy 4.4.2** Utilize Transportation Demand Management strategies to encourage use of alternatives to the private automobile.

The City has successfully used Transportation Demand Management (TDM) tools in the downtown area to achieve very high pedestrian, transit and bicycle mode shares, and in 2017 expanded TDM requirements to the whole city. Development in Central SoMa should employ TDM measures for all new development, such as parking management and pricing, free or discounted transit passes, coordination of private shuttle services, and coordination of car sharing and bicycle sharing distribution, discounts, and related programs.

**OBJECTIVE 4.5**

**ACCOMMODATE REGIONAL, THROUGH, AND DELIVERY TRAFFIC WHERE NECESSARY, BUT MITIGATE THE IMPACTS OF SUCH TRAFFIC ON LOCAL LIVABILITY AND CIRCULATION**

For the foreseeable future, some streets in Central SoMa will serve as citywide and regional auto connections, mainly because of their relation to freeway access points. There is also pressure on the streets caused by demand from ride sharing and e-commerce. These important demands on the street should be balanced with other necessary street functions.

**Policy 4.5.1** Maintain the ability of certain streets to accommodate through-traffic while ensuring they meet minimum needs for safety and comfort of all road users.

Bryant and Harrison Street should continue to accommodate through-traffic in SoMa. However, increasing livability and protecting local circulation on these streets may require some reduction in vehicle capacity, a reduction that may to a certain extent be balanced by shifting local travel to other modes.
Policy 4.5.2 Design buildings to accommodate delivery of people and goods with a minimum of conflict.

The movement of people and goods will continue to be important in the neighborhood. The rise of ride sharing has created new demands to accommodate convenient loading at both residential and non-residential buildings. The uptick in internet sales means residential buildings will need to accommodate increased deliveries. Additionally, Central SoMa will continue to be a neighborhood with many businesses, and these businesses will need loading capacity for goods. All of these trends are supportive of the goal of enabling people to live without private automobiles. The City should ensure that loading is considered and prioritized in the context of street redesign projects and on-street parking management. Off-street loading facilities, particularly for larger projects, should not compromise the interface of buildings with the public realm.
FULFILLING THE VISION

Providing safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:

Supporting **social sustainability** by enabling people to move within and through the neighborhood safely, conveniently, and (if they choose), inexpensively.

Supporting **economic sustainability** by enabling people to get to and from work efficiently.

Supporting **environmental sustainability** by reducing emissions of greenhouse gas and other air pollutants by reducing the amount of miles traveled by vehicles in the Plan Area.
The Central SoMa Plan presents an excellent opportunity to build new parks and recreational facilities, provide the funding to maintain them, and the activity to keep them well used.
GOAL FIVE

Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities

CONTEXT

Central SoMa currently suffers from a shortage of public parks and recreational opportunities relative to number of residents, workers and visitors to the area. This is largely due to its industrial history. Within the Plan Area there is only one outdoor recreational space: South Park. There are also smaller indoor and outdoor passive spaces as well as private indoor gyms. Importantly, there are three large public facilities just outside the Plan Area that serve the people of Central SoMa: Yerba Buena Gardens, Gene Friend Recreation Center, and Victoria Manalo Draves Park. Given the superior public transit in Central SoMa, area residents have access to a broad range of other recreational opportunities in the City. However, given the length of blocks and limited number of facilities, substantial portions of the Plan Area lack easy access to playgrounds, public sports courts, and quiet spaces for more contemplative activities.

By increasing the population in Central SoMa, the need for parks and recreational opportunities will only increase. Fortunately, the Central SoMa Plan presents an excellent opportunity to build new parks and recreational facilities, provide the funding to maintain them, and the activity to keep them well used. Seizing these opportunities will require dedicated and strategic focus.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of offering an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 5.1

MAXIMIZE THE BENEFIT PROVIDED BY EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

The existing parks in and around Central SoMa, though modest in size, provide important resources. However, they will need investment to enhance their long-term viability. It is also likely that new parks and recreational opportunities will not be built until several years after adoption of the Plan. Therefore, it is necessary to ensure that existing parks and recreational centers are optimized.

Policy 5.1.1 Support funding for the rehabilitation of Gene Friend Recreation Center.

The Gene Friend Recreation Center is a park and recreational center at the northwest corner of 6th and Folsom Streets, just outside the Plan Area. It serves the residents and workers of SoMa with...
indoor and outdoor basketball, weight room, lawn area, playground, and indoor space for dancing, art, and events. The Recreation and Parks Department is currently developing a renovation plan to update the facilities and increase capacity. As an important resource for the community, new development in Central SoMa should contribute to the funding of this important project.

Policy 5.1.2 Support funding for improved programming at Victoria Manalo Draves Park.

Victoria Manalo Draves Park lies half a block west of the Plan Area between Folsom and Harrison Streets. At 2.5 acres, the park is the largest green space in the SoMa neighborhood and enjoys abundant sunlight due to its southern orientation and wide street frontages. Despite the opportunity, it is currently not being utilized to its full potential, often due to a lack of programming and other forms of activation. Added density will increase the demand for outdoor recreation and green spaces. To best utilize this resource, new development in Central SoMa Plan should contribute funding to the programming and reconfiguration of this park in order to maximize active uses.

Policy 5.1.3 Explore funding for the rehabilitation of Yerba Buena Gardens.

Yerba Buena Gardens the name for a series of parks, recreational spaces, and cultural amenities built atop the Moscone Convention Center, spanning the two blocks between 3rd Street and 4th Street from Mission Street to Folsom Street, as well as additional space north on the north side of Mission Street. Recreational amenities in Yerba Buena Gardens include large plazas, lawns, gardens, a playground, a bowling alley, a skating rink, and a historic carousel. These amenities directly serve the northern part of the Plan Area, in addition to being a regional and even international attraction.
At the time of the writing of this Plan in 2017, responsibility for maintenance, capital investment, and operations of Yerba Buena Gardens is being transferred from the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (successor to the Redevelopment Agency) to other City agencies. This transfer includes the loss of some existing funding streams and uncertainty about future funding streams. As the City identifies and implements funding strategies for Yerba Buena Gardens, it should explore the role of new development in Central SoMa in contributing to the lasting wellbeing of this world-class attraction.

**Policy 5.1.4** Explore additional strategies to fund existing parks and recreation centers.

In addition to City money, there are often other sources available to fund existing parks and recreation centers. This includes federal and state funding, as well as other grants and potential partnerships. The City should explore ways to receive this money in support of the parks and recreation centers that serve Central SoMa.

**OBJECTIVE 5.2**

**CREATE NEW PUBLIC PARKS**

New public parks in Central SoMa are needed to provide much needed green space, a respite from the busy streets, and opportunities for active recreation for children, adults, and even dogs.

**Policy 5.2.1** Create a new public park in the highest growth portion of the Plan Area.

Most of the new development of jobs and housing proposed by the Plan is slated to occur in the southwest portion of the Plan Area, generally between the I-80 freeway and Townsend Street west of 3rd Street. Currently, this area does not have any public parks. The City has identified an opportunity for a park on the block bounded by 4th, 5th, Bryant, and Brannan Streets making use of the publicly-owned parcel at 639 Bryant Street, which is used by SFPUC as a storage lot. A park on the interior of this site could, like South Park, be accessed by numerous streets and alleys and activated by adjacent uses such as ground floor retail and PDR. The City should work towards the creation of a park at this location.

**Policy 5.2.2** Create a new linear park along Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Street.

Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets offers an opportunity to repurpose underutilized street right-of-way as a new park. Bluxome Street is functionally an alley and does not serve major circulation purposes, but is extraordinarily wide (70’) compared to other SoMa alleys (typically 35’-40’). The wide street is currently devoted primarily to angled parking. The City should rebalance the right-of-way allocation by expanding the pedestrian area on one side of the street and consolidating the vehicular area to two lanes of traffic and one parallel parking lane. This would allow nearly one-half acre of open space to be created on the block. Coordination with the adjacent development will provide a strong connection to this space and help make it successful.
Policy 5.2.3 Pursue the creation of a large new park within or near Central SoMa to serve the burgeoning greater SoMa area.

In many neighborhoods, a large multi-acre park serves as the common gathering and recreational center for the whole community and helps define the neighborhood (e.g., Washington Square for North Beach, Alamo Square for the Western Addition, Bernal Heights Park for Bernal, and Dolores Park for the Mission and Castro). These Parks provide relief from the urban environment that only a large space can. Yerba Buena Gardens and Victoria Manalo Draves currently play that role in SoMa, but as the neighborhood grows the need for a new large park will also grow. The City should pursue the creation of such a signature, neighborhood-defining park within the vicinity of Plan Area, such as on a portion of the Caltrain Railyards.

Policy 5.3.1 Increase the amount of public recreation center space, including the creation of a new public recreation center.

The Plan Area is presently served by the Gene Friend Recreation Center at 6th and Folsom just outside the Plan boundary. However, as the residential and worker population grows in the greater SoMa neighborhood, there will likely be demand for an additional Recreation Center. The City should pursue the creation of such a facility within or near the Plan Area to serve this expected demand and coordinate the amenities and offerings with those available at Gene Friend.

Policy 5.3.2 Develop public recreational facilities under the I-80 freeway.

There is currently ample unutilized land under I-80 between 4th and 6th Streets. With such projects as the SoMa West Skatepark and Dog Run, the City has demonstrated that a public recreational facility under a freeway can simultaneously meet the community’s recreational needs and create safer and more pleasant conditions for pedestrians. As such, the City should work with Caltrans to pursue the potential for providing similar facilities underneath I-80.

OBJECTIVE 5.3 CREATE NEW PUBLIC RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Public recreational facilities, such as spaces for athletics and cultural activities, are essential outlets for residents and workers to engage in fun, exercise and stimulating activity. Facilities for active recreation, such as basketball courts and skateparks, can be located in parks, but they can also be in buildings or other spaces not suitable for traditional neighborhood parks. As such, with forethought and creativity, there are more opportunities for incorporating recreational facilities into this highly urban area.
OBJECTIVE 5.4

UTILIZE THE STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR ADDITIONAL GREEN SPACES, GATHERING AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

In a dense neighborhood such as Central SoMa, it is important to utilize every opportunity to provide respites and gathering spaces. One opportunity to do so is by utilizing space on the narrow streets and alleys, including new mid-block connections.

**Policy 5.4.1** Where appropriate, promote pedestrian-only or shared-street design concepts for narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections.

Central SoMa’s narrow-streets and alleys are important for pedestrian circulation, but often carry a low volume of cars. Even more of these public rights-of-way will be created as part of the development of large parcels in the Plan Area. Where appropriate, these areas should be designed to be pedestrian-only or “shared streets,” where vehicular use is minimized. On such streets, the City should increase green spaces and provide amenities for gathering, such as benches and tables. Where streets are fully pedestrian-only, the City could provide additional recreational amenities, such as playgrounds.

Privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) have been a staple of the downtown for over 30 years, providing important gathering places and interesting public spaces.

**Policy 5.4.2** Improve 2nd and Folsom Streets as Green Connections per the City’s Green Connections Plan.

The Green Connections plan aims to increase access to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront by envisioning a network of “green connectors” – city streets that will be upgraded to make it safer and more pleasant to travel to parks by walking, biking, and other forms of active transportation. Within the Central SoMa plan area, 2nd and Folsom Streets are identified as Green Connections. These streets should be improved in accordance with the Green Connections Design Toolkit.

POPOS in Downtown. Photo by Petar Iliev, SF Planning.

POPOS in Downtown. Photo by Petar Iliev, SF Planning.
OBJECTIVE 5.5
AUGMENT THE PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION NETWORK WITH PRIVATELY-OWNED PUBLIC OPEN SPACES (POPOS)

Planning Code requirements adopted in the Eastern Neighborhoods in 2008 require all non-residential development to provide open space, but unlike the Downtown, none of this space has been required to be publicly accessible. By contrast, privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) have been a staple of the downtown for over 30 years, providing important gathering places and interesting public spaces. However, by nature of their upper-floor location and limited hours, their primary function has been to serve the daytime needs of downtown office workers. The Recreation and Open Space Element, updated in 2014, specifically recommends expanding the POPOS requirements outside the Downtown to other mixed use areas, like Central SoMa, in order to augment the open space and recreation system.

Policy 5.5.1 Require new non-residential development and encourage residential development to provide POPOS that address the needs of the community.

To help address the demand for parks and recreational amenities created by new development, POPOS should be required in new non-residential development and encouraged in new residential development. These POPOS should be designed to help meet the needs of the community through such strategies as being at street level, inviting, open extended hours, and featuring needed amenities like play areas, community gardens and dog runs. The City should preference that these POPOS be open to the sky, except where there are particularly unpleasant environmental conditions, the outdoor space would undermine the experience for people walking, or where they provide an active recreational amenity that will benefit from being indoors. POPOS can also contribute to the environmental sustainability goals by managing storm water and providing other environmental benefits.

OBJECTIVE 5.6
ENSURE THE NEIGHBORHOOD’S PARKS AND RECREATION OFFERINGS FUNCTION AS A NETWORK AND COMPLEMENT THE FACILITIES OF THE BROADER SOMA AREA

The implementation of the Objectives and Policies described above will result in a substantial increase in the amount of space dedicated to parks and recreational facilities within Central SoMa. To maximize their value to the community, it is important that these spaces function as a network that systematically addresses needs.

Policy 5.6.1 Design the parks and recreational opportunities in a systematic manner to serve the community’s needs.

There are many different needs that can be addressed by parks and recreation facilities. This includes playgrounds for children of varying age groups, fields and courts for playing sports, dog play areas, multi-purpose recreation buildings to serve a variety of activities, and passive spaces for multiple kinds of social gathering and personal time. The parks and
GOAL 5. PARKS AND RECREATION
The implementation of the Objectives and Policies above can offer an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities in Central SoMa.
FULFILLING THE VISION

Offering an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:

- **Supporting social sustainability** by providing places to gather, to exercise, and to gain a respite from a busy neighborhood.

- **Supporting economic sustainability** by facilitating healthy, and thus more productive, workers.

- **Supporting environmental sustainability** by increasing greenery, habitat, and space to implement other environmentally positive measures.

Recreational facilities currently serving Central SoMa should be programmed to address this diversity of needs that will continue to evolve with time, tastes, and population changes. This would entail developing and implementing a parks and recreation strategy for the Plan Area and/or larger South of Market area. This strategy could identify the neighborhood needs in the context of both existing and planned facilities and population, as well as identifying potential locations to meet these needs.
Central SoMa is poised to become a truly sustainable (healthy, green, efficient), resilient, and regenerative neighborhood—an “Eco-District” where urban development gives more to the environment than it takes.
Central SoMa is poised to become a truly sustainable (healthy, green, efficient), resilient, and regenerative neighborhood where urban development gives more to the environment than it takes. In such a community, buildings use 100 percent greenhouse gas-free energy (much of it generated within the neighborhood); carbon emissions and fossil fuels are completely eliminated; non-potable water is captured, treated, and re-used within the district to conserve potable water and eliminate waste; nature is a daily experience, with greening and biodiversity thriving on streets, buildings, and parks; and zero solid waste is sent to the landfill.

To achieve this bold vision, the City is committed to advancing livability and environmental performance through innovative and neighborhood-scale systems, projects, and programs. Creative partnerships between residents, organizations, businesses, and government entities help ensure sustainability targets are achieved and progress is tracked over time. The results will be palpable to the daily experiences of people living, working, and visiting the neighborhood, and will place Central SoMa at the forefront of action on global climate change.

All of this will require an intentional and substantial shift from today’s conditions and business-as-usual approaches. At a time of ever-increasing awareness of the threats of climate change, considerable greenhouse gas emissions are generated from inefficient and fossil-fuel based energy use in buildings and vehicle transportation. While recent drought conditions have heightened concerns about the City’s water supply, a substantial amount continues to be wasted every day through inefficient use and disposal. Reflective of its industrial and auto-dominated history, the neighborhood is severely lacking in quality pedestrian environments and nature. With substantial low-lying areas built on fill, the neighborhood is also at risk from earthquakes and flooding, which could be exacerbated by sea level rise in the long term. And while the City is a world leader in waste diversion from landfills, there is still work to be done at the very local level to achieve our goal of zero waste.

Finally, Central SoMa has been identified by the State’s Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment’s Cal Enviroscreen tool as an area disproportionately exposed to and at risk from high pollution levels, in part because of its proximity to an elevated, regional freeway corridor. Because the area also includes a higher proportion of disadvantaged residents,
it is especially important that the Objectives and Policies of the Plan incorporate environmental justice considerations that help protect the community from poor health. These include efforts to improve air quality, as well to create public facilities, facilitate access to healthy food, provide safe and sanitary housing, promote physical activity, and foster civic engagement.

While the litany of environmental challenges is daunting, there is also tremendous opportunity in Central SoMa. Implementation of this Plan will result in a substantial number of new buildings, infrastructure investment, and public benefits within the Plan Area, leading to dramatic opportunities for significant improvements to environmental quality. Given current State and City regulations, new buildings are required to be greener and more resilient than buildings from earlier eras. However, additional cost-effective regulations for new development, such as living roofs and the use of 100 percent greenhouse gas-free electricity can help ensure that individual projects are environmentally sustainable and resilient to a degree that provides restorative benefits to the larger neighborhood. Similarly, implementation of this Plan will result in a re-envisioning of the streets, sidewalks, and open spaces of the Plan Area—not only to be more vibrant and safer, but also to complement the neighborhood’s environmental health and resilience. Strategies include the incorporation of beneficial elements, such as trees, green infrastructure for stormwater management, and energy efficient street lights. Finally, the Plan establishes a framework for innovation, to enable the latest and greatest technologies and design approaches to be applied to the built environment, like passive design and district-scale utility systems that service multiple buildings to heighten efficiencies.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES TO FULFILL THIS GOAL

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the Plan’s Goal of creating an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 6.1

DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY FOR CREATING AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE AND RESILIENT NEIGHBORHOOD

In many policy areas, the City is a national and global leader in environmental sustainability and resiliency. That being said, many of the City’s policies and programs are implemented independently from one another. Moving from current conditions to an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood will necessitate a huge shift in existing practices across a number of topic areas. Achieving this shift will require the establishment of a comprehensive strategy that can serve as a blueprint over many years of implementation. By focusing on the neighborhood scale, the City can be more targeted and opportunistic than citywide strategies, while benefiting from economies of scale not available at the level of the individual buildings. Coordinated
implementation can also leverage neighborhood-scale resources and expertise, by providing a platform for community members, institutions, and businesses to engage with city leaders and utility providers to meet ambitious sustainability goals and tangible quality of life improvements.

An environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood will necessitate a huge shift in existing practices.

**Policy 6.1.1** Create an implementing entity within the City.

Currently, numerous City departments are involved in implementing disparate strategies aimed at meeting San Francisco's myriad of environmental sustainability and resiliency goals. Neither the goals nor the strategies are typically neighborhood-specific or approached in relation to each other, so opportunities for efficiency and co-benefits are often missed. To ensure the effective implementation of the City's comprehensive strategy, an implementing entity should be identified within the City's government. This entity will be able to operate at the neighborhood level across all topic areas, and thus be able to identify possible synergies and unique opportunities that would not be apparent under the existing system. This team would work closely with all relevant agencies and community partners to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and to realize District-specific strategies.

**Policy 6.1.2** Provide guidance to private and public entities.

Effective implementation will require the ongoing participation of a number of public and private entities. To coordinate their actions, the City should create a sustainable neighborhoods guide, including the vision, objectives, policies, and implementation measures necessary to create an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood, as well as technical resources, precedents, and guidelines. Such a document should aim to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the issues and the strategies proposed to address them, whereas such information is currently diffused across multiple documents and agencies.
Policy 6.1.3 Ensure that environmental sustainability and resiliency is considered holistically in public investment decisions.

The City has multiple bodies designed to guide investment in public areas, including street improvements and the creation and improvement of parks. The City should make sure that the goal of environmental sustainability and resiliency is factored into all of these decisions for Central SoMa by including the implementing team into relevant processes, such as the Interagency Plan Implementation Team (IPIC) and the Streets Design Advisory Team (SDAT).

Policy 6.1.4 Ensure that property owners, developers, and tenants have the opportunity to maximize environmental sustainability and resilience.

The City has an important role in shaping new residential and commercial development to ensure that it meets development and design standards. The City should leverage its involvement in this process to provide advice, direction, and encouragement to new development to maximize its environmental sustainability and resilience. The City should also work proactively with owners of existing buildings as to their role in the neighborhood’s environmental sustainability and resiliency, including opportunities to invest in efficiency upgrades through green technologies and techniques, and to engage residents, workers, and visitors on how individual actions cumulatively have major impacts.

Policy 6.1.5 Continue to evolve the requirements and recommendations with changing needs and technologies.

Achieving true environmental sustainability and resiliency will require a major shift in the way we currently treat energy, water, refuse, landscaping, etc. In implementing this comprehensive strategy, it may become apparent that certain necessary strategies are not economically, physically, or technologically possible at a given time. However, there is rapid innovation occurring globally in the field of sustainability, as populations around the world struggle with similar issues as Central SoMa. As such, the City should continue to monitor changes in the field, educate partners, and upgrade requirements as necessary, to help fulfill the vision of this Goal.

Objective 6.2

Minimize Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Global climate change, caused by excess greenhouse gas emissions, may be the single largest environmental issue for the present century. It is already affecting weather patterns and ecosystems, causing sea level rise, and population migrations. No single entity is responsible for climate change, and no single entity can solve it—the collective action of billions of people across the planet is required.

About half of all greenhouse gas emissions in SF are produced by building systems and equipment.

Recognizing this concern, San Francisco has established aggressive goals for reduction of greenhouse gases. Compared to 1990 levels, the City already achieved its target of 20 percent reduction by 2012 and 25 percent reduction by 2017, and is seeking to reach 40 percent reduction by 2025 and 80 percent reduction by 2050. The City is aiming for all buildings to use 100 percent renewable electricity by 2030 and to reduce energy consumption in existing commercial buildings by 2.5 percent annually. The City also wants to shift transportation away from automobile usage,
having already met its goal that 50 percent of all trips within San Francisco be taken by other means by 2017, and seeking to reach 80 percent by 2050.

To help meet these targets, the City has instituted a suite of requirements. The City can build on these measures in Central SoMa through targeted strategies on buildings, utilities, and transportation. These additional measures are necessary to help San Francisco and the State meet its aggressive targets for reducing greenhouse gases. Increased greening in the Plan Area, as discussed under Objective 6.4 below, will also support the reduction of greenhouse gases.

**Policy 6.2.1** Maximize energy efficiency in the built environment.

In San Francisco, about half of all greenhouse gas emissions are produced by building systems and equipment (e.g., heating, cooling, appliances, lighting, etc.). The easiest way to reduce building emissions is by increasing the efficiency of energy use. As such, the City should continue implementing current measures for new and existing buildings, such as 1) requiring all newly constructed buildings (and major renovations) to meet or exceed California’s Title-24 Energy Code by up to 10 percent; 2) requiring all existing commercial buildings larger than 10,000 square feet of conditioned space to complete energy benchmarking, have an energy audit conducted by a qualified professional, and share key data about building performance with the City; and 3) requiring homes to be retrofit with energy efficiency measures at the time of sale. The City should also ensure that buildings have every opportunity to exceed existing requirements, and should seek new ways to further increase efficiency. The City should also ensure that street lighting is as efficient as possible.

**Policy 6.2.2** Maximize onsite renewable energy generation.

Renewable energy harnesses the sun, wind, and movement of water without depleting the source. The
field of local renewable energy generation is rapidly evolving, and solar energy is already an economically viable alternative to non-renewable energy sources such as fossil fuels. Recognizing this, the City recently passed legislation that requires most new development projects to include solar installations on 15 percent of their roof area (photo voltaic and/or solar thermal hot water). Because Central SoMa’s buildings and climates are especially suited to solar power, the City should expand this potential to larger roof areas and building facades. To exemplify the maximization of onsite renewable energy generation, the City could undertake a demonstration project on a public building within the Plan Area.

**Policy 6.2.3** Satisfy 100 percent of electricity demand using greenhouse gas-free power supplies.

After maximizing energy efficiency and onsite renewable energy generation, many buildings will still need to purchase electricity. Any purchase of electricity from greenhouse gas-emitting sources (coal, natural gas, etc.) will contribute to climate change, even if that electricity is generated far from San Francisco. As such, the City should require that buildings in Central SoMa purchase the remainder of their electricity from greenhouse gas-free power sources.

**Policy 6.2.4** Explore strategies to reduce fossil fuel use in buildings.

In addition to electricity, buildings use fossil fuels such as natural gas and oil for heating, cooling, and cooking. The City should explore economically viable alternatives to these fossil fuels, and potentially develop requirements for all-electric systems and/or use of renewable energy sources in lieu of these fossil fuels.

**Policy 6.2.5** Minimize transportation-based greenhouse gas emissions.

In San Francisco, moving people and goods generates about 40 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions. The City has already instituted numerous strategies to shift travel mode away from private automobiles, such as investing in new transportation infrastructure (e.g., the Central Subway and new bicycle lanes) and requiring large development to provide shuttles, transit passes, and/or other strategies to reduce driving, while simultaneously constraining supply through the reduction of parking allowed in new development. The City should continue implementing these measures. In addition, the City should seek ways to further minimize transportation-based greenhouse gas emissions in Central SoMa, such as facilitating electric vehicle use through the provision of ample charging stations and other infrastructure, and exploring ways to curb emissions from idling trucks.

**OBJECTIVE 6.3**

**MINIMIZE WATER WASTE**

The recent multi-year severe drought conditions in California only exacerbate the need to address the extreme inefficiencies of our current patterns of water use and vulnerability of our potable water supplies. Recognizing this, the City and State have both developed targets around water usage. The State has established a goal of 20 percent reduction in per capita water use by 2020 from the per capita urban water use in 2010—a target that San Francisco has already
achieved through strategies discussed in the policies below.

The Central SoMa Plan Area is well positioned to lead the City’s effort towards a more sustainable water policy.

The Central SoMa Plan Area is well positioned to lead the City’s effort towards a more sustainable water policy, due to factors such as:

- The large amount of new development that can utilize the best technologies and practices for water efficiency, as well as implement on-site infrastructure systems for non-potable water capture, storage, and re-use systems; both within individual buildings and ideally between multiple projects.

- The large number of streetscape projects will provide numerous opportunities to implement technologies and best practices for capturing, treating, and reusing stormwater as a non-potable water source for irrigation and street cleaning.

Policy 6.3.1 Efficiently use potable water.

Because there will always be a demand for potable water for drinking, bathing, and cooking, and because water is a precious resource, it is imperative that it is used in the most efficient way possible. The City already requires that all new buildings install efficient fixtures; that existing properties repair plumbing leaks and replace inefficient plumbing fixtures (toilets, urinals, faucets, and showerheads) with high-efficiency models by 2017 or upon major improvements; and that all projects with 1,000 square feet or more of new or modified landscape area design, install, and maintain efficient irrigation systems, utilize low water-use plantings, and calculate a water budget. The City should continue implementing these requirements, and should seek additional strategies to increase potable water efficiency and conservation in Central SoMa.

Policy 6.3.2 Increase non-potable water use in buildings.

Upwards of 75 percent of building functions do not require potable water, including toilet flushing, irrigation, and building cooling systems. Since 1991, the City has required new construction and major alterations in large parts of the city (including all of Central SoMa) to install dual plumbing (“purple pipes”) for use with future recycled water sources. In 2015 the City started requiring the largest of these buildings (250,000 square feet and greater) to start capturing and treating non-potable water onsite and utilizing it via the dual plumbing system, and for buildings 40,000 square feet or more to study the potential to do so. The City should continue these requirements, and seek ways to make this requirement more efficient by linking multiple buildings into the same non-potable system, an opportunity which is particular to Central SoMa due to the large scale of future development and the concentration of major new development in a small geographic area. The City should also explore

Non-potable water sources in a typical San Francisco building. Image courtesy of SFPUC.
additional ways to shift from potable to non-potable water use in building.

**Policy 6.3.3** Increase non-potable water use in parks, open spaces, sidewalks, and streets.

Landscaping and street cleaning are two water-intensive uses for which non-potable water could be substituted for potable water. In major public open spaces in Central SoMa, the City should capture and use stormwater for irrigation and toilet flushing. The City should also install sufficient non-potable water filling stations to satisfy all street cleaning needs in the neighborhood.

**OBJECTIVE 6.4**

**SUPPORT BIODIVERSITY, ACCESS TO NATURE, AND A HEALTHY ECOSYSTEM**

Reflecting its urbanized, industrial past, there is very little natural habitat or greening in Central SoMa. Nearly 90 percent of the neighborhood is covered in impervious surfaces, and there is substantially less tree coverage in SoMa than elsewhere in the city. Additionally, the existing plants in the Plan Area are generally not supportive of local wildlife, such as birds and butterflies. As a result, today’s residents, workers, and visitors have very little access to nature, which studies have shown is essential to mental and physical health and to human development.

The City has very few targets and programs regarding biodiversity and natural habitat. Present requirements of new development are limited to street tree planting and bird-safe building design. In Central SoMa, there is an opportunity to greatly surpass existing requirements, by maximizing the quantity and quality of greening in both public spaces and private property.

**Policy 6.4.1** Maximize greening of parks, streets, and other publicly-accessible spaces.

The City’s Urban Forest Plan seeks to maximize street trees and sidewalk gardens. The City’s Better Streets Plan already requires that new development provide street trees every 20 feet. The City should continue this policy, while following the Urban Forest Plan by filling in the gaps along street frontages where new development is not occurring. The City should pay special attention to greening efforts around the freeway corridor, which could provide substantial benefits in terms of air quality, habitat creation, and beautification. The City should also require
that open spaces are maximally greened, including within privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) that are to be provided as part of new commercial development.

Nearly 90 percent of the neighborhood is covered in impervious surfaces, and there is substantially less tree coverage in SoMa than elsewhere in the city.

Policy 6.4.2 Maximize greening of rooftops and walls.

Buildings cover well over half of the land in Central SoMa and typically have large flat roofs. Almost all the roofs and walls of these buildings are devoid of any plant life. This provides a tremendous opportunity for greening and biodiversity – particularly from new buildings, which can be designed appropriately to handle the logistics of watering and soil loads. The City should therefore require a substantial portion of the roofs of new buildings be “living,” including locally appropriate plants, open space, stormwater management, and urban agriculture. To demonstrate the feasibility and efficacy of such living roofs, the City should build a “demonstration” roof on a public building within the Plan Area. To maximize efficient use of space, the City should also encourage living walls on buildings wherever possible.

Policy 6.4.3 Ensure that greening supports habitat and biodiversity.

Supporting biodiversity and access to nature requires not only quantity of greening, but quality and location. As such, the City should ensure plantings in the neighborhood’s new buildings, open spaces, sidewalks, and streets are native, habitat supportive, and climate appropriate species. In addition, individual green areas should be planned with consideration of adjacent opportunities to create green connections and corridors. The City should also continue implementing its landmark bird-safe buildings standards.

OBJECTIVE 6.5 IMPROVE AIR QUALITY

San Francisco’s air quality has improved over the past decades, in part due to cleaner fuels and trends away from an industrial economy. Additionally, the State, region, and City have all developed regulations and implementation strategies to reduce impacts from a myriad of contaminants from a range of sources (such as vehicles, construction practices, and off-gassing materials). That being said, relative to other neighborhoods, Central SoMa has a high volume of emissions from car and truck traffic — both from its surface streets, which have been designed primarily for heavy vehicular traffic, and the elevated regional freeway that bisects it. There are also higher building emissions from diesel generators and fire pumps relative to less developed neighborhoods. Commensurately, the area has a higher incidence of air pollution-related hospitalization rates. Additionally, there is the potential for higher heat levels due to the
high concentrations of constructed, non-reflective surfaces and lack of greenery in the neighborhood. These areas continue to be concerns that the City should seek to address.

**Policy 6.5.1** Support a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

As discussed thoroughly in Goal #4, a key priority is to shift travel demand in Central SoMa towards transit and non-polluting modes such as walking and bicycling. While such measures are important to the efficiency, safety, and attractiveness of the transportation network, they simultaneously have a tremendous benefit in improving local air quality. The City should make sure that the air quality benefits of such transportation improvements are prominently featured in any discussion of the merits of these policies.

**Policy 6.5.2** Utilize greening to reduce pollution and heat.

In addition to beautification and biodiversity benefits, many trees and plants are natural filters for pollution and capable of absorbing heat. The City should therefore support substantial greening efforts in Central SoMa that maximize air quality improvements, as discussed under Objective 6.4 above.

**Policy 6.5.3** Improve air quality around the freeway.

Given the sheer volume of vehicles and its elevated nature, the area around the I-80 freeway continues to have the worst air quality in the Plan Area related to pollutants, including fine and ultra-fine particulate matter. The City should work diligently to improve the air quality in this area, through such measures as reducing emission sources, intensive greening in and around the corridor, and technological solutions, such as air filtering systems and material surfaces.

**Policy 6.5.4** Utilize healthier buildings materials and technologies that improve indoor and outdoor air quality.

Building materials and operations can off-gas toxins and pollutants that impact health. The City already has standards for building interiors that require the use of zero or low-emitting materials and requires enhanced filtration systems for areas of poor air quality, such as Central SoMa. The City should continue these policies, and should provide expertise to buildings in Central SoMa for regarding additional ways that buildings can support healthy indoor and outdoor air quality through filtration systems and other evolving technologies.

**Objective 6.6**

ENSURE A FLOOD-RESILIENT NEIGHBORHOOD

Flood resistant design guidelines should meet City goals of vibrant sidewalks and active ground floors.

Portions of Central SoMa already experience frequent urban flooding during extreme storms. Climate change is expected to exacerbate flooding by increasing the
severity of storms and by raising the overall sea level. Low-lying portions of Central SoMa (particularly the southwest portion of the Plan Area) are susceptible to both temporary flooding and permanent inundation. This area lies on the north shore of Mission Bay at the end of the historic Hayes Creek and marsh. Simultaneously, the area is adjacent to Mission Creek, which is expected to rise (along with the Bay) several feet by the end of the century and potentially place parts of Central SoMa below future sea level.

In part to reduce flooding impacts and avoid combined sewage discharges into the Bay, the SFPUC has been undertaking a $20 billion Sewer System Improvement Program. It will upgrade conventional piped systems (“grey infrastructure”) for reliability and regulatory compliance while implementing innovative “green infrastructure” projects (typically rain gardens and bioswales that use soil and plants to restore and mimic natural processes) to manage stormwater in a manner that creates healthier urban environments. In 2016, the City also released a Sea Level Rise Action Plan to establish a baseline understanding of end-of-century vulnerability and outline immediate next steps for improving the capacity to adapt in areas near the Bay and ocean. Both efforts recognize the need to improve local flood-resilience in Central SoMa, while pursuing larger citywide strategies and measures. In general, Central SoMa’s infill nature, with a mix of new and existing buildings, makes adaptation more complicated than at some of the City’s wholesale redevelopment sites along the waterfront.

**Policy 6.6.1** Develop a comprehensive sea level rise and flood management strategy for Central SoMa and adjacent at-risk areas.

To address risks to the neighborhood, the City should develop a comprehensive sea level rise and flooding strategy for Central SoMa and areas similarly affected by Mission Creek. This can be done as part of, or folded into, the City’s larger effort to create a citywide Adaption Plan for Sea Level Rise and Urban Flooding. It should include a hydrology study and a strategy for stormwater storage and conveyance, as well as design guidelines for flood-resistant buildings.

**Policy 6.6.2** Reduce building vulnerability to sea level rise and extreme storms.

The City already requires buildings to manage a portion of their stormwater on site, and to comply with City’s Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building and Subdivision standards. The City should continue to implement these requirements and efforts to reflect future sea level rise conditions in adopted 100-year flood levels. In the meantime, due to the rapid pace of development in Central SoMa, the City should create neighborhood-specific flood resistant design guidelines for buildings. These design guidelines should be reflective of other City goals, such as ensuring vibrant sidewalks and active ground floors.

**Policy 6.6.3** Maximize stormwater and flood management using streets, sidewalks, and open spaces.

Major storms have shown that they can overwhelm the City’s combined sewage and stormwater system, forcing polluted water to stay on the surface and/
or discharge into the Bay. Recognizing this, the city’s streets and sidewalks should be designed to effectively convey stormwater to centralized storage facilities. Simultaneously, landscaping in the sidewalks and in open spaces should be designed to include green infrastructure that slows flows and enhances water quality.

**OBJECTIVE 6.7**

**MAXIMIZE EARTHQUAKE RESILIENCE**

Earthquake preparedness has been a policy focus for over a hundred years. Given the opportunity provided by the large number of new buildings, Central SoMa should be at the forefront of earthquake resilience.

The issue of a major earthquake is not a question of if, but when.

**Policy 6.7.1** Ensure the ability of new and existing buildings to withstand a major seismic event.

San Francisco’s Building Code includes strict measures to ensure seismic preparedness and safety. The City should continue implementing these measures. The City should also make property owners aware of ongoing City efforts towards seismic preparedness, such as the soft-story ordinance and comprehensive Resilient SF strategy.

**Policy 6.7.2** Secure sufficient power and water supplies to withstand a 72-hour emergency.

The best place to house people after a major seismic event (or other disaster) is in their own homes, or at least in their own neighborhoods. Working populations also need the ability to temporarily reside in their office buildings for up to 72 hours, if needed. Doing so requires that these buildings not only withstand a disaster, but have sufficient power and water to weather the first few days after the event. The City should explore strategies for supporting such onsite capacity in Central SoMa, including district scale energy.

**OBJECTIVE 6.8**

**HELP ACHIEVE ZERO SOLID WASTE**

Through its recycling and composting programs, San Francisco met the State-mandated 50 percent landfill diversion by 2000 and achieved the locally mandated 75 percent landfill diversion by 2010. The City has a zero waste target by 2020 and should utilize Central SoMa as a model for how to achieve this goal.

**Policy 6.8.1** Maximize recycling and composting of solid waste from all buildings.

Meeting a goal of zero solid waste requires that individuals sort and dispose of their refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash. To overcome the behavioral challenges in achieving this goal, the City requires that buildings provide adequate and equally...
Fulfilling the Vision

Creating an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood in Central SoMa would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:

- Supporting social sustainability by providing a more inviting neighborhood that encourages people to spend time outdoors.
- Supporting economic sustainability by maximizing resource efficiency, minimizing waste, and fostering innovation.
- Supporting environmental sustainability by improving local ecological systems, as well as providing an example for neighborhoods around the city and beyond.

Policy 6.8.2 Maximize recycling and reuse of construction and demolition materials.

All buildings that are required to comply with the Green Building Code and/or LEED must already recycle 75 percent of their construction and demolition debris. The City should continue to implement this requirement and seek ways to encourage all other buildings to improve diversion rates, in part through on-site sorting in advance of collection.

Policy 6.8.3 Reduce litter in streetscapes and parks.

In terms of volume, litter is a minimal part of the waste stream. However, it is the most visible form of solid waste, and therefore should be reduced to the greatest degree possible in the neighborhood. To do so, the City should establish tamper-proof, durable, and well-designed refuse systems for sidewalks, parks, and open spaces in Central SoMa. All privately-owned public open spaces should be required to provide three-stream collection systems.
The Plan Area’s cultural heritage is a valuable historical, social, and economic resource that requires thoughtful management to safeguard the City’s unique identity and to ensure a high quality-of-life for its current and future inhabitants.
Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood’s Cultural Heritage

CONTEXT
SoMa was once the domain of longshoremen, warehousemen, merchant mariners, day laborers, immigrant farm workers, and other manual workers (most of whom were men) who contributed immeasurably to the prosperity and economic development of the West. Many were newcomers—beginning with the Irish, Germans, and Scandinavians in the nineteenth century. These groups were followed by waves of Greeks, Eastern European Jews, Ukrainians, and Japanese during the early twentieth century. Dustbowl refugees arrived during the Depression, and Central Americans, African-Americans, and Filipinos took up residence during the post-World War II era.

The industrialization of SoMa was the result of the neighborhood’s proximity to the waterfront, in addition to its regional highway and rail links, and has been referred to as San Francisco’s back porch – the place where the unglamorous service businesses and industrial enterprises could conveniently set up shop. The topography of South of Market allowed for flat and wide thoroughfares, making the transportation of goods via wagon and eventually train and truck much easier.

During the Gold Rush era, SoMa served as the most productive industrial zone on the West Coast. In the years following the gold rush, the area evolved into a mixed-use neighborhood. This is in part attributed to the fact that residential uses were developed in conjunction with industrial facilities, to provide convenient access for industrial workers who could not yet afford public transit.

The 1906 earthquake and fire destroyed almost every building and structure in SoMa and dramatically changed the socio-economic characteristics of the entire area. After the 1906 earthquake, economic forces led to the reconstruction of the neighborhood as a predominantly light industrial district, which caused the residential population to plummet. In its place, SoMa developed an eclectic mix of commerce, industry, and increasingly, entertainment and residential living spaces.
SoMa was once the domain of longshoremen, warehousemen, merchant mariners, day laborers, immigrant farm workers, and other manual workers who contributed immeasurably to the prosperity and economic development of the West.

The ongoing evolution and reinvention of SoMa has resulted in many important tangible and intangible cultural assets. There are several historic districts and a myriad of individually significant buildings. The neighborhood has been an important center for two culturally important communities: Filipinos and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) community. Additionally, there are many important businesses, organizations, festivals and events, and communities.

Collectively, these cultural assets create an inimitable sense of place and a connection to its past, as well as a social and economic fabric that can be shared across generations. Protecting this cultural heritage, particularly as the neighborhood changes and develops, is necessary to safeguard the neighborhood’s unique identity and to ensure a high quality-of-life for its current and future inhabitants. Doing so requires thoughtful strategies that, properly implemented, encourage a deeper awareness of our shared and multi-faceted history while conveying a sense of what is possible in the future.

SoMa is an important center for two culturally important communities: Filipinos and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) community.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of preserving and celebrating the neighborhood’s history.

OBJECTIVE 7.1

ENSURE THAT THE HISTORY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS ADEQUATELY DOCUMENTED

Adequately documenting the neighborhood’s history requires recording Central SoMa’s rich history via both a historic context statement and survey.

Photo by tobakhopper, “the crowd : folsom street fair, san francisco (2013)” September 29, 2013 via Flickr, Creative Commons Attribution
Policy 7.1.1 Complete and adopt a Central SoMa Historic Context Statement.

Historic Context Statements are documents that chronicle the historical development of a neighborhood. A Central SoMa Historic Context Statement should be completed and adopted to record the important history of this neighborhood in one place.

Understanding our future requires understanding our past.

Policy 7.1.2 Complete and adopt a Central SoMa Historic Resources Survey.

Assessing the value of a building, landscape, or feature requires a Historic Resources Survey to determine whether it is significant for local, state, or national historical registers. The research and analysis contained in such a Survey is helpful to the Planning Department, community, property owners, and decision-makers, as the documentation provides up-front information about a property’s historic status. Such a Historic Resources Survey should be undertaken in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 7.2
SUPPORT THE PRESERVATION, RECOGNITION, AND WELLBEING OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD’S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

The term “cultural heritage” is understood to mean tangible properties or intangible assets that express the ways of living developed by a community and passed on from generation to generation. These elements are rooted in the community’s history and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community. Tangible cultural heritage includes objects, buildings, sites, structures, cultural landscapes, or districts that are significant in architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of San Francisco, the state of California, or the nation. Intangible cultural heritage includes the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, or skills that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. Intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. These two categories of cultural heritage resources – “tangible” or “intangible” – require different approaches for identification, protection, and management.

Facilitate the creation and implementation of a SoMa Pilipinas – Filipino Cultural Heritage Strategy.

The South of Market is home to the largest concentration of Filipinos in San Francisco, and is the
The Filipino community has deep roots in the neighborhood, beginning in the 1920s and becoming a predominant presence in the 1960s. The Filipino culture is a critical part of the neighborhood’s diversity, strength, and resilience. Having survived Redevelopment in the 1960s-1980s, the community is still subject to the threat of displacement given the current market forces that are driving up housing and commercial rents. To rectify this issue, in 2016 the City created SoMa Pilipinas – Filipino Cultural Heritage District. This CHD includes all of Central SoMa north of Brannan Street, and extends into other parts of SoMa as far west as 11th Street. Because of its substantial overlap with the Plan Area, the Planning Department should collaborate with the community to develop and implement a strategy to stabilize, promote, and increase the visibility of SoMa’s Filipino community.

**Policy 7.2.2** Facilitate the creation and implementation of other social or cultural heritage strategies, such as for the LGBTQ community.

Through its long and tumultuous history, Central SoMa has been home to many important social and cultural communities. The City should continue exploring opportunities to recognize and support these communities, whether through neighborhood-specific programs or as part of citywide efforts. For example, the Historic Preservation Commission adopted the Citywide LGBTQ Historic Context Statement in 2015. The LGBTQ community also has a long-standing presence in SoMa (e.g., by 1956, the two most prominent national organizations dedicated to improving the social status of gays and lesbians were both headquartered within the Central SoMa). This Historic Context Statement can be used by community history advocates and the Planning Department to provide a foundation for the protection, identification, interpretation, and designation of historically and culturally significant LGBTQ-related sites and places, within SoMa and citywide.

**OBJECTIVE 7.3**

**ENSURE THE NEIGHBORHOOD’S TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE INDUSTRIAL AND ARTS LEGACY IS NOT LOST**

Central SoMa has been an important industrial area since the Gold Rush. Much of the industrial jobs are now gone, due to the overall shift in the American economy towards services and the movement of many of those remaining industrial companies to the periphery of the city and region. Yet there is still an important blue-collar presence in Central SoMa reflected not only in its buildings but in the surprising diversity of practices, knowledge, and skills still extant, from the Flower Mart to auto repair shops to metal fabricators to artists’ studios.
Policy 7.3.1 Implement strategies that maintain PDR jobs in the neighborhood.

As Central SoMa continues to grow, there is potential for its PDR jobs to be priced out. The City should help maintain the neighborhood’s share of PDR jobs (as discussed in more detail in Objective 3 of Goal #3). Maintaining PDR jobs helps support the preservation of intangible heritage assets, such as the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, or skills represented within SoMa’s current and legacy industrial uses.

Policy 7.3.2 Support the preservation of buildings and features that reflect the industrial and arts legacy of the neighborhood.

Protecting the neighborhood’s industrial legacy is not just about the people working there, but also the context of where the work and daily life occurred. As such, important historic industrial buildings and features should be preserved and maintained in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and via the mechanisms described elsewhere in this Goal.

Objective 7.4

Prevent Demolition of or InSensitive Alterations to Cultural Heritage Resources in the Built Environment

San Francisco’s heritage is visible in its historic built environment, which includes objects, buildings, sites, structures, and landscapes. These resources provide visual and tangible continuity to the events, places, people, and architecture of San Francisco’s storied past. Culturally significant buildings contribute to the City’s diverse housing and commercial stock, and to the human scale and pedestrian orientation of its neighborhoods. These buildings are also important to quality-of-life in the City, and they help to make it attractive to residents, visitors, and businesses. Because of their importance, the Central SoMa Plan aims to prevent the demolition or insensitive alteration that would undermine the contributions that these cultural heritage resources make to the neighborhood and the City.

Policy 7.4.1 Protect Landmark-worthy cultural heritage properties through designation to Article 10 of the Planning Code.

Article 10 of the Planning Code contains a list of individual resources and districts that are protected City Landmarks. The Plan Area currently contains 29 such buildings, which are designated as either individual Landmarks or contributors to a Landmark District. The City has identified six buildings as eligible individual Landmarks and 11 additional buildings that are eligible contributors to a Landmark District, based upon review of the existing cultural resource surveys and community outreach efforts. These buildings should be protected through designation in Article 10 of the Planning Code.
Policy 7.4.2 Protect “Significant” and “Contributory” cultural heritage properties through designation to Article 11 of the Planning Code.

Article 11 of the Planning Code contains lists of individual buildings and districts considered historically and architecturally significant and contributing buildings in the downtown area. The City should extend Planning Code Article 11 designations into the Plan Area, to afford qualifying buildings the benefits, such as the ability to participate in the City’s “Transfer of Development Rights” (TDR) program, once designated. The City has identified 27 buildings as eligible “Significant” or “Contributory” buildings, based upon review of the existing cultural resource surveys and community outreach efforts.

Policy 7.5.1 Support funding for the rehabilitation of the Old Mint.

The City-owned Old Mint at 5th and Mission is one of San Francisco’s most significant buildings. A survivor of the 1906 earthquake and fire, it was listed as a National Historic Landmark, the National Park Service’s highest honor, on July 4, 1961. It is also in a state of significant disrepair and in need of substantial and immediate rehabilitation. Funding generated from the Central SoMa Plan should contribute, as part of a broader community partnership, to identify a program strategy, to fund a rehabilitation and restoration plan, and to ensure it remains a facility for public use.

Policy 7.5.2 Enable “Significant” and “Contributing” buildings underbuilt per applicable zoning to sell Transferable Development Rights.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) is an effective method for creating economic benefit for buildings designated “Significant” or “Contributing” in Article 11 of the Planning Code. It creates economic value for buildings by enabling them to sell unused development rights where there is a difference between what is allowed and the actual size of the building. In San Francisco, this tool has primarily been utilized in the downtown (C-3) zoning districts and adjacent districts. The City should extend this tool into the Plan Area. Facilitating the TDR program would support the protection of these buildings by reducing development pressure and providing an economic incentive for the preservation and maintenance of designated cultural resources.

Policy 7.5.3 Require large new development projects to purchase Transferable Development Rights.

In addition to extending the right to sell TDR to Central SoMa, major new developments should be required to purchase TDR as well. As such, this would...
Figure 7.2
PROHIBITION OF LOT Mergers [PLANNING CODE SECTION 249.78(D)(7)]

Exception:
(i) The street frontages of lots abutting the north side of Perry Street and the street frontages along Harrison Street on Block 3763 in lots 099 and 100 are exempt from this control.
(ii) On blocks of less than 200 feet in length between streets or alleys, an applicable lot may merge with an adjacent non-applicable lot if the non-applicable lot is a corner lot.
create a mechanism by which new developments in Central SoMa directly support the preservation and maintenance of the neighborhood’s historic buildings.

**Policy 7.5.4** Support additions over wholesale demolition to preserve cultural heritage properties.

Regardless of historic designation status, the City should support new development and the preservation of cultural heritage properties though application of Standards 9 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Supporting sensitive, well-designed additions to historic buildings is one way to increase square footage and to benefit from the preservation of cultural resources. As such, the City should support additions rather than wholesale demolition when such demolitions are physically feasible.

**Policy 7.5.5** Encourage the use of existing strategies and incentives that facilitate the preservation and rehabilitation of designated cultural heritage properties.

Cultural heritage properties already benefit from a wide range of strategies and incentives to support preservation and maintenance. This includes measures to increase available revenue, including the Mills Act, Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives, and façade easements. This also includes additional flexibility from Planning Code and Building Code requirements through exemptions granted by the Zoning Administrator or via application of the California Historic Building Code. The City should continue encouraging the application of these strategies and incentives to Central SoMa’s cultural resources.

**OBJECTIVE 7.6**

**SUPPORT RETENTION OF FINE-GRAINED DEVELOPED PATTERN AND CHARACTER-ENHANCING BUILDINGS**

Buildings that have cultural heritage significance are not the only buildings of merit in Central SoMa. There are many buildings that exhibit high levels of visual cohesion and contextual architectural expression. Collectively, these buildings also form development patterns that are emblematic of the history of SoMa and that make the neighborhood visually interesting.
Policy 7.6.1 Restrict the consolidation of small- and medium-sized lots with character-enhancing buildings.

The Plan Area has myriad development patterns, ranging from “fine-grained” blocks where the lots are as little as 25 feet wide, to monumental blocks where individual lots are hundreds of feet in length. The most pleasant blocks to experience are presently those areas where the pattern of fine-grained parcels is combined with older buildings that enhance, individually and as a group, the character and activity of SoMa. As such, these historic development patterns should be preserved by restricting the consolidation of these lots into larger lots.

Policy 7.6.2 Incentivize retention of character-enhancing buildings.

Character-enhancing buildings received a “6L” California Historic Resources Status Code (CHRSC) in the historic survey. As such, these buildings were determined not to be eligible for the same level of protection as historically or architecturally significant resources. However, because they are character-enhancing, the City should consider strategies to incentivize their retention.
FULFILLING THE VISION

Preserving and celebrating the neighborhood’s history would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:

Supporting **social sustainability**
by retaining important existing communities as well as links to the neighborhood’s past.

Supporting **economic sustainability**
by providing a reservoir of older buildings that support important uses that may not be able to otherwise compete on rents.

Supporting **environmental sustainability**
by reducing the need for new building materials.
The goal of the Central SoMa Plan is to ensure that each new building enhances the character of the neighborhood and the city as a whole.
Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City

CONTEXT
While many existing residential, historic, public, and large commercial buildings in Central SoMa are likely to remain in the foreseeable future, there is also a substantial amount of land on which new development is likely to occur.

New buildings and landscapes will change the neighborhood in many ways. The design of ground floors can control how interesting and safe a street will be for people walking. The size and massing of buildings as perceived from the street can be inviting if scaled appropriately, alienating if too small or too far removed, or intimidating if too large, looming or impervious. The collection of the buildings as viewed from the distance can either enhance or detract from the overall skyline and sense of the City’s landscape. The architecture of a building can either engage people with intimate details and support a feeling of a cohesive and dynamic neighborhood or only coolly express its own internal interests without enriching its context.

Within the existing neighborhood, there are already numerous good and bad examples for each of these issues. The goal of the Central SoMa Plan is to ensure that each new building enhances the character of the neighborhood and the city as a whole by having engaging ground floor, appropriate scale, great architecture and a beneficial contribution to the skyline.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES
The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of ensuring that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city.

OBJECTIVE 8.1
ENSURE THAT THE GROUND FLOORS OF BUILDINGS CONTRIBUTE TO THE ACTIVATION, SAFETY, AND DYNAMISM OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD

The most important part of a building is the ground floor, where it interfaces with the street and other public spaces. Most people never actually go inside or assess the vast majority of the buildings they encounter – but they are, often subconsciously, aware of how the ground floors shape their daily experience of the neighborhood. People will seek out streets that feel interesting and richly textured, enabling them to...
engage with friends, people-watch, view items in shop windows or activity inside businesses, and safely avoid undesired encounters.

Policy 8.1.1 Require that ground floor uses actively engage the street.

When ground floors are dominated by internally oriented or non-public uses like parking and offices, people walking by or in adjacent public spaces do not feel the ability to engage with their environment and feel socially disconnected and disinterested. Recognizing this, the City has already instituted requirements for ground floors, such as that they must be lined with active uses, and not with parking or storage. The City also requires a high amount of building transparency on the ground floor, high ceilings, and supports frequent placement of doors. The City should consider additional measures to increase ground floor activity, such as requiring retail in certain locations (as discussed in Goal #3), allowing production, distribution, and repair uses (PDR) if they properly activate the street, and prohibiting uses on the ground floor that do not interface well with the street, such as offices.

Policy 8.1.2 Design building frontages and public open spaces with furnishings and amenities to engage a mixed-use neighborhood.

As discussed elsewhere in this document, Central SoMa is one of the most lively and diverse neighborhoods in the City, containing residents, many different kinds of work activities, and visitors at all hours of the day. Buildings and open spaces should reflect and enhance this experience through the design and inclusion of amenities. Projects should include fixtures, furnishings, art, utilities, and programming at the ground floor or adjacent open space to invite and support more active and consistent use of public areas including alleys, open spaces, and sidewalks. These smaller elements help connect interior and exterior uses and support more impromptu and flexible activities on the ground floor that can evolve with the neighborhood.

Policy 8.1.3 Ensure buildings are built up to the sidewalk edge.

When buildings are set back from the sidewalk – such as in a suburban strip mall environment – people on foot feel exposed on both sides and detached from their surroundings, leaving adjacent street traffic as the defining experience. By contrast, most buildings in Central SoMa should be at the property line, or set back in instances where there is opportunity and desire to widen the sidewalk or create public space for active usage. In the case of purely residential buildings with walk-up units, the ground floors should be designed in accordance with the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines, such as incorporating setbacks to allow for livable interior spaces, stoops, landscaping, and appropriate public-private transition.
Policy 8.1.4 Minimize parking and loading entrances.

Frequent parking and loading entrances diminish the ability to have active, safe, and dynamic ground floors – particularly on retail-focused streets. Therefore, parking and loading entrances in buildings should be limited, and as necessary directed towards the narrow streets and alleys with fewer pedestrians and fewer retail uses.

Objective 8.2

Ensure that the overall development pattern is complementary to the skyline

San Francisco is renowned for its physical beauty and unique sense of place. These qualities are defined by buildings and streets laid upon hills and valleys, the San Francisco Bay and Pacific Ocean, and signature landmarks poised at picturesque locations. The city’s urban form at this scale is an essential characteristic of San Francisco’s identity and should be enhanced by the Central SoMa Plan.

Policy 8.2.1 Set height limits, bulk controls, and architectural guidelines mindful of important views.

From other vantage points, the proposed heights in Central SoMa should be subservient to the dramatic hills around it – including the built “hill” of the downtown high-rise district. Changes proposed in the northwest and southeast part of the Plan Area should be in keeping with the buildings immediately adjacent and/or within a block. In the southwest part of the Plan Area, there is a potential to create a new development pattern that would become, for the first time, noticeable from a distance. However, this new pattern should consist of a small cluster of buildings spaced apart from each other and achieving heights half as high, at most, of buildings downtown. As such, this area would serve as more of a “foothill,” complementing rather than detracting from the overall skyline. The tallest of these buildings should demarcate the 4th and Townsend intersection, identifying the Caltrain station and intersection of multiple light rail lines as a key node of city importance, and serve to distinguish the area on the skyline through both height and distinctive architecture.

The diversity of buildings in Central SoMa is reflective of the many roles it has played in the city’s history.
These images are intended to visualize the overall development capacity of the Central SoMa Plan. They are not meant to be a precise assessment of potential at the individual parcel level. It is certain that eventual development at these locations will look differently than rendered in these images.
REINFORCE THE CHARACTER OF CENTRAL SOMA AS A MID-RISE DISTRICT WITH TANGIBLE “URBAN ROOMS”

The diversity of buildings in Central SoMa is reflective of the many roles it has played in the city’s history. One of the most common building forms is the “mid-rise” building of five to eight stories (65 to 85 feet), characteristic of its industrial and warehouse legacy. These mid-rise buildings have proven to have great longevity, because their large floors and high ceilings are attractive to a range of uses. This includes modern office uses, which desire flexibility with workspace arrangements that accommodate expansive collaborative and informal environments, while simultaneously discouraging the proliferation of individual offices.

In SoMa, these mid-rise buildings create a comfortable “urban room” – which is when the perceived height of the building is approximately equivalent to the width of the street. In the Plan Area, major streets are 82.5 feet wide and the narrow minor streets are typically 35 feet wide. This combination of mid-rise buildings whose heights are similar to the street width sets Central SoMa apart from adjacent high-rise districts.

Policy 8.3.1 Set height limits to enable mid-rise development.

Currently, height limits on major streets are too low to support mid-rise development. These height limits should be adjusted to enable mid-rise development, except where there is an important civic asset that lower heights would benefit.

Policy 8.3.2 Require new buildings to reinforce the urban room.

Buildings in Central SoMa should be designed to be mindful of creating and preserving the urban room.

Policy 8.3.3 Require buildings whose height exceeds the street width to step back at the upper stories.

Buildings that exceed the height of the urban room will contribute to the neighborhood’s mid-rise character if the predominance of their mass and height is not visible or dominant from the street. Additionally, there should be sufficient light, air, and sense of openness between buildings. Therefore, the City should require massing and design strategies that reduce the apparent mass of buildings above a height of 85 feet and should require adequate spacing between towers.

Policy 8.3.4 Limit the distribution and bulk of new towers and focus them at important nodes.

By efficiently using land, new towers (i.e., buildings taller than 160 feet in height) are helpful to fulfilling the Plan’s goal to increase the capacity for jobs and housing (as discussed in Goal #1). However, as a
mid-rise district, such towers should not be permitted to dominate the landscape. To do so, the number of towers should be limited. Additionally, these towers should be located at important nodes in the Plan Area, such as the intersection of the Central Subway and Caltrain and the intersection of 5th and Brannan.

**Policy 8.3.5** Limit heights in areas with a high concentration of historic buildings and areas of unique character.

The southeastern portion of the Plan Area features two unique concentrations of historic resources – the South Park block and the western portion of the South End Historic District. In order to preserve the unique character and scale of these areas, the City should not increase height limits in either, including the area identified for expansion of the South End Historic District (as discussed in Goal #7).

**Policy 8.3.6** Minimize the impact of shadows on public spaces to the extent feasible, balanced with other core objectives.

Sunlight is an important factor in people’s attraction to and enjoyment of public spaces. Planning Code Section 295, adopted pursuant to Proposition K in 1984, protects Recreation and Park Department parks from new shading that might be significant and adverse to the use of those parks. South Park is the only Recreation and Park Department property in the Plan Area. However, there are other important public open spaces that require attention as well, despite a lack of formal protection. The City should propose height districts to minimize shadow impacts on South Park, Yerba Buena Gardens, and the Bessie Carmichael School yard. On other public spaces, particularly new spaces either discussed in Goal #5 or those that may be created in the future, shadows should be minimized to the degree that such sculpting of the buildings does not sacrifice other important Plan objectives, especially those regarding optimizing land use. These future open spaces will be funded and activated by new development, without which they would not exist, and are being proposed in the context of the Plan’s overall urban form and land use parameters. Some shading from buildings enabled by this Plan is inherent in the creation of these open spaces. As such, new buildings should be sculpted to maximize sunlight to these spaces without unduly impacting the development capacity of the sites intended by this Plan.

**Policy 8.3.7** Utilize new buildings to diminish the dominant presence of the freeway in the neighborhood.

The elevated I-80 freeway slices through the Plan Area. While the freeway structure is relatively low (30-50 feet), it looms large above the low-slung buildings on either side and creates a physical and psychological divider of the neighborhood. Where the City is increasing development potential, it should allow buildings to be taller than the freeway. This will help diminish the presence of the freeway while integrating the areas on either side.
OBJECTIVE 8.4
ENSURE THAT NARROW STREETS AND ALLEYS MAINTAIN THEIR INTIMATENESS AND SENSE OF OPENNESS TO THE SKY

Every block in Central SoMa is blessed with one or more narrow streets and alleys, whose widths are typically 35 feet or less. The patterns and layouts of these streets change from block to block, creating unique and distinguishing configurations.

Historically, the buildings along these narrow streets and alleys have been lower in height — reflecting their smaller scale “urban room.” The result is that the alleys have provided a sense of openness, intimateness, and reprieve in this dense neighborhood of wide streets and large buildings. The scale of these streets is an essential ingredient to the livability of the district.

Policy 8.4.1 Require new buildings facing alleys and narrow streets to step back at the upper stories.

While a central tenet of the Plan is support for increasing capacity for housing and jobs in the neighborhood, the intent of this Plan is also to ensure that the narrow streets and alleys maintain their sense of openness to the sky and lower scale so that future generations can continue to enjoy their benefit. Therefore, the City should ensure that new buildings facing alleys and narrow streets step back at the upper stories. As well, in parts of the Plan Area that contain high concentrations of older and small-scale residential uses along alleys (e.g., the northwest part of the Plan area), building height limits should be kept relatively lower than on the major streets surrounding them.

OBJECTIVE 8.5
ENSURE THAT LARGE DEVELOPMENT SITES ARE CAREFULLY DESIGNED TO MAXIMIZE PUBLIC BENEFIT

Central SoMa includes a number of large, underutilized sites (parcels or groups of adjacent parcels that are 30,000 to well over 100,000 square feet) that represent a substantial portion of the overall development in the Plan Area. Because of their size, these sites have the potential to deliver substantial public benefits if carefully designed.

Policy 8.5.1 Provide greater direction and flexibility for large development sites in return for improved design and additional public benefits.

The City should develop guidelines and requirements for large development sites where there is potential for additional public benefits and where alternative organization or massing on the site would better achieve the goals of the Plan. These guidelines and requirements should lay out how these specific sites could provide desirable community benefits, such as public open space and recreational facilities, dedicated sites for affordable housing development, and other benefits critical to achieving the goals of the Plan.

Policy 8.5.2 Limit the length of new buildings.

Development on large lots could lead to buildings that have very long street frontages. Such buildings can have a negative impact on the surrounding environment by feeling too imposing or creating a sensation of monotony or homogeneity to the street environment. The City already has controls to prevent such conditions by requiring mass reductions for buildings longer than 200 feet and mid-block alleys on lots longer than 300 feet. The City should continue to implement these controls in Central SoMa.
Perhaps the most lasting aspect of a building is its architecture and the ways it engages people.

OBJECTIVE 8.6

PROMOTE HIGH QUALITY ARCHITECTURE THAT ENHANCES THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Perhaps the most lasting aspect of a building is its architecture – its form, materials, programming, and all the other ways it engages people. Achieving high quality architecture in Central SoMa is critical, given its central location, the substantial number of new buildings expected (some of which will be quite large), and the rich history and diversity of the buildings in the neighborhood.

Policy 8.6.1 Conform to the City’s Urban Design Guidelines.

The City is in the process of adopting Urban Design Guidelines that will apply to all new development within San Francisco. These Guidelines will give direction on a number of important design issues, including site design, massing, open space, fenestration and facade development, and ground floor design. To promote design excellence, at a minimum all projects in Central SoMa should conform to the City’s Urban Design Guidelines.

Policy 8.6.2 Promote innovative and contextually-appropriate design.

Central SoMa is currently an organic collection of buildings built at different scales, in different times and for different purposes. It is also a neighborhood steeped in a history of invention and creativity, including in technology, industry and the arts. Given this eclectic and innovative environment, new development in Central SoMa should promote innovative design that also respects its context. This innovation can be evident in the choice or choices of materials, structure, sustainability features, form, landscape, and expression of uses or concept.

Policy 8.6.3 Design the upper floors to be deferential to the “urban room”.

As discussed above, the height limits and bulk controls in Central SoMa will support its character as a mid-rise district with a strong urban room. The architecture, including materials, facade patterns, and proportions, of new development should be designed to reinforce this character.

Policy 8.6.4 Design buildings to be mindful of wind.

Like much of San Francisco, Central SoMa is subject to strong winds, which generally emanate from the west. Tall buildings and exposed structures can strongly affect the wind environment for pedestrians. A building that stands alone or is much taller than the surrounding buildings can intercept and redirect winds that might otherwise flow overhead and bring them down the vertical face of the building. These winds and resulting turbulence may create conditions that are unpleasant on the neighborhoods sidewalks, streets, and open spaces. The City should require that buildings be designed to minimize new wind impacts at the ground level.
Ensure large projects integrate with existing urban fabric and provide a varied character.

Central SoMa has a number of large development sites due to the area’s industrial legacy. Many of these sites could feature multiple sizable buildings. Due to their scale, development on these sites has the potential to dominate and stand apart from their surroundings and form homogeneous and insular collections of buildings or campuses. Instead, projects proposed on these sites should be designed to integrate with the surrounding urban fabric, reflecting and enhancing the existing development patterns. Additionally, they should provide a varied character and avoid design cues that suggest a “campus” environment.

Central SoMa is a neighborhood steeped in a history of invention and creativity, including in technology, industry and the arts.

Whenever possible, delineate via the Planning Code what is allowed and not allowed in new development.

To maximize certainty for all parties, the rules for new development should be unambiguously established in the Planning Code. This can be accomplished by minimizing allowance for exceptions and exemptions from Planning Code controls, and by clearly laying out conditions and criteria for when exceptions to the basic controls may be warranted – particularly on large sites (as discussed above). Open-ended, subjective conditions allowing exceptions for “design excellence” or ill-defined “public benefits” should be avoided in favor of objective criteria and clear direction.

Central SoMa is a neighborhood steeped in a history of invention and creativity, including in technology, industry and the arts.

Establish Clear Rules for Development

In developing new buildings, there are instances in which a flexible process creates a lack of clarity for all parties – community, developers, and the City – as to what is possible. While in some cases this may lead to superior outcomes, in many cases the only result is distrust and uncertainty until a decision is made very far into the process, resulting in lost time and money. The Plan would not be considered successful if neither the community nor property owners have certainty about how development will proceed and have certain guarantees regarding physical, programmatic and public benefit parameters.
FULFILLING THE VISION

Ensuring that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:

- **Supporting social sustainability** by maintaining the traditional feel of SoMa while facilitating additional opportunities for social interactions and interesting streets.

- **Supporting economic sustainability** by promoting interesting buildings that have substantial size and thus the potential to attract companies to stay, grow, and/or come to the neighborhood.

- **Supporting environmental sustainability** emphasizing light and air at the street level.
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### PART II: CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

**IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX**
# CENTRAL SOMA PLAN IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX

This Implementation Matrix describes the actions, and agencies, and stakeholders that will implement the objectives and policies of the Central SoMa Plan. This document includes the best available information at the time of Plan adoption, and may evolve over time depending on a number of factors, such as availability of resources and policies within the Plan and citywide.

## GOAL #1 - ACCOMMODATE A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF JOBS AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ensure there is sufficient land area where space for jobs and housing can be built</td>
<td>1.1.1 Retain zoning that supports capacity for new jobs and housing</td>
<td>1.1.1.1 Maintain existing MUG, SoMA NCT, and South Park zoning. Convert MUG zoning to CMUO zoning.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of existing Zoning Map</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Limit zoning that restricts capacity for development</td>
<td>1.1.2.1 Change SLU, SALI, WSMUO, and RED zoning to CMUO, MUR, and MUG zoning.</td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ensure that developable land has, collectively, sufficient capacity for jobs and housing</td>
<td>1.2.1 Set height limits on parcels as appropriate to fulfill this Objective</td>
<td>1.2.1.1 Increase height limits.</td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Allow physical controls for height, bulk, setbacks, and open space to determine density</td>
<td>1.2.2.1 Remove Floor Area Ratio (FAR) limits on non-residential buildings.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL #2 - MAINTAIN THE DIVERSITY OF RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maintain the existing stock of housing</td>
<td>2.1.1 Continue implementing controls that maintain the existing supply of housing</td>
<td>2.1.1.1 Continue implementing unit merger and demolition controls.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.2 Continue enforcing restrictions on conversion of units to hotels rooms, including Short Term Rentals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Planning and Administrative Codes</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Office of Short Term Rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.3 Continue implementing strategies to ensure livability of units – particularly Single Room Occupancy housing (SROs).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Administrative Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Maintain the affordability of the existing stock of housing</td>
<td>2.2.1 Continue implementing controls and strategies that help maintain the existing supply of affordable housing</td>
<td>2.2.1.1 Continue enforcing rent control and eviction protection regulations.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Administrative Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rent Board and Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1.2 Continue implementing funding strategies such as the Rental Assistance Demonstration program and rehabilitation loans for affordable buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of MOHCD programs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Support the conversion of existing housing into permanently affordable housing</td>
<td>2.22.1</td>
<td>Continue implementing the City’s Small Sites program.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of MOHCD programs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.22.2</td>
<td>Continue to enable new development to satisfy their affordable housing requirements supporting the conversion of existing housing into permanently affordable housing.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Ensure that at least 33 percent of new housing is affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income households</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>Set affordability requirements for new residential development at rates necessary to fulfill this Objective</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>Require contribution to affordable housing from commercial uses</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>Ensure that affordable housing revenue generated by the Central SoMa Plan stays in the neighborhood</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>Allow affordable housing sites to sell any unused development rights</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Support housing for other households that cannot afford market rate housing</td>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>Continue implementing strategies that support the development of “gap” housing</td>
<td>Ongoing application of funds and requirements</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MOHCD, Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementation Measure 2.2.2.1

**Continue implementing the City’s Small Sites program.**

*Ongoing implementation of MOHCD programs*

### Implementation Measure 2.2.2.2

**Continue to enable new development to satisfy their affordable housing requirements supporting the conversion of existing housing into permanently affordable housing.**

*Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code*

### Implementation Measure 2.3.1.1

**Set the percentage of affordable housing by Central SoMa Public Benefits Tiers in accordance with the City’s requirements for below-market rate units, specified in Planning Code Section 415.**

*Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code*

### Implementation Measure 2.3.2.1

**Continue requiring contribution from commercial developments through the Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee.**

*Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code*

### Implementation Measure 2.3.3.1

**Require affordable housing revenue generated by the Central SoMa Plan to be expended within the boundaries of SoMa (Market Street, the Embarcadero, King Street, Division Street, and South Van Ness Avenue).**

*Planning Code amendment Upon Plan adoption*

### Implementation Measure 2.3.3.2

**Allow the application of the “land dedication” option for both residential and non-residential development.**

- For residential development, the land dedication requirement would be equivalent to 45% of the potential Gross Floor Area that could be provided on the principal site.
- For non-residential development, the land dedication would be based on the actual cost of acquisition of the project sponsor of the dedicated land, taking into consideration any information that would impact the value of the land, pursuant to Section 413.7.

*Planning Code amendment Upon Plan adoption*

### Implementation Measure 2.3.4.1

**Add affordable housing sites to list of sites eligible for the Transfer of Development Rights program (as discussed in Implementation Measure 7.5.2.1).**

*Planning Code amendment Upon Plan adoption*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Support housing for other households that cannot afford market rate housing</td>
<td>2.4.1 Continue implementing strategies that support the development of “gap” housing</td>
<td>2.4.1.1 Apply ongoing strategies for creating middle-income housing, such as funding created through 2015’s Proposition A, down payment assistance loan programs, and the middle-income housing requirements imposed by June 2016’s Proposition C and subsequent Board actions.</td>
<td>Ongoing application of funds and requirements</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MOHCD, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Support housing for a diversity of household sizes</td>
<td>2.5.1 Continue requiring family-sized units</td>
<td>2.5.1.1 Require that new development provide at least 40% two-bedroom, 30% three-bedroom units, or 35% two or more bedrooms with at least 10% containing three or more bedrooms.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Support the schools, child care, and community services that serve local residents</td>
<td>2.6.1 Help fund public schools</td>
<td>2.6.1.1 Continue implementing the Schools Impact Fee.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of existing Planning Code requirements</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>San Francisco Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6.1.2 Fund provision of supplemental services at Bessie Carmichael School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing funding from CFD As funding accrues</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6.2 Help facilitate the creation of child care facilities</td>
<td>2.6.2.1 Continue implementing the Child Care Impact Fee and Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of existing Planning Code requirements</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, require that Key Development Sites with office or hotel uses provide on-site child care facilities in satisfaction of child care fee requirements pursuant to Section 414.4, unless they can demonstrate to the Planning Commission that doing so would be infeasible, pursuant to Section 249.76(a)(4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6.3 Help facilitate the creation of new community services</td>
<td>2.6.3.1 Create a new Community Services Impact Fee (established in Section 432). New development will be given the option to provide community facilities directly via an In-Kind Agreement with the City instead of paying the fees.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL #3 – FACILITATE AN ECONOMICALLY DIVERSED AND LIVELY JOBS CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Ensure the Plan Area accommodates significant space for job growth</td>
<td>3.1.1 Require non-residential uses in new development on large parcels</td>
<td>3.1.1.1 On parcels larger than 40,000 square feet south of Harrison Street require that two-thirds of new development below 160 feet in height be non-residential.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 Limit restrictions on non-residential development</td>
<td>3.1.2.1 Change the existing zoning on parcels designated for growth so that the area is primarily zoned CMUG, MUR, and MUG.</td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>Support living wage jobs across all sectors</td>
<td>3.1.3.1</td>
<td>Continue implementing City job training programs as well as hiring strategies such as Local Hire and First Source,</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of City programs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3.2</td>
<td>Seek new strategies to facilitate living wage jobs, such as implementation of a 2017’s California Assembly Bill 73 via a Housing Sustainability District in Central SoMa.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, OEWD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Support the growth of office space</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Facilitate the growth of office</td>
<td>See Implementation Measure 3.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Ensure the removal of protective zoning does not result in a loss of PDR in the Plan Area</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Maintain zoning that restricts non-PDR development in certain locations</td>
<td>Maintain SALI zoning between 4th and 6th Streets and Harrison and Bryant Streets.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of existing Zoning Map</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Limit conversion of PDR space in formerly industrial districts</td>
<td>Continue to implement the provisions of Planning Code Section 202.8 (approved under Proposition X).</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>Require PDR space as part of large commercial development</td>
<td>3.3.3.1</td>
<td>In new office developments of greater than 50,000 square feet, require new PDR, via one of the following options:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build PDR on-site to whichever amount is greater: the amount required by Code Section 202.8 or 40% of the lot area. Exempt from land area for purposes of calculating the FAR any land dedicated to affordable housing or publicly accessible open space fully open to the sky.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build net new PDR off-site at 1.5 times the on-site requirement. This PDR can be built anywhere in SoMa (Market, Embarcadero, South Van Ness, 13th St, Division St, China Basin).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserve existing PDR space at 2.0 times the on-site requirement. This PDR can be preserved anywhere in SoMa not zoned SALI after Plan adoption (Market Street, the Embarcadero, Division Street, and South Van Ness Avenue).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.2</td>
<td>Explore the potential for development to meet their PDR requirement through an in-lieu fee to the City to be used for the construction of new PDR and preservation/retention of existing PDR space.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>OEWD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4</td>
<td>Provide incentives to fund, build, and/or protect PDR</td>
<td>3.3.4.1</td>
<td>Require floor-to-floor ceiling heights of 17 feet for PDR uses.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue technical support and strategic programs and agreements that support the growth of PDR businesses and the development of new PDR space.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of City programs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>OEWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4.3</td>
<td>Support existing PDR businesses that may be impacted by new development by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a new PDR Relocation Fund to support businesses with moving costs and rent subsidies.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Require projects to notify existing PDR tenants about their development plans and provide information on the Central Soma PDR Relocation Fund and OEWD's PDR Sector Assistance programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4.4</td>
<td>Continue implementing the 1% Art Program, including the option for development to participate in the Public Art Trust.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of City programs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Facilitate a vibrant retail environment that serves the needs of the community</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Allow retail throughout the Plan Area</td>
<td>3.4.1.1</td>
<td>Continue allowing retail in all zoning districts.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>Require ground-floor retail along important streets</td>
<td>3.4.2.1</td>
<td>Maintain retail requirements along 4th Street between Townsend and Bryant.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Require retail on following streets:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2nd Street on the west side between Dow Place and Townsend Street;</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3rd Street between Folsom Street and Townsend Street;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4th Street between Bryant St and Folsom St;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Folsom Street between 4th and 6th;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Brannan Street between 4th Street and 5th Street;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Townsend Street on the north side between 2nd Street and 4th Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3</td>
<td>Support local, affordable, community-serving retail</td>
<td>3.4.3.1</td>
<td>Ban formula restaurants and bars. Require other formula retail uses to attain a Conditional Use Permit throughout the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.3.2</td>
<td>For development on lots greater than 20,000 square feet, require micro retail units (100-1,000 sq ft) of one for every 20,000 square feet of lot area (rounding to the nearest unit).</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.3.3</td>
<td>Continue banning stand-alone big box retail.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Support development of hotels</td>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>Allow hotels throughout the growth-oriented part of the Plan Area</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.1.1</td>
<td>Continue permitting small hotels in the WSMUO District. Permit hotels in the MUG and CMUO with a Conditional Use.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.1.2</td>
<td>Support the development of one or more large (&gt;500 room) hotels in the vicinity of the Moscone Convention Center.</td>
<td>City engagement with private developers during entitlement process</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>OEWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Recognize the importance of nightlife uses in creating a complete neighborhood</td>
<td>3.6.1 Allow nightlife where appropriate</td>
<td>3.6.1.1 Continue allowing restaurants and bars throughout the Plan Area, as controlled by district.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6.1.2 Continue permitting nighttime entertainment uses as-of-right in those areas being converted from SALI to CMUO and WSMUO.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL #4 – PROVIDE SAFE AND CONVENIENT TRANSPORTATION THAT PRIORITIZES WALKING, BICYCLING, AND TRANSIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Provide people walking a safe, convenient, attractive environment on all the streets in the Plan Area</td>
<td>4.1 Ensure streets throughout the Plan Area are designed in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy.</td>
<td>4.1.1 Undertake a comprehensive complete streets plan for all of the major streets in the Plan Area (i.e., 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, and Townsend Streets). This strategy should incorporate pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements. Designs should incorporate on- and off-street loading needs and emergency vehicle access. Dedicate funding towards the planning and construction of recommended improvements through the Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), Eastern Neighborhoods Impact (ENI) Fee, and/or a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD). (See Figure 4.1 in the Plan for a map of existing sidewalk conditions).</td>
<td>Designed by the City with community input, adopted by legislation from San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW), and implemented by a combination of the City and new development (through meeting the Better Streets Plan and/or In-Kind Agreements with the City)</td>
<td>Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW), Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 Ensure sidewalks on major streets meet Better Streets Plan standards</td>
<td>4.1.2.1 See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3 Prohibit new curb cuts on key major streets and limit them elsewhere</td>
<td>4.1.3.1 Ban curb cuts within the Plan Area on all of Folsom, Brannan, Townsend, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 6th Streets, and any blocks of Howard Street that are one-way; require a Conditional Use permit for curb cuts for all other major streets in the Plan Area.</td>
<td>See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.4 Provide signalized crosswalks across major streets</td>
<td>4.1.4.1 See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.5 Ensure there are crosswalks at all signalized intersections</td>
<td>4.1.5.1 See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.6</td>
<td>Ensure there are safe intersections at freeway ramps</td>
<td>4.16.1.1</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans to redesign or improve intersections at freeway ramps.</td>
<td>Intergovernmental coordination</td>
<td>Within 5 years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFMTA, San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.7</td>
<td>Provide corner sidewalk extensions to enhance pedestrian safety at crosswalks, in keeping with the Better Streets Plan</td>
<td>4.17.1.1</td>
<td>Implement strategies identified through the City's Walk First and Vision Zero programs, as well as additional strategies identified in the complete streets plan discussed in Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Walk First and Vision Zero programs; also Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.8</td>
<td>Ensure safe and convenient conditions on narrow streets and alleys for people walking</td>
<td>4.18.1.1</td>
<td>Undertake a follow-up Narrow Streets and Alleys Strategy, and implement recommendations adopted by that Strategy, as well as additional strategies identified in the complete streets plan discussed in Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Community planning effort; also Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Start process within two years of Plan Adoption</td>
<td>Planning, Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.9</td>
<td>Ensure there are street trees and street furnishings on sidewalks wherever possible, in keeping with the Better Streets Plan</td>
<td>4.19.1.1</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of street tree requirements in the Planning Code, as well as additional strategies identified in the complete streets plan discussed in Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.10</td>
<td>Expand the pedestrian network wherever possible through creation of new narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections</td>
<td>4.10.1.1</td>
<td>Continue implementing the existing requirements for development on large lots.</td>
<td>Application of existing Planning Code requirements, with further guidance in the Central SoMa Key Site Guidelines</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11.2</td>
<td>Prioritize the creation of new connections wherever possible through acquisitions and/or easements on private lots (as part of Implementation Measure 4.1.7.1).</td>
<td>4.10.2</td>
<td>Coordinating with Development as opportunities arise</td>
<td>Start process within 12 months of Plan Adoption</td>
<td>Planning + Real Estate Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.11</td>
<td>Use public art, lighting, and other amenities to improve the pedestrian experience beneath elevated freeways</td>
<td>4.111.1</td>
<td>See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.11.2</td>
<td>Continue working with Caltrans to facilitate these improvements on their property.</td>
<td>4.111.2</td>
<td>Intergovernmental coordination</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), Planning, Public Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.11.3</td>
<td>Encourage projects to dedicate their 1% for art requirements to the Arts Trust, and the City to dedicate this funding for art in this area.</td>
<td>4.111.3</td>
<td>City engagement with private developers during entitlement process</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, Arts Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Make cycling a safe and convenient transportation option throughout the Plan Area for all ages and abilities</td>
<td>4.2.1 Ensure that the bicycle network is in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy and Bicycle Strategy.</td>
<td>4.2.1.1 Implement the recommendations of the City’s Bicycle Plan designed in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy.</td>
<td>Implementation of the Bicycle Plan and Vision Zero programs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2 Minimize gaps in the existing bicycle network by providing bicycle routes through the Plan Area, designed for safety in accordance with the City’s Vision Zero policy and Bicycle Strategy.</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Implementation of the Bicycle Plan and Vision Zero programs</td>
<td>Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3 Provide additional bicycle infrastructure, such as bicycle parking to support ridership</td>
<td>4.2.3.1 Continue implementing bicycle parking regulations in buildings.</td>
<td>Application of existing Planning Code requirements</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3.2 Support the implementation and expansion of Ford Go-Bike</td>
<td>Application of existing SFMTA process</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3.3 Support the creation of bicycle parking facilities on streets and sidewalks, as appropriate</td>
<td>Application of existing SFMTA process</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFMTA, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ensure that transit serving the Plan Area is a dequate, reliable, pleasant</td>
<td>4.3.1 Provide a robust network of lanes that are exclusively for transit</td>
<td>4.3.1.1 Implement transit lanes identified by the Muni Forward Program, as well as additional strategies identified in the complete streets plan discussed in Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Implementation of the Muni Forward Program; also Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFMTA, Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2 Support funding maintaining a state of good repair of the existing fleet and infrastructure</td>
<td>The Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) and Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee (EN Fee) are existing. The Central SoMa (CS) Fee and Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) were created upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.3 Support funding to implement Muni Forward</td>
<td>The TSF and EN Fee are existing. The CS Fee and CFD were created upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.4 Support funding to meet future needs for both local and regional transit service to the Plan Area</td>
<td>The TSF and EN Fee are existing. The CS Fee and CFD were created upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, SFCTA, SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.5</td>
<td>Study adjustment of transit service program to serve the demand from the increase in jobs and housing in the neighborhood</td>
<td>4.3.5.1 Study the need to revise transit service after a substantial amount of the expected development has occurred.</td>
<td>SFMTA study with community input</td>
<td>After 10 years of Plan adoption, or as needed</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>Encourage mode shift away from private automobile usage</strong></td>
<td>4.4.1 Limit the amount of parking in new development</td>
<td>4.4.1.1 Within the CMUO District, reduce the amount of parking allowed as follows:</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For residential development, principally permit 0.25 spaces per unit, with up to 0.5 spaces per unit permitted with a conditional use authorization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For all non-residential development, set the maximum amount allowed as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Office: one space for every 3,500 square feet,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retail: one space for every 1,500 square feet, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All other uses as currently listed in Planning Code Section 151.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.2 Utilize Transportation Demand Management strategies to encourage use of alternatives to the private automobile</td>
<td>4.4.2.1 Implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures required by the Planning Code, removing grandfathering provision for projects that could not be built but for the Central SoMa Plan.</td>
<td>Application of existing Planning Code requirements</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td><strong>Accommodate regional, through, and delivery traffic where necessary, but mitigate the impacts of such traffic on local livability and circulation</strong></td>
<td>4.5.1 Maintain the ability of certain streets to accommodate through-traffic while ensuring they meet minimum needs for safety and comfort of all road users</td>
<td>4.5.1.1 Design and construct Bryant and Harrison Streets to accommodate more through traffic than other east-west streets in the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Community planning efforts</td>
<td>Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5.2 Design buildings to accommodate delivery of people and goods with a minimum of conflict</td>
<td>4.5.2.1 Require sponsors of development projects that provide more than 100,000 square feet to prepare a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP), and submit the plan for review and approval by the Planning Department and the SFMTA. The DLOP shall focus on reducing potential conflicts between driveway operations, including loading activities, and pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles, and to maximize reliance of on-site loading spaces to accommodate new loading demand. The DLOP shall include consider, at a minimum, loading dock management, large truck access, garage/loading dock attendants, and refuse collection. The DLOP shall also look at designs to separate loading from sensitive land uses as well as building design strategies to better support off-peak and unattended deliveries.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning, SFMTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SFMTA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Support funding for the rehabilitation/rebuild of Gene Friend Recreation Center</td>
<td>Maximize the benefit provided by existing parks and recreational facilities</td>
<td>Funding from ENT and/or CFD to support ongoing RPD efforts</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>RPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Support funding for the rehabilitation/rebuild of Gene Friend Recreation Center</td>
<td>Help fund the rehabilitation and/or rebuild of Gene Friend Recreation Center.</td>
<td>Funding from ENT and/or CFD to support ongoing RPD efforts</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>RPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>Support funding for the activation of Victoria Manalo Draves Park</td>
<td>Help fund activation of and/or capital upgrades to Victoria Manalo Draves Park.</td>
<td>Funding from CFD and/or ENT Fee to support ongoing RPD efforts</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>Planning, RPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3</td>
<td>Explore funding for rehabilitation of Yerba Buena Gardens</td>
<td>Identify appropriate ways to fund the rehabilitation of Yerba Buena Gardens, potentially including funding from the Central SoMa Community Facilities District.</td>
<td>Collaborative process facilitated by the City involving stakeholders in the Yerba Buena area</td>
<td>Ongoing dedicated staff time</td>
<td>Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.4</td>
<td>Explore additional strategies to fund existing parks</td>
<td>Explore additional strategies to fund existing parks</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing until completed</td>
<td>Planning, RPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Create new public parks</td>
<td>Create new public parks in the highest growth portion of the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Identify appropriate ways to fund the rehabilitation of Yerba Buena Gardens, potentially including funding from the Central SoMa Community Facilities District.</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>Planning, RPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>Create new public parks</td>
<td>Help fund design, construct, and maintain new public parks.</td>
<td>Help fund design, construct, and maintain new public park on the block bounded by 4th Street, 5th Street, Bryant Street, and Brannan Street.</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>Planning, RPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>Create new public parks</td>
<td>Help fund design, construct, and maintain new public park on 4th Street between 5th Street and 6th Street.</td>
<td>Help fund design, construct, and maintain new public park on 4th Street between 5th Street and 6th Street.</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>Planning, RPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Create new public parks</td>
<td>Help fund design, construct, and maintain new public park on 4th Street between 5th Street and 6th Street.</td>
<td>Help fund design, construct, and maintain new public park on 4th Street between 5th Street and 6th Street.</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>Planning, RPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Create new public recreational opportunities</td>
<td>Increase the amount of public recreational facilities.</td>
<td>Dedicate funding towards the creation of a large new park in the Central SoMa area, including site acquisition and construction costs.</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>Planning, Public private engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>Create new public recreational opportunities</td>
<td>Work with developers of new projects to explore the potential to locate a new recreational center in their new public recreational facilities.</td>
<td>Work with developers of new projects to explore the potential to locate a new recreational center in their new public recreational facilities.</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>Planning, Public private engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2</td>
<td>Develop new public recreational facilities</td>
<td>Develop new public recreational facilities.</td>
<td>Inquire about the feasibility of developing new public recreational facilities.</td>
<td>As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td>Planning, Public private engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL #5 – OFFER AN ABUNDANCE OF PARKS AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES**

**IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.2.2</td>
<td>As appropriate, help fund, design, construct, and maintain public recreation facilities under the I-80 freeway.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding from EN Fee, CFD, or offsite POPOS. Designed through community planning efforts. Implemented by the City and/or private development.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Utilize the street right-of-way for additional green spaces, gathering and recreational opportunities</td>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>Where appropriate, promote pedestrian-only or shared-street design concepts for narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections</td>
<td>5.4.1.1</td>
<td>Support pedestrian-only or shared streets in new developments required to provide mid-block connections.</td>
<td>Design and review of development projects</td>
<td>Ongoing, as development proposals occur</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Augment the public open space and recreation network with privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS)</td>
<td>5.5.1</td>
<td>Require new non-residential development and encourage residential development to provide POPOS that address the needs of the community</td>
<td>5.5.1.1</td>
<td>Require new non-residential development (exclusive of PDR and Institutional Uses) of 90,000 square feet or more to provide POPOS at a rate of one square foot for every 50 square feet of gross floor area. Require these POPOS to meet certain design standards, in consultation with staff of the Recreation and Parks Department, as follows:</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On large sites south of Bryant Street, POPOS must be at grade and open to the sky.
- On other sites, POPOS requirements may be met outdoors, indoors, or through an in-lieu fee, with preference for outdoor space, and all on-site space provided at-grade up to the first 15% of lot area.
- POPOS must be on-site or within 900 feet of the development.
- POPOS must be open evening and weekends, and
- POPOS must be lined by active uses.

The Planning Commission will consider how the proposed POPOS serves the needs of diverse inhabitants of Central SoMa, including (but not limited to) residents, youth, families, workers, and seniors.

| 5.5.1.2 | Continue enabling residential and non-residential development to have a reduced open space requirement where such open space is publicly accessible | | Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code | Ongoing | Planning |
| 5.5.1.3 | Review and approve design and operations strategy of proposed POPOS. | | Design and review of development projects | Ongoing, as development proposals occur | Planning, RPD |
### GOAL #6 – CREATE AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE AND RESILIENT NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ensure the neighborhood’s parks and recreation offerings function as a network and complement the facilities of the broader SoMa area</td>
<td>5.6.1</td>
<td>Design the parks and recreational opportunities in a systematic manner to serve the community’s needs</td>
<td>5.6.1.1</td>
<td>Develop and implement a parks and recreation strategy for the Plan Area and/or larger South of Market area. This strategy should identify the neighborhood needs in the context of both existing and planned facilities and population. It should also identify locations to meet these needs as new parks and recreational facilities are built and/or rehabilitated.</td>
<td>Community planning effort</td>
<td>Start process within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>RDP, Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive strategy for creating an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood</td>
<td>6.1.1</td>
<td>Create an implementing entity within the City</td>
<td>6.1.1.1</td>
<td>Support the formation of an inter-agency team that would be responsible for supporting implementation of sustainability and resilience strategies, both in Central SoMa as well as potentially other plan areas. The team will include the Planning Department, San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE), San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (ORCP) and other relevant City departments. This team would provide a forum for connecting with residents and community groups, businesses and workers, visitors, developers of new buildings, owners and managers of existing buildings, utilities, potential funders, and other key stakeholders.</td>
<td>Planning Department in partnership with SFE, SFPUC, DBI, and ORCP</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within one year of Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated with the IPIC, and through development review in the SDAT</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated with new development in the UDAT</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Support property owner engagement and education on opportunities and incentives to increase the environmental sustainability and resilience of building design, operations, and occupant behavior. This could occur in coordination with the interagency team identified in Implementation Measure 6.1.1.1.</td>
<td>6.1.4.2</td>
<td>Department of Building Inspection (DBI), SF Environment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor environmental conditions and trends, and evolving technologies and strategies to fulfill the vision and goals of the Central SoMa Plan. This could occur in coordination with the interagency team identified in Implementation Measure 6.1.1.1.</td>
<td>6.1.5</td>
<td>Planning Department work program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For new and existing buildings, continue implementing the energy efficiency requirements of the San Francisco Green Building Code and California Building Standards Title 24.</td>
<td>6.2.1</td>
<td>Planning, SFE</td>
<td>Ongoing, implementation of the San Francisco Green Building Code and California Title 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide information to new development proposals on how to increase energy efficiency beyond current requirements.</td>
<td>6.2.1.2</td>
<td>Planning, SF Department of Building Inspection (DBI), SFE</td>
<td>Required for development applications received after December 31, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide information to existing building owners about energy retrofit programs.</td>
<td>6.2.1.3</td>
<td>Planning, SFE</td>
<td>At annual benchmarking and 5-year audit requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore requiring energy use intensity (EUI) estimates for new development.</td>
<td>6.2.1.4</td>
<td>Planning, SF Department of Building Inspection (DBI), SFE</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support SFPUC's ongoing LED upgrades of its streetlights throughout the District.</td>
<td>6.2.1.5</td>
<td>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)</td>
<td>Ongoing SFPUC work program, coordinated with street and sidewalk projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support the replacement and/or conversion of streetlights to LED as part of the Central SoMa complete streets upgrades (See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1).</td>
<td>6.2.1.6</td>
<td>San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Works, Planning</td>
<td>Ongoing, as funding accrues and as prioritized through City and community processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore upgrades to street lighting not planned for the Central SoMa complete streets upgrades.</td>
<td>6.2.1.7</td>
<td>Planning, SFPUC, SFMTA, Planning</td>
<td>Required for applications received after December 31, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore and adopt measures to increase solar energy generation on and within the District.</td>
<td>6.2.2</td>
<td>Planning, SFPUC, SFMTA</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the San Francisco Green Building Code and California Title 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.2</td>
<td>Expand current solar requirements to all new development up to 160 feet tall, regardless of number of occupied floors.</td>
<td>6.2.2.2</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment Upon Plan adoption Planning, DBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.3</td>
<td>Explore strategies to increase onsite renewable energy generation and/or solar thermal hot water systems beyond current minimums; including, increased rooftop productivity, building facades, and other innovations.</td>
<td>6.2.2.3</td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide Within two years of Plan adoption SFE, Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.4</td>
<td>Provide information to existing building owners about funding opportunities for solar energy generation systems, as well as opportunities to combine living roofs with solar systems to increase performance and co-benefits.</td>
<td>6.2.2.4</td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide At annual benchmarking and 5-year audit requirements SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.5</td>
<td>Design and implement solar projects on key public sites, in coordination with a better roof program.</td>
<td>6.2.2.5</td>
<td>Coordinated with new development, involving Planning Department, SFE, and SFPUC Within two years of Plan adoption SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3</td>
<td>Satisfy 100 percent of electricity demand using greenhouse gas-free power supplies</td>
<td>6.2.3.1</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment Upon Plan adoption Planning, SFE, DBI, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3.2</td>
<td>Provide existing buildings with information on green power purchase options.</td>
<td>6.2.3.2</td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide At annual benchmarking and 5-year audit requirements SFE, DBI, Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4</td>
<td>Explore strategies to reduce fossil fuel use in buildings.</td>
<td>6.2.4.1</td>
<td>Planning Department in coordination with SFE Within two years of Plan adoption SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5</td>
<td>Minimize transportation-based greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>6.2.5.1</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 1 and Goal 4 Ongoing Planning, SFMTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5.2</td>
<td>Meet citywide requirements for electrical distribution and service capacity standards that support electrical vehicle (EV) charging in off-street parking spaces in new development and major renovations.</td>
<td>6.2.5.2</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Green Building Code Ongoing SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5.3</td>
<td>Explore requirement for installing EV plug-in stations at off-street loading docks in new and existing development that eliminates delivery truck idling emissions.</td>
<td>6.2.5.3</td>
<td>Planning Department in coordination with SFE Within three years of Plan adoption SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4</td>
<td>Explore a program to plan and install EV charging stations in publicly accessible parking spaces (on-street and off-street) throughout Central SoMa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Department in coordination with SFE, SFPUC, SFMTA</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5</td>
<td>Explore the potential of vacuum systems for refuse materials management on multi-building/district-scale development sites, in part to significantly reduce refuse hauling noise and emissions impacts by minimizing material pick-up locations and frequency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Department in coordination with SFE</td>
<td>Within three years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1</td>
<td>Minimize water waste</td>
<td>6.3.1.1</td>
<td>Efficiently use potable water</td>
<td>Continue implementing existing City requirements for water efficiency and conservation in new development.</td>
<td>Green Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2</td>
<td>Increase non-potable water use in buildings</td>
<td>6.3.2.1</td>
<td>Implement the Non-Potable Ordinance: • Require non-potable treatment systems in new developments 250k square feet or larger, leveraging all available non-potable water sources (rainwater, graywater, showers and laundry, and foundation drainage) for maximum reuse for irrigation and toilet flushing, and • Continue implementing existing City requirement that all new development 40,000 square feet and larger conduct a Water Balance Study considering non-potable water capture and use.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Health Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2.2</td>
<td>Explore opportunities for maximizing non-potable water use in building cooling systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2.3</td>
<td>Encourage and facilitate the development of district, multi-project scale non-potable water systems: • Continue to increase awareness and reduce barriers to district-scale systems, • Continue to provide technical guidance to interested project sponsors, and • Consider augmenting the currently required Water Balance Study to consider potential synergies between adjacent properties, i.e., upsizing and connecting required non-potable systems to provide recycled water to adjacent buildings that already contain dual-plumbed systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3</td>
<td>Increase non-potable water use in parks, open spaces, sidewalks, and streets</td>
<td>6.3.3.1</td>
<td>Coordinate the planning, design, and construction of non-potable water collection, treatment, and storage systems as part of Central SoMa’s major public park and open space projects to service irrigation demand with 100% non-potable water.</td>
<td>Included in the Central SoMa sea level rise and flood management strategy (Implementation Measures 6.6.1.1) and major public development projects</td>
<td>Within 10 years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3.2</td>
<td>Fund the planning, design, and construction of sufficient non-potable water filling stations to satisfy all street cleaning needs in the District.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4.1.1</td>
<td>Continue implementing the Urban Forest Master Plan, Better Streets Plan, Green Connections, and other efforts to maximize street trees, sidewalk gardens, and green public spaces.</td>
<td>Planning Department in coordination with SFPUC and Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Public Works Codes and the Urban Forest Master Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, SFPUC, Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Support biodiversity, access to nature, and a healthy ecosystem</td>
<td>6.4.1</td>
<td>Maximize greening of parks, streets, and other publicly-accessible spaces</td>
<td>6.4.1.1</td>
<td>Continue implementing the Urban Forest Master Plan, Better Streets Plan, Green Connections, and other efforts to maximize street trees, sidewalk gardens, and green public spaces.</td>
<td>Planning Department in coordination with SFPUC and Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, SFPUC, Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.2</td>
<td>Maximize greening of rooftops and walls</td>
<td>6.4.2</td>
<td>Require new development (sites 5,000 square feet and larger, with building heights 160 feet and less) to construct at least 50% of roof area as a living roof, to be designed in a manner that meets applicable non-potable water and stormwater management requirements.</td>
<td>Planning Code Amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3</td>
<td>Ensure that greening supports habitat and biodiversity</td>
<td>6.4.3</td>
<td>For all greening on streets and public open spaces, encourage the use of climate appropriate, habitat supportive, pollution filtering, and non-invasive plants, as well as integrated pest management that meets City standards.</td>
<td>SDAT and Public Works review of streets, sidewalks, and open space plans</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.4</td>
<td>Encourage the inclusion of interpretive signage and other public information on biodiversity, habitat, and nature in POPOS and other publicly accessible open spaces.</td>
<td>6.4.4</td>
<td>For all greening on private roofs and privately-owned public open spaces, require the use of climate appropriate, habitat supportive, pollution filtering, San Francisco native or non-invasive plants (as identified in the SF Plant Finder, Bay Friendly Guidelines, or similar tool), and meet the City's Integrated Pest Management Ordinance.</td>
<td>SFE, SFPUC review as part of living roof and/or stormwater management approvals</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFE, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.5</td>
<td>Continue implementing and improving Bird Safe Buildings Standards in new development.</td>
<td>6.4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.6</td>
<td>Encourage the inclusion of interpretive signage and other public information on biodiversity, habitat, and nature in POPOS and other publicly accessible open spaces.</td>
<td>6.4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFE, Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Improve air quality</td>
<td>6.5.1 Support a reduction in vehicle miles travelled</td>
<td>6.5.1.1 See Implementation Measures in Goal 4.</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4.</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4.</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4.</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td>See Implementation Measures in Goal 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2</td>
<td>Utilize greening to reduce pollution and heat</td>
<td>6.5.2.1 See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3.</td>
<td>6.5.2.1 See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3.</td>
<td>6.5.2.1 See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3.</td>
<td>6.5.2.1 See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3.</td>
<td>6.5.2.1 See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.3</td>
<td>Improve the air quality around the freeway</td>
<td>6.5.3.1 As part of a comprehensive freeway corridor transformation strategy, develop and implement air quality improvement measures along the freeway corridor, such as of greening, use of air filtration materials technologies, and other innovations.</td>
<td>Planning Department work program</td>
<td>Strategy within one year of Plan adoption, ongoing implementation as funding permits</td>
<td>Planning Department work program</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.4</td>
<td>Utilize healthier building materials and technologies that improve indoor and outdoor air quality</td>
<td>6.5.4.1 Ensure all new development meets the highest current City standards for Low Emitting Materials in building interiors.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Green Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFE, DBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Green Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFE, DBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Green Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFE, DBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Green Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFE, DBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Require enhanced filtration systems for areas of poor air quality, in accordance with Article 38 of the Health Code.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Green Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SFE, DBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide examples, resources, and standards, such as the use of pollution filtering building skins and other exterior materials that promote healthier outdoor air.</td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide</td>
<td>Within one year of Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promote the best available control technologies for diesel generators and fire pumps.</td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Maximize flood resilience</td>
<td>6.6.1 Develop a comprehensive sea level rise and flood management strategy for Central SoMa and adjacent at-risk areas</td>
<td>6.6.1.1 Develop a Central SoMa sea level rise and flood management strategy, including:</td>
<td>Planning Department work program</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• District-wide hydrology study (extreme storm and 100-year flood flows, considering sea level rise impacts),</td>
<td>Planning Department work program</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehensive plan of optimally sized, located, and prioritized flood management infrastructure, including potential green infrastructure systems in streets and sidewalks, street grade adjustments, floodways, detention basins, and stormwater systems, and</td>
<td>Planning Department work program</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Targeted policies and programs to reduce flood risk.</td>
<td>Planning Department work program</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2</td>
<td>Reduce building vulnerability to sea level rise and extreme storms</td>
<td>6.6.2.1 All new development and substantial modifications to existing development should meet the flood resistant building standards of the City's Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code, especially as flood hazard maps are updated to reflect precipitation-driven flooding and sea level rise.</td>
<td>Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City Administrator’s Office, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City Administrator’s Office, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City Administrator’s Office, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City Administrator’s Office, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City Administrator’s Office, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City Administrator’s Office, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2.2</td>
<td>Develop and implement flood resistant design guidelines for representative building typologies in Central SoMa that help protect structures while ensuring vibrant/livable sidewalks and streets.</td>
<td>6.6.2</td>
<td>Implement flood resistant design guidelines for representative building typologies in Central SoMa</td>
<td>Planning Department work program, in collaboration with Sea Level Rise Action Plan implementation</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning, SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.3</td>
<td>Maximize stormwater and flood management using streets, sidewalks, and open spaces</td>
<td>6.6.3.1</td>
<td>Integrate stormwater and flood management tools into all “complete streets” improvements through both functional landscape elements and street design, according to the Central SoMa sea level rise and flood management strategy and associated design guidelines.</td>
<td>Integrated into complete streets design and construction (see Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1)</td>
<td>Ongoing (see Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1)</td>
<td>Planning (see Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.3.2</td>
<td>Integrate stormwater and flood management tools into existing and new open spaces, guided by the Central SoMa sea level rise and flood management strategy and associated design guidelines.</td>
<td>Integrated in park design processes (see Implementation Measures 5.2.1.1 through 5.2.4.1)</td>
<td>Ongoing (see Implementation Measures 5.2.1.1 through 5.2.4.1)</td>
<td>Recreation and Parks Department (RPD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Maximize earthquake resilience</td>
<td>6.7.1</td>
<td>Ensure the ability of new and existing buildings to withstand a major seismic event</td>
<td>Continue implementing Building Code requirements for seismic safety.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Building Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7.1.2</td>
<td>Provide project sponsors with information on latest citywide resilience efforts, such as Resilient SF, the Solar Storage initiative, etc.</td>
<td>Engagement through the PPA and entitlement process</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.2</td>
<td>Secure sufficient power and water supplies to withstand a 72-hour emergency</td>
<td>6.7.2.1</td>
<td>Consider developing a Central SoMa program for securing emergency on-site power and water capacity, in new private developments, existing buildings, public sites, neighborhood emergency center, etc.</td>
<td>Planning Department, in coordination with SFE, SFPUC, City Administrator’s Office and DBI</td>
<td>Within two years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFE, SFPUC, City Administrator’s Office, DBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Help achieve zero solid waste</td>
<td>6.8.1</td>
<td>Maximize recycling and composting of solid waste from all buildings</td>
<td>Ensure adequate refuse sorting and storage facilities and operations in all buildings, to support achieving a target of zero waste, including: • Enforce current requirements to provide adequate and equally convenient collection, sorting, and storage space for recyclables, compostables, and trash streams, in order to allow the recovery of 100% of a facility’s refuse materials, and • Enforce requirements that all multi-family residential and commercial buildings have on-site staff to facilitate source separation and tenant education.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of the Building Code and Environment Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>DBI, SFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8.1.2</td>
<td>Develop refuse collection and storage design guidelines for Central SoMa’s common residential and commercial building typologies.</td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide</td>
<td>Within one year of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8.2</td>
<td>Maximize recycling and reuse of construction and demolition materials</td>
<td>Encourage all new development to pursue onsite source separation that facilitates higher recycling rates for construction and demolition debris.</td>
<td>Inclusion in the Sustainable Neighborhood Guide</td>
<td>Within one year of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.3</td>
<td>Reduce litter in streetscapes and parks</td>
<td>6.8.3.1</td>
<td>Encourage 3-stream sorting and/or collection systems in privately managed open spaces (POPOS).</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.3.2</td>
<td>Explore development of a Central SoMa Litter Waste Abatement Strategy, including public education, facilities, and signage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Department in coordination with SFE</td>
<td>Within three years of Plan adoption</td>
<td>SFE, Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.3.3</td>
<td>Help fund neighborhood cleaning efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing funding from CFD</td>
<td>As funding accrues</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL #7 – PRESERVE AND CELEBRATE THE NEIGHBORHOOD’S CULTURAL HERITAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Ensure that the history of the neighborhood is adequately documented</td>
<td>7.1.1</td>
<td>Complete and adopt the historic context statement</td>
<td>7.1.1.1</td>
<td>Not applicable – already adopted.</td>
<td>Motion #0277 of the Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>Completed March 2016</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2</td>
<td>Complete and adopt the historic resources survey</td>
<td>7.1.2.1</td>
<td>Not applicable – already adopted.</td>
<td>Motion #0277 of the Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>Completed March 2016</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Support the preservation, recognition, and wellbeing of the neighborhood’s cultural heritage resources</td>
<td>7.2.1</td>
<td>Facilitate the creation and implementation of a SoMa Pilipinas Cultural Heritage Strategy</td>
<td>7.2.1.1</td>
<td>Staff community process of developing the SoMa Pilipinas Cultural Heritage Strategy.</td>
<td>Ongoing community process culminating in presentations to the Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Expected Fall of 2016</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.1.2</td>
<td>Provide annual funding for social and cultural programming to the broader SoMa community, including the Filipino community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding from CFD</td>
<td>Upon accrual of funds from the CFD</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2</td>
<td>Facilitate the creation and implementation of other social or cultural heritage strategies, such as for the LGBTQ community</td>
<td>7.2.2.1</td>
<td>Support efforts to implement the recommendations of the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing community and City conversation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.2.2</td>
<td>As appropriate, undertake community process of developing a cultural heritage strategy for groups important to the living history of Central SoMa.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing community and City conversation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.2.3</td>
<td>Provide annual funding for social and cultural programming to the broader SoMa community, including the LGBTQ community.</td>
<td>Funding from CFD</td>
<td>Upon accrual of funds from the CFD</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Ensure the neighborhood’s tangible and intangible industrial and arts legacy is not lost</td>
<td>7.3.1</td>
<td>Implement strategies that maintain PDR jobs in the neighborhood</td>
<td>7.3.1.1</td>
<td>See implementation measures related to Objective 3.3.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan Adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.2</td>
<td>Support the preservation of buildings and features that reflect the industrial and arts legacy of the neighborhood</td>
<td>7.3.2.1</td>
<td>See implementation measures related to Objectives 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Prevent demolition of or insensitive alterations to cultural heritage resources in the built environment</td>
<td>7.4.1</td>
<td>Protect Landmark-worthy cultural heritage properties through designation to Article 10 of the Planning Code</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.1.1</td>
<td>Maintain and safeguard properties already designated to Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code within the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.1.2</td>
<td>Designate properties and districts to Article 10 of the Planning Code</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.2</td>
<td>Protect “Significant” and “Contributory” cultural heritage properties through designation to Article 11 of the Planning Code</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption and ongoing until complete, with the sequence of additions based on prioritization of the Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.2.1</td>
<td>Expand Article 11 of the Planning Code to include Central SoMa.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.2.2</td>
<td>Reclassify properties and districts to Article 11 of the Planning Code.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Support mechanisms for the rehabilitation and maintenance of cultural heritage properties</td>
<td>7.5.1</td>
<td>Support funding for the rehabilitation of the Old Mint</td>
<td>Requirement of the Community Facilities District</td>
<td>Ongoing, as funding accrues</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.1.1</td>
<td>Dedicate funding through a Community Facilities District to support the restoration of the Old Mint.</td>
<td>Requirement of the Community Facilities District</td>
<td>Ongoing, as funding accrues</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.2</td>
<td>Enable “Significant” and “Contributing” buildings underbuilt per applicable zoning to sell Transferable Development Rights</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.2.1</td>
<td>Revise the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program to extend to Central SoMa.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.3</td>
<td>Require large new development projects to purchase Transferable Development Rights</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.3.1</td>
<td>Require projects to buy TDR (for specific requirements, see the “Requirements for New Development” document). TDR must be purchased from buildings within Central SoMa or public buildings.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.4</td>
<td>Support additions over wholesale demolition to preserve cultural heritage properties</td>
<td>7.5.4.1 For historic buildings not included in Article 10 or 11, require buildings to explore additions as an alternative to demolition. Only support demolition upon demonstrative proof of the infeasibility of additions. Projects informed through the City’s Urban Design Guidelines and the Historic Design Guidelines documents.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.5</td>
<td>Encourage the use of existing strategies and incentives that facilitate the preservation and rehabilitation of designated cultural heritage properties</td>
<td>7.5.5.1 Continue implementing existing programs where appropriate. Such programs include the Mills Act, Federal Rehabilitation Tax Incentives, façade easements, Planning Code exemptions and the use of the California Historic Building Code.</td>
<td>Ongoing promotion and technical support provided by Planning Department’s Preservation Planning team.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning, Department of Building Inspection (DBI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.1</td>
<td>Restrict the consolidation of small- and medium-sized lots with character-enhancing buildings</td>
<td>7.6.1.1 Ban the consolidation of lots containing buildings with historic or neighborhood-character buildings (California Historic Resources Status Codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6L) where the frontage that could be merged is under 200 feet in length (excepting the frontage along the north side of Perry Street and on small blocks where there is a non-character building on the corner).</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.2</td>
<td>Incentivize retention of character-enhancing buildings</td>
<td>7.6.2.1 See Implementation Measure 7.6.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL #8 – ENSURE THAT NEW BUILDINGS ENHANCE THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Ensure that the ground floors of buildings contribute to the activation, safety, and dynamism of the neighborhood</td>
<td>8.1.1 Require that ground floors actively engage the street</td>
<td>8.1.1.1 Continue implementing the existing requirements that buildings be lined with active uses. Revise the definition of “active” to remove offices and to allow PDR on the ground floor if it meets the transparency and fenestration requirements of non-PDR uses. Expand the definition of frontages to POPOS and mid-block connections.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comply with the City's Urban Design Guidelines with regards to design of ground floors.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Require ground floor ceiling heights of 17 feet for non-residential uses.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.2</td>
<td>Design building frontages and public open spaces with furnishings and amenities to engage a mixed-use neighborhood</td>
<td>8.1.2.1 Review and support building designs where fixtures, furnishings, art, utilities, and programming at the ground floor or adjacent open space invite and support more active and consistent use of public areas including alleys, open spaces, and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensure that new buildings are built up to the sidewalk edge</td>
<td>8.1.3.1 Require new buildings to be built up to the sidewalk edge, which can be done by the property line up to the top of the podium, which should have setbacks in accordance with the Ground Floor Residential Guidelines.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minimize parking and loading entrances</td>
<td>8.1.4.1 Implement curb cut controls from Policy 4.1.2.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensure that the overall development pattern is complementary to the skyline</td>
<td>8.2.1.1 Set height limits to enable mid-rise development mindful of important views</td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reinforce the character of Central SoMa as a mid-rise district and provide &quot;urban rooms&quot;</td>
<td>8.3.1.1 Set height limits along the major streets to facilitate podiums of 65 to 85 feet.</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Require buildings whose height exceeds the width of the major streets to step back at the upper stories</td>
<td>8.3.3.1 For buildings 160 feet or less in height, apply &quot;skyplane&quot; to the portion of the building between 85-160 feet, as follows (and as visually conveyed in the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design):</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• At 85 feet in height, require a 15 foot setback for at least 60% of each frontage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On the north side of the street:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Height district of 130 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 50%.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Height district of 160 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 70%.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On the south side of the street:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Height district of 130 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 65%.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Height district of 160 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 80%.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.2</td>
<td>Require setbacks of 15-feet above a height of 85 feet on all sides of the building not facing a public right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.3</td>
<td>Do not allow any bridges between buildings to be above 130 feet in height.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.4</td>
<td>Require the following additional controls to apply when there is a proposed tower (i.e., building over 160 feet) (as visually conveyed in the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When there is an existing tower, the second tower should be at least 115 feet. The distance between towers may be reduced to a minimum of 85 feet if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The difference in the height of the two towers is at least 50 feet,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The bulk of the second tower is reduced relative to the reduction in tower separation, such that at 85 feet, the maximum tower bulk shall be 10,000 square feet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any tower seeking reduced tower separation will be required to be designed contextually to the other tower, and to maximize apparent distance and architectural differentiation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When a tower is adjacent to a building that is between 85 to 160 feet, at least 30 feet separation is required, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On lots large enough to contain a building with a tower portion (taller than 160') and a portion between 85 to 160 feet along a street frontage, in addition to these masses needing to be separated by at least 30 feet, these portions should be designed to look like different buildings from the frontage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.4.1</td>
<td>Limit new buildings greater than 160 feet (i.e., towers) to important nodes, including along the new Central Subway, 5th and Howard, 2nd and Harrison, and 5th and Howard, and 9th and Brannan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.4.2</td>
<td>Require the following bulk controls for buildings taller than 160 feet (as visually conveyed in the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.5</td>
<td>Limit heights in areas with a high concentration of historic buildings and areas of unique character</td>
<td>8.3.5.1</td>
<td>Keep height limits as is at South Park, the South End Historic District and the South End Historic District Extension.</td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.5.2</td>
<td>Create lower heights on 4th and near Bessie Carmichael Annex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.6</td>
<td>Minimize the impact of shadows on public spaces to the extent feasible, balanced with other core objectives</td>
<td>8.3.6.1</td>
<td>Set height limits districts to minimize shadow impacts on South Park, Yerba Buena Gardens, and Bessie Carmichael School's 6th-8th grade campus.</td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3.6.2</td>
<td>Sculpt new development to the degree possible to minimize shadows on public spaces without unduly impacting development capacity.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.7</td>
<td>Utilize new buildings to diminish the dominant presence of the freeway in the neighborhood</td>
<td>8.3.7.1</td>
<td>Raise height limits above the existing 30 feet limits between 2nd and 4th Streets.</td>
<td>Zoning Map amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 Ensure that narrow streets and alleys maintain their intimateness and sense of openness to the sky

8.4.1 Require new buildings facing alleys and narrow streets to step back at the upper stories

8.4.1.1 Maintain existing sun-angle requirements on the south side of east-west narrow streets (35 feet wide or less)

- Height district of 55 feet and under: require upper stories set back at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the abutting alley.
- Height district of 65 feet: require apparent mass reduction of 50%.
- Height district of 85 feet: require apparent mass reduction of 70%.
- Height district of 130 feet: require apparent mass reduction of 85%.

- For towers, the skyplane controls do not apply, but for buildings along Perry Street, require upper stories set back at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the street.

8.4.1.2 Extend the sun-angle requirement on the south side of east-west narrow streets (35 feet wide or less) to the south side of north-south narrow streets.

- Height district of 55 feet and under: require upper stories set back at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the east-west street.
- Height district of 65 feet: require apparent mass reduction of 50%.
- Height district of 85 feet: require apparent mass reduction of 70%.
- Height district of 130 feet: require apparent mass reduction of 85%.

8.4.1.3 Apply skyplane to north side narrow streets (35 feet wide or less) at heights above 35 feet as follows (and as visually conveyed in the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design):

- Height districts of 55 feet and under: require upper stories set back at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the north-south street.
- Height district of 65 feet: require apparent mass reduction of 50%.
- Height district of 85 feet: require apparent mass reduction of 70%.

8.4.1.4 On streets between 36 and 80 feet in width, apply the skyplane requirements of major streets as described in Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1, but begin the apparent mass reduction requirements at a height equivalent to the width of the street.

8.4.5 Ensure that large development sites are carefully designed to maximize public benefit

8.5.1 Provide greater direction and flexibility for large development sites in return for improved design and additional public benefits

8.5.1.1 Develop “Key Development Site Guidelines” that lay out more detailed design guidelines and convey specific return on investment benefits allowed and specific public benefits to be realized.

8.5.1.2 An additional 25 feet of height may be permitted on sites where such flexibility in height would facilitate the provision of new housing and park/amenity space and otherwise align with strategies of the Plan, as long as such additional height does not increase the overall amount of development otherwise enabled by the Plan or cause new significant impacts related to wind and shadow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.5.2</td>
<td>Limit the length of new buildings</td>
<td>8.5.2.1</td>
<td>Continue implementing the existing requirements for horizontal mass reductions.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of existing Planning Code requirements</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6.1</td>
<td>Conform to the City's Urban Design Guidelines</td>
<td>8.6.1.1</td>
<td>Comply with the City's Urban Design Guidelines.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6.2</td>
<td>Promote innovative and contextually-appropriate design</td>
<td>8.6.2.1</td>
<td>Utilize application of “skyplane” as a device to create interestingly shaped buildings (as detailed in the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design).</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.2.2</td>
<td>Harmonize new building designs with existing neighborhood materials but in a contemporary or reinterpreted way (as detailed in the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design).</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.2.3</td>
<td>Recognize and enhance existing local material and geometry variations to support neighborhood-specific architecture (as detailed in the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design).</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.2.4</td>
<td>Employ innovative architectural ideas for larger projects that provide a clear organizing principle for design (as detailed in the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design).</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.2.5</td>
<td>Allow rooftop screening mechanisms to be proportional to building height</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.3</td>
<td>Design the upper floors to be deferential to the “urban room”</td>
<td>8.6.3.1</td>
<td>Require buildings to comply with skyplane controls discussed under Policy 8.3.3 and 8.4.1.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.3.2</td>
<td>Utilize material systems that visually diminish upper facades.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.4</td>
<td>Design buildings to be mindful of wind</td>
<td>8.6.4.1</td>
<td>For buildings over 85 feet, set the following wind requirements:</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not allow an increase in the number of hours during which wind exceeds the “comfort criterion” defined for Central SoMa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not allow an increase in the total exceedances of the “hazard criterion” defined for Central SoMa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Apply the same exceptions included in Section 148.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.5</td>
<td>Ensure large projects integrate with existing urban fabric and provide a varied character</td>
<td>8.6.5.1</td>
<td>Modulate larger projects vertically or horizontally, whichever is more appropriate, to reflect surrounding lots and massing patterns.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.5.2</td>
<td>For projects with more than one building, recognize and respond to the existing pattern of long blocks, open spaces, and large and small streets.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>LEAD AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6.5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vary the roofs of buildings for projects with long facades.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6.5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage projects on site that are larger than two acres to have multiple architects.</td>
<td>Design review of individual projects</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Establish clear rules for development</td>
<td>8.7.1</td>
<td>Wherever possible, delineate via the Planning Code what is allowed and not allowed in new development</td>
<td>Utilize the Community Plan Exemption process for complying projects.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of CEQA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimize potential exceptions and exemptions within the Planning Code.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the threshold for seeking &quot;Large Project Authorization&quot; commensurate with the neighborhood’s expected development.</td>
<td>Planning Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limit the capacity for complaints against uses operating in a lawful manner.</td>
<td>Administrative Code amendment</td>
<td>Upon Plan adoption</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II: CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

PUBLIC BENEFITS PACKAGE
The vision of the Central SoMa Plan is to create a social, economic, and environmentally sustainable neighborhood by 2040, with space for approximately 32,000 new jobs and 8,800 new housing units. With its centralized location near downtown, excellent transit access, and numerous undeveloped or underdeveloped sites, the neighborhood is well-positioned to become a new hub for employment and housing the core of the city and Bay Area Region.

As it grows and evolves over the next 25 years, Central SoMa will require significant investments in infrastructure. As such, the City places requirements on new development to help ameliorate and mitigate its impacts. These requirements and controls will result in approximately $2 billion in public benefits to serve the neighborhood – compared to the $500 million in revenues that would occur absent the plan.

The purpose of this Public Benefits Program Document is to summarize the Plan’s public infrastructure program, sources of funding, relative allocation of revenues from the various sources among the infrastructure projects, and implementation processes and mechanisms. It includes the following sections:

1. **Process:** This section briefly outlines the process of developing the implementation program and strategy for the Central SoMa Plan, including describing the supporting needs assessments, community outreach and interagency process, and technical analyses.

2. **Public Benefits Package:** This section outlines a range of infrastructure and services that may serve new growth anticipated under the Plan, including a description of the implementing agencies/organizations and anticipated timeline for delivery.

3. **Funding Strategy:** This section describes the requirements on new development to finance the improvements proposed in the Public Benefits Package.

4. **Administration & Monitoring:** This section describes the interagency processes for ensuring coordination during the plan implementation period, as well as procedures for ongoing monitoring to ensure that the Plan’s objectives are being met.

Several of the funding and implementation processes are legally established and more thoroughly described in other City codes and ordinances, including the Planning Code and Administrative Code. Also note that these proposals are designed to be consistent with the requirements of California Mitigation Fee Act and all proposed development impact fees have been evaluated against relevant maximum justified nexus amounts, where applicable.  

---

1. Last updated in March 2019 (reflects final Central SoMa Plan adopted in December 2018).
2. Pursuant to the California Mitigation Fee Act (CA Government code § 66000 et seq.), cities may enact development impact fee requirements provided they are roughly proportional in nature and extent to the impact of the new development.
The Planning Department worked iteratively with other agencies and stakeholders to develop the public benefits, financing, and administration strategies described in this Implementation Plan. Concepts for infrastructure and public benefits were first developed for the Draft Central Corridor Plan in 2013, and further refined through additional outreach leading up to the Draft Central SoMa Plan in 2016. The Department held a series of public meetings and conducted an online survey in order to solicit public feedback on needs and funding priorities for public benefits. Details from these outreach events is chronicled at the project website (http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org).

This document describes a fiscally constrained list of projects that has been prioritized based on City and community feedback. It may not reflect the entire scope of possible infrastructure and service needs in the Plan Area, nor the longer term needs beyond the life of the Plan (anticipated as 25 years). It reflects public input on key neighborhood priorities and needs, informed by feedback from implementing agencies on project feasibility and cost. The public benefits identified may require further scoping and analysis on project design, financial feasibility, environmental review, and implementation. Project scoping and planning has already begun for a number of the City agency projects identified here, with the goal of having projects ready for construction by the time that funding generated by the Plan becomes available.

Additional technical analysis was conducted to support these proposed public benefits. A financial feasibility analysis by Seifel Consulting, Inc. was conducted in order to quantify the value created by the Plan and establish a financially feasible level of development requirements. Other nexus studies conducted for the City’s development impact fees provided further information on the amount of new infrastructure and services needed to serve new development. This document was also informed by methods and processes used for prior area planning processes (including Eastern Neighborhoods, Market & Octavia, and Transit Center District Plan).

Approval of the Implementation Program does not bind the City to approving or proceeding with any of the projects described in this Public Benefits Program. The City may modify this list of projects in the future, as the neighborhood evolves, new needs are identified, and/or any additional required environmental review is completed. Any such process would involve substantial public input and would require a revision to this Implementation Document. As described further in Section IV (Administration & Monitoring), oversight for implementation of this plan will be shared among various public agencies and elected officials, with input from the public through Community Advisory Committees (CACs) and other events or hearings. These regulatory bodies will be responsible for overseeing ongoing capital planning efforts, including: financial reporting and monitoring; deliberation regarding the sequencing and prioritization of expenditures; and if necessary, modifications to the Implementation Document, which would require ultimate approval by the Board of Supervisors.
Public benefits are goods and services expected to be generated by new development that typically: 1) support the broader community's wellbeing; 2) are not provided voluntarily by the private sector (or at least not in sufficient quantity or quality to meet demand); and, 3) require some sort of subsidy or opportunity cost (e.g. public or private funding) to create, operate, and maintain. Common types of public benefits include affordable housing, parks, and transit service. In order to fund public benefits, government agencies utilize “value capture” strategies – such as development requirements, taxes, fees, or other exactions. These strategies are often implemented concurrent to investments in public infrastructure (such as new transit service) or increases in development potential for property owners. The public benefits generated through these strategies are typically delivered through one or more of the following three mechanisms:

• **Direct provision of benefit by a specific development project** (e.g. on-site affordable housing units or the provision of Privately Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS). These public benefits are typically provided at the same time as the new development or shortly thereafter.

• **One-time impact fees** paid when a project is ready for construction, such as citywide (e.g. Child Care Fee) and area plan fees (e.g. Eastern Neighborhoods Community Infrastructure Fee).

• **Ongoing taxation** such as a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD).

This section describes the public benefits and the key funding sources expected to be generated by the Plan. There are nine categories of public benefits that may be funded by the Central SoMa Plan in support of its Goals, Objectives, and Policies. Table 1 summarizes how the revenues generated by Plan may be allocated among these public benefits, accompanied by a detailed discussion of each category of public benefit provided in order of allocated funding.³

Notably, in addition to this $2 billion increase in funding for public benefits expected to be generated directly by new development, taxes from new development in the Plan Area are expected to generate up to $1 billion additional revenues for the City's General Fund within the same time period, through increased property taxes, sales taxes, and other means. These taxes could be directed toward the neighborhood, other citywide needs, or a combination of the two at the discretion of the City's budgeting process. Additionally, the City could choose to fund public benefits in the neighborhood through other mechanisms, such as bonds or general taxes. Any of these funding sources could be directed to the Plan Area to accelerate delivery of public benefits, which would make the timing of implementation less dependent on the phasing of new development. However, pursuit of these mechanisms is dependent on processes and decision-making external to the adoption of this plan. Such additional funding sources would enable the City to address other neighborhood infrastructure needs, as identified at that time. For additional analysis of the overall economic impact of the Central SoMa Plan, see the Economic Impact Statement prepared by the Office of Economic Analysis.⁴

---

³ All dollar amounts expressed here are in 2017 dollars. Actual average revenues collected each year will be higher, due to scheduled tax rate escalation as well as indexing of City fees (which are escalated annually to reflect construction costs).

⁴ Available at: https://sfcontroller.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Economic%20Analysis/180184_economic_impact_final.pdf
Table 1
CENTRAL SOMA PUBLIC BENEFITS PACKAGE: SUMMARY (IN 2017 DOLLARS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
<th>CATEGORY ALLOCATION (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>$940,000,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet the target of 33% Below-Market Rate (BMR) units</td>
<td>$940,000,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$495-500,000,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local transit improvements to enhance convenience and safety</td>
<td>$340,000,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional transit capacity enhancement and expansion*</td>
<td>$155-160,000,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$185,000,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Friend Recreation Center Reconstruction/Expansion</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Manalo Draves Park Programming</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 1-acre park in Southwest portion of Plan Area</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New public recreation center**</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and greenery maintenance and activation</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New large (2+ acre) SoMa park (initial site identification)**</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bluxome linear park**</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New under-freeway public recreation area</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately-Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS)</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alternative project: 7th &amp; Mission Park)</td>
<td>($20,000,000)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, Distribution, &amp; Repair</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and creation of PDR space to ensure no net loss due to the Plan</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets</td>
<td>$110,000,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign of all major streets in the Plan Area to be safe and comfortable for people walking, biking, and on transit.</td>
<td>$110,000,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Preservation &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>$114-119,000,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of the US Mint Building*</td>
<td>$15-20,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and maintenance of historic buildings</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New community facilities (e.g. health care clinics and job training centers)</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural programming</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital for cultural amenities (e.g. Yerba Buena Gardens)</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR Relocation Assistance Fund</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood cleaning</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability &amp; Resilience</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced stormwater management in complete street projects</td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway corridor air quality and greening improvements</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Roofs enhanced requirements</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other energy and water efficiency projects</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools &amp; Childcare</td>
<td>$64,000,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New childcare centers</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital investments in schools serving K-12 population</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie Carmichael supplemental services</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$2,160,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The funding for these projects shall be allocated pursuant to Planning Code Section 434(e).
** If funds for these Parks & Recreation projects are provided by other sources (such as contributions from new development) or if revenues exceed the projected amounts, funding could be allocated to the “Alternative” project listed here.

NOTE: Over the course of Plan build out (roughly 25 years), the City expects to allocate funds among the public benefit categories in the amounts listed (or proportionally according to the category allocation percentages listed, should the final amount of revenues differ from what is shown here). However, the sequence of fund disbursement will be determined based on a variety of factors, including project readiness, community priorities, completion of any additional required environmental review, and other funding opportunities. The list of specific projects is subject to change and is not legally binding.

PUBLIC BENEFITS PROGRAM
Table 2
CENTRAL SOMA PUBLIC BENEFITS PACKAGE: DETAILED FUNDING SOURCES & USES (IN 2017 DOLLARS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC BENEFIT</th>
<th>DIRECT PROVISION BY NEW DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>CENTRAL SOMA COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT (§434)</th>
<th>EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS INFRASTRUCTURE FEE (§425)</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION LINKAGE SUSTAINABILITY FEE (§417A)</th>
<th>JOBS-HOUSING LINKAGE FEE (§419)</th>
<th>AFFORDABLE HOUSING FEE (§415)</th>
<th>CENTRAL SOMA INFRASTRUCTURE FEE (§428.2)</th>
<th>SCHOOL IMPACT FEE (CA ED. CODE §17620)</th>
<th>CHILD CARE FEE (§414 AND 414(A))</th>
<th>CENTRAL SOMA COMMUNITY FACILITIES FEE (§428.1)</th>
<th>TOTAL (BY CATEGORY)</th>
<th>% SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td>$550,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$940,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$940,000,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSIT</td>
<td>$155-160,000,000</td>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$495,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS &amp; RECREATION</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$185,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, &amp; REPAIR (PDR)</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETE STREETS</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$110,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL PRESERVATION &amp; COMMUNITY SERVICES</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$74-79,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$114-119,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$59,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLS &amp; CHILDCARE</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (BY SOURCE)</td>
<td>$836,000,000</td>
<td>$354,000,000</td>
<td>$240,000,000</td>
<td>$220,000,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$2,160,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The funding for these projects shall be allocated pursuant to Planning Code Section 434(e).
** Pending a trailing Planning Code amendment.

NOTE: Over the course of Plan build out (roughly 25 years), the City expects to allocate funds among the public benefit categories in the amounts listed (or proportionally according to the category allocation percentages listed), should the final amount of revenues differ from what is shown here). However, the sequence of fund disbursement will be determined based on a variety of factors, including project readiness, community priorities, completion of any additional required environmental review, and other funding opportunities. The list of specific projects is subject to change and is not legally binding.
AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Central SoMa Plan Objective 2.3, states that the City should “Ensure that at least 33% of new housing is affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income households”. The Central SoMa Plan will generate approximately 2,670 affordable units. The Plan will require that these below market rate units are developed within SoMa (i.e., the area bounded by Market Street, the Embarcadero, King Street, Division Street, and South Van Ness Avenue).

Table 3
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS – AFFORDABLE HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,970 BMR units</td>
<td>$730,000,000</td>
<td>Inclusionary Housing Program (Planning Code Section (Sec.) 415)</td>
<td>Applicable to new residential projects. Individual developments may choose how to satisfy the program requirements, but revenues are generally expected to be split 50-50 between: 1) onsite Inclusionary Housing Program units provided directly by development projects; and, 2) off-site Inclusionary Housing units or units provided by MOHCD, funded by payment of the Affordable Housing Fee</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 BMR units</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee (Sec. 413)</td>
<td>Fee is paid by new nonresidential developments, and units are provided by MOHCD.</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$940,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivery and Timing

All of the funding sources for below-market rate (BMR) units in the Plan Area are provided through either direct provision or impact fees paid by new developments. As such, the delivery of BMR units is highly dependent on the volume of new development. Onsite and offsite BMR units provided through the Inclusionary Housing Program are expected to be provided at the same time as market rate units of the affiliated project.

BMR units funded through impact fees at the time of development are directed to the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), which uses the money to identify and purchase sites and construct new affordable housing units, often in conjunction with nonprofit housing developers. MOHCD may need to assemble the impact fees from several market-rate projects to obtain sufficient funds for each new affordable housing project. Thus, the development of these units may lag behind the market rate units, unless additional affordable housing funds are directed to the Plan Area in the interim.

In addition, MOHCD is increasingly exploring affordable housing preservation strategies, in which they convert existing housing units (such as rent-controlled apartments) into permanently affordable BMR units. The City’s Small Sites Program is one such tool, funding acquisition and rehabilitation of 5-to-25-unit rental buildings. Central SoMa could rely on both production and preservation strategies in order to achieve the Plan’s affordable housing targets.

---

5 Meeting this Objective also fulfills the target of 33% affordability in the city, as established by the votes in 2014’s Proposition K.
**TRANSIT**

Central SoMa Plan Objective 4.3 states that the City should “Ensure that transit serving the Plan Area is adequate, reliable, and pleasant.” This is because new and enhanced public transportation infrastructure is fundamental to accommodating the influx of new jobs and housing units proposed for Central SoMa. Although the completion of the Central Subway system will provide a vital connection between the Plan Area and the rest of the city, additional improvements will be required over time to ensure that people can travel to and from the area safely and conveniently.

Funding from the Plan may be directed to both local and regional transportation systems, reflecting the important role that the Plan Area will serve as a hub in the Bay Area for jobs, housing, and culture. The Plan is expected to generate $495-500 million in investments to both near- and long-term transit service and capacity enhancements, serving both local and regional transit. Local transportation funding needs include, but are not limited to: transit enhancement and expansion, preventive maintenance (e.g. state of good repair efforts), streetscape improvements (such as transit priority lanes and boarding islands), and service adjustments.

Regional transit funding may be directed towards “core capacity” enhancement and expansion projects meant to facilitate movement to the Plan Area from the East Bay and Peninsula/South Bay. Studies are ongoing at the regional level to further define the scope and specifics of such projects, including the Core Capacity Study, Plan Bay Area, and related efforts. Efforts may include BART station and fleet upgrades, Bay Bridge corridor efficiency improvements, Caltrain corridor improvements (such as the Downtown Extension, or DTX, project), and longer-term projects (such as advancement of a second Transbay transit crossing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local transportation enhancements</td>
<td>$340,000,000</td>
<td>Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) (Sec. 411A); Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 423); Central SoMa Infrastructure Impact Fee (CSF) (Sec. 433); Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD; Sec. 434)</td>
<td>Funds may go to SFMTA to support transit service expansion/enhancement as well as preventive maintenance projects.</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional transit capacity enhancement and expansion</td>
<td>$155-160,000,000</td>
<td>TSF (Sec. 411A); CSF (Sec. 433); Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD; Sec. 434)</td>
<td>These funds may be split roughly equally between (1) near term enhancements on the Transbay corridor, (2) longer-term “core capacity” projects (such as a second Transbay rail crossing), and (3) enhancements on the Caltrain/High Speed Rail corridor.</td>
<td>TBD, but could include BART, Caltrain, MTC, TJPRA, and California High Speed Rail Authority, among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$495-500,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 The funding for these projects shall be allocated pursuant to Planning Code Section 434(e).
**Delivery and Timing**

Funds for local transit improvements may be directed to and administered by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). The funds derived from impact fees (the TSF, Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee, and the Central SoMa Fee) will accrue as development projects receive their building permits, and are thus tied directly to the rate of new development. The remaining funds derived from the CFD would accumulate over the lifespan of the Plan and beyond, as new development comes online and begins paying the tax. However, the City also has the option of bonding against this revenue stream, thus accruing these funds substantially earlier. This may be desirable, in order to ensure that transportation investments are in place to attract and meet the needs of new development.

In addition, the portion of revenues from Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fees is programmed through the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) and the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee (ENCAC), described further in Section IV. The ENCAC, comprised of community stakeholders, provides annual recommendations for how to allocate fee revenues to high priority public projects. These proposals are subsequently evaluated, modified, and approved by the IPIC and the City Capital Planning Committee, and included in the City’s annual Capital Budget and 10-year Capital Plan (adopted biennially).

The funds for regional transit improvements is expected to come primarily from the CFD following a similar timeline as described above. These funds would be collected by the Assessor-Recorder’s office and may be directed to regional transportation agencies, through a process that would be governed by an interagency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

**PARKS & RECREATION**

Central SoMa Plan Goal #5 states that the Plan area should “offer an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities.” Central SoMa and the broader SoMa neighborhood currently suffer from a shortage of public parks and recreational opportunities, largely due to the area’s industrial history. The Plan envisions a range of new parks, recreational facilities, and public open spaces, in addition to funding for renovation and programming of existing facilities (thereby fulfilling Plan Objectives 5.1-5.6). These new and upgraded facilities may include playgrounds, sport facilities, recreational programs, and passive open spaces, catering to diverse open space needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gene Friend Recreation Center Reconstruction/Expansion</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 423)</td>
<td>Enhancement/expansion of existing facility to accommodate growth in demand.</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Manalo Draves Park Programming</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD; Sec. 434)</td>
<td>Funding for activation and programming.</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 1-acre park in Southwest portion of Plan Area</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 423)</td>
<td>Development of a potential park on the existing SFPUC-owned lot in the area between 4th, 5th, Bryant, and Brannan Streets. This may potentially be provided by an In-Kind Agreement with surrounding development.</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New public recreation center*</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 423)</td>
<td>This may potentially be funded through direct provision on a development project.</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and greenery maintenance and activation</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD; Sec. 434)</td>
<td>Maintenance and programming of public parks and open spaces. Priority for this funding is to ensure that the new 1-acre park is properly maintained.</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Park; Department of Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New large (2+ acre) SoMa park (initial site identification)*</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 423)</td>
<td>Funding for initial site identification and coordination for a large signature park in the larger SoMa area.</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bluxome linear park*</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD; Sec. 434)</td>
<td>A park built on the existing Bluxome Street right of way. This may potentially be developed as a privately-owned public open space (POPOS) by nearby developments.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New under-freeway public recreation area</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 423)</td>
<td>This may potentially be developed as a POPOS by nearby developments.</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately-Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS)</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>Direct provision by new development (Sec. 138)</td>
<td>Up to four acres of net new publicly-accessible open space spread across the Plan area, provided directly on new development projects.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Alternative project: 7th &amp; Mission Park)</em></td>
<td>($20,000,000)</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD; Sec. 434)</td>
<td>Funding to acquire and develop a new park site at 1133 Mission Street.</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$185,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: If funds for these Parks & Recreation projects are provided by other sources (such as contributions from new development) or if revenues exceed the projected amounts, funding could be allocated to the “Alternative” project listed here.

7 This list of projects is ordered by priority, based on community feedback and discussions with the Recreation and Parks Department. It is not legally binding and is subject to change in response to future open space opportunities and priorities in the Plan Area. The cost of parks and recreational benefits is highly subject to design decisions and identification of complementary funding sources. If the benefits listed all cost the City the maximum foreseeable, then the sum of these benefits will exceed the amount allocated.

8 Projects may also receive funding from the Central SoMa Community Infrastructure Fee (Sec. 433), pending a trailing Planning Code amendment.
**Delivery and Timing**

Revenues from impact fees will accrue concurrently with the pace of new development, while the CFD revenues accrue annually as additional projects come online and begin paying the tax (or earlier should the City choose to bond against this revenue stream). The prioritization of projects is conveyed in Table 5, with the highest priority for funding at the top of the table. However, this order may be amended, through input from the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee and Interagency Plan Implementation Committee, policymakers, and other public feedback, based on timing considerations (such as shovel readiness) and financial considerations (such as leveraging other funds).

POPOS would be delivered at the same time as their associated development projects, and would undergo an urban design review process involving the Planning Department and Recreation and Parks Department to ensure that they meet minimum requirements for size, usability, and quality. Collectively, the POPOS requirement is expected in result in up to four acres of new publicly accessible open space, all of which will be provided at ground level.

**PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND REPAIR (PDR)**

Central SoMa Plan Objective 3.3 states that the City should “Ensure that the removal of protective zoning does not result in a loss of PDR in the Plan Area.” This is because the production, distribution, and repair (PDR) sector is critical to San Francisco. Companies in the PDR sector serve the needs of local residents and businesses, and tend to provide high-paying jobs and career advancement opportunities for people without a four-year college degree. PDR jobs also enhance the city’s economic diversity and therefore our ability to weather times of economic stress.

The SoMa neighborhood has a legacy as a home for PDR jobs. The Plan would ensure that the removal of protective zoning does not result in a net loss of PDR jobs in the Plan Area, by providing requirements to fund, build, and/or protect PDR spaces. The total amount of PDR space that will be preserved or created is approximately 900,000 square feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900,000 sq ft of PDR space</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td>Direct provision by new development (Sec. 202.8 and Sec. 249.78)</td>
<td>PDR space directly provided by new development</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivery and Timing**

The direct provision of PDR space will come from land use controls and conditions for allowing residential and non-residential development, in the form of requirements to maintain and/or replace existing spaces and to
include new space in developments. As a direct provision, no transfer of funds or payment of fees will occur. The PDR space will be provided at the same time the associated space becomes ready for occupancy.

**COMPLETE STREETS**

Central SoMa Plan Objective 4.1. states that the City should “Provide a safe, convenient, and attractive walking environment on all the streets in the Plan Area.” The current network of streets in the Plan Area provides a poor experience for all users – whether walking, driving, riding transit, or cycling. Streets are clogged with rush hour traffic, many sidewalks are not up to City standards, crosswalks are few and far between, and bicycle infrastructure is incomplete and discontinuous – all of which contribute to high rates of traffic crashes and injuries.

The Plan calls for complete streets improvements to make walking and biking more safe and convenient, in order to complement the transit improvements and encourage people to drive less. Funding generated by new development may be used to transform the vast majority of all major streets in the Plan Area into high quality streets for walking, biking, and transit.

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign of all major streets in the Plan Area</td>
<td>$110,000,000</td>
<td>Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) (Sec. 411A); Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 423); Central SoMa Infrastructure Impact Fee (CSF) (Sec. 433); Central SoMa Mello-Roos CFD (CFD; Sec. 434)</td>
<td>Redesign of approximately four miles of major streets (including portions of 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, and Townsend Streets) at an estimated cost of $4,400-$5,400 per linear foot.</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivery and Timing**

All funding dedicated to complete streets would be directed to the SFMTA and San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFDPW) for planning, design, and construction. These funds are projected to be sufficient to redesign the vast majority of the major streets in the Plan Area. Although the Central SoMa Plan includes conceptual designs for the major streets, each street will need to undergo a more detailed design process, incorporating additional public feedback and environmental review as necessary, and including opportunities for incorporating environmental sustainability and green landscaping elements. Although improving main streets is the highest priority, improvements may also be implemented on alleyways in the Plan Area as funding allows. Within the main streets, prioritization will be set by SFMTA.

---

9 The Plan endorses the pursuit and analysis of an in-lieu fee for PDR, but the fee itself is not proposed as part of the Plan.
As noted in the Transit section above, revenues from the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fees receive additional oversight through the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee and the IPIC. The improvements funded by fees and the CFD could occur as money is accrued. The fees will accrue concurrently with the pace of development, while the CFD accrues annually as additional projects come online and begin paying the tax. As previously noted, the City has the option to accelerate projects by bonding against this revenue stream or utilizing other funds (including general fund revenues).

Alternatively, some improvements may be provided directly by development in order to meet minimum Better Streets Plan requirements or to satisfy an In-Kind Agreement, particularly on the new and renovated mid-block alleys that will not be included in SFMTA streetscape planning efforts. These improvements would be completed at the same time as the affiliated development project.

**CULTURAL PRESERVATION & COMMUNITY SERVICES**

Central SoMa Plan Objective 2.6 states that the City should “Support the schools, child care, and community services that serve the local residents.” “Community services” includes space for nonprofit and government organizations that provide services to the community, such as health clinics and job training facilities. As commercial rents continue to increase citywide, it becomes increasingly difficult for many of these uses to start, grow, and stay in San Francisco. Central SoMa is already a popular location for many of these services, due to its central and transit-accessible location, and large number of commercial properties. The Plan will provide space for these types of facilities, as part of its central goals of increasing jobs and facilitating economic and cultural diversity. The City has recently developed a Community Facilities Nexus Study in order to quantify the demand for these services generated by new development, in order to establish a legal nexus for levying a Central SoMa Community Facilities Fee, a new development impact fee. Community services also includes neighborhood cleaning services to help promote the cleanliness, and thus walkability, of the neighborhood’s streets.

Central SoMa Plan Objective 7.5 states that the City should “Support mechanisms for the rehabilitation and maintenance of cultural heritage properties.” To fulfill this Objective, revenues generated by the Plan may be used as seed funding for the restoration and seismic upgrade of the celebrated U.S. Mint building and grounds at 5th and Mission Streets, one of the City’s most significant historic properties. The building has long been envisioned as a major opportunity site to provide a cultural asset that celebrates the civic history of the City. With expanded funding (as described in Planning Code Sec. 434(e)), the site could provide low-cost space for nonprofit organizations serving the neighborhood and City, including, but not limited to, cultural heritage and social organizations established through the City’s recent cultural district legislation (including the newly-formed SoMa Pilipinas cultural district). The future redevelopment and programming of the site will be determined through a process led by the Office of Economic & Workforce Development, in collaboration with community partners.

Revenues from the Plan may also be used to provide capital for cultural amenities. Funding could also be utilized for capital improvements at Yerba Buena Gardens and/or to help build or purchase a building for the neighborhood’s important cultural communities, the Filipino community and the LGBTQ community. Finally, revenues from the Plan may also be used to help preserve and maintain important historic buildings within the

---

Plan Area. This revenue will come from the sale of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR), a voluntary program available to these historic buildings whereby they sell their unused development rights to new development in the area. To facilitate the process, large new non-residential developments will be required to purchase TDR from historic buildings in the Plan Area.

Central SoMa Plan Objective 7.2 states that the City should “Support the preservation, recognition, and wellbeing of the neighborhood’s cultural heritage resources.” To fulfill this Objective, revenues generated from the Plan may be used annually to support social and cultural programming in the neighborhood. This funding currently comes from the SoMa Stabilization Fund, which is expected to run out of resources in the near future. The Plan therefore enables the continuation of this valuable funding source for the foreseeable future.

**Table 8**
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS – CULTURAL PRESERVATION & COMMUNITY SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of the US Mint Building</td>
<td>$15-20,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Restoration and seismic upgrade of the US Mint Building. Expanded funding could allow the facility to provide low-cost space for cultural preservation programs and nonprofit organizations.</td>
<td>OEWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and maintenance of historic buildings</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) (Sec. 128.1)</td>
<td>Sale of Transferable Development Rights from historic buildings to new development. Revenues from these sales are required to be spent on preservation and maintenance of the associated historic resource.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000 sq ft of new space for community services</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Community Facilities Fee (Sec. 432)</td>
<td>Impact fees to develop new facilities for nonprofit community services (such as health care or job training) needed to serve new growth.</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural programming</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Annual funding for social and cultural programming for such activities as arts, job training, and tenant protections.</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital for cultural amenities (e.g. Yerba Buena Gardens)</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Capital improvements and/or funding to help build or purchase a building for the neighborhood’s important cultural communities.</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR Assistance Fund</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Funding to support existing PDR businesses and to mitigate the impacts of displacement. Programs could include relocation assistance, including support with business services, rents, and moving costs.</td>
<td>OEWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood cleaning</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Ongoing funding for cleaning of neighborhood streets.</td>
<td>SFDPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$114-119,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[11] The funding for these projects shall be allocated pursuant to Planning Code Section 434(e).
Delivery and Timing

Revenues from the Central SoMa Community Facilities Fee will be directed to the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) to fund the development of new community facility space. As an impact fee, funding would accrue concurrently with development over the duration of the Plan. Facilities could potentially be developed through some combination of standalone locations (such as a centralized non-profit “hub” space) or potentially co-located within affordable housing projects. In the latter case, because the development of these affordable units would occur after the market rate development providing the necessary funding, the development of community facilities is likely to occur after these new developments as well. New developments will also be given the option to provide community facilities directly via an In-Kind Agreement with the City (instead of paying the Community Facilities Fee), which would result in faster delivery of the benefit.

Revenues from the CFD that may be used to support the restoration of the US Mint Building will accrue annually as projects come online and begin paying the tax. As previously noted, the City has the option to accelerate projects by bonding against this revenue stream or utilizing other funds (including general fund revenues). Funding from the Plan may be part of a larger funding and programming effort for restoration, rehabilitation, and ongoing operations of the US Mint Building. This scope of work and budget is currently being developed, and it is anticipated that additional funds will need to be generated.

Sale of TDRs for the preservation and maintenance of other significant historic buildings in the Plan Area could occur upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY & RESILIENCE

Central SoMa Plan Goal #6 is to “Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood” where urban development gives more to the environment than it takes (thereby fulfilling Plan Objectives 6.1–6.8). The Plan proposes innovative building- and neighborhood-scale interventions to improve environmental performance, providing a model for the rest of the city and beyond. New development will be required to incorporate living roofs, generate renewable energy onsite, and use only 100% greenhouse gas-free (GHG-free) electricity for the balance. Funds may also be directed to adding habitat-supportive landscaping and green infrastructure to streets and open spaces, to beautify them while also improving air quality, micro climate comfort, stormwater management, and ecological function. District-scale utility systems (e.g., shared energy and/or water systems linked between both new and existing buildings) are encouraged in order to enhance resource and cost efficiencies.
Table 9

TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS – ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY & RESILIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced stormwater management in complete street projects</td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD, Sec. 434)</td>
<td>Stormwater infrastructure (grey infrastructure, landscaping, etc.) on all major streets.</td>
<td>Planning, SFPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway corridor air quality and greening</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Greening improvements along/under the freeway corridor to improve air quality and enhance pedestrian comfort.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Roofs enhanced requirements</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>Direct provision by new development (Sec. 249.78)</td>
<td>Living Roofs requirement of 50% of usable roof area on projects 160’ or shorter, surpassing City policy.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Roofs demonstration projects</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Demonstration projects to highlight best practices, including a Living Roof project ($1mn) and a solar project ($500k).</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recycling and stormwater management in public spaces</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Infrastructure for 100% recycled (non-potable) water for street cleaning and park irrigation; green stormwater management in parks.</td>
<td>Planning, SFPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% energy-efficient street lights</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Energy efficient upgrades to street lights throughout the Plan area.</td>
<td>Planning, SFPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability studies &amp; guideline documents</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)</td>
<td>Funding for a District Energy &amp; Water Utility Systems Study ($500k), a Central SoMa Sea Level Rise &amp; Flood Management Strategy ($400k), a Fossil Fuel Free Buildings Study &amp; Guidelines Document ($300k), and Flood Resilient Design Guidelines ($300k)</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivery and Timing**

The majority of funding for environmental sustainability improvements may be provided by the CFD, and will occur upon accrual of revenues, or earlier if the City chooses to bond against the CFD revenue stream. The sustainability studies and guideline documents discussed above are proposed to be delivered within two years after adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, and may lead to additional new requirements or public benefits.

The Living Roofs are provided directly onsite by new development and will occur with their respective projects. Additional benefits will be directly provided through new development via existing requirements (such as current energy and water efficiency requirements) and are not quantified here.

**SCHOOLS AND CHILD CARE**

Central SoMa Plan Objective 2.6 states that the City should “Support the schools, child care, and community services that serve the local residents.” In terms of schools and child care, the Plan Area is expected to see a large
increase in the number of children as it continues to transition from a primarily industrial neighborhood to a mixed-use hub for jobs and housing. The Plan will generate funding to meet the demand for schools and childcare for youth ages 0-18 through existing City impact fees.

Additionally, the Plan may help fund supplemental services at Bessie Carmichael, the neighborhood’s only public school. At Bessie Carmichael, which serves children in K-8 grade, 100% of the students receive free and reduced lunch and 20% of the student population is self-identified homeless students. The supplemental services would be intended to address the challenges of addressing the needs of this student population through such strategies as additional mental health services and a summer program to fund year-round support to the children.

**Table 10**

**TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS - SCHOOLS & CHILDCARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>School Impact Fee (State Education Code Sec. 17620)</td>
<td>Impact fees to meet demand for school facilities to serve growth generated within the Plan Area.</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
<td>Child Care Fee (Sec. 414, 414A); Eastern Nbhds Impact Fee (Sec. 423)</td>
<td>Impact fees to meet demand for child care facilities to serve growth, located within the Plan area.</td>
<td>HSA Office of Early Care &amp; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie Carmichael Supplemental Services</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>Central SoMa Mello- Roos Community Facilities District (CFD, Sec. 434)</td>
<td>Annual funding to provide supplementary services to the school, such as additional mental health services and the ability to provide year-round programming</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivery and Timing**

The School Impact Fee will accrue at the time projects receive building permits. It is directed to the San Francisco Unified School District for use at their discretion throughout the city. New school facilities are expected to serve a broader area than just Central SoMa and will cost significantly more than the funds generated by the fees in the Plan Area. Additional fees, including those collected by the School Impact Fee in previous years, will be required to accrue enough to build new facilities.

Funds from the Child Care Fee and Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee will accrue at the time projects receive building permits. They will go to the Child Care Facilities Fund, which is administered jointly by the City’s Human Services Agency Office of Early Care and Education and the Low-Income Investment Fund (LIIF). The Child Care Fee money can be spent throughout the City, while the Eastern Neighborhoods fee must be spent within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Areas. Child care facilities are less costly than school facilities and might come online sooner. New developments have the option to satisfy up to their entire Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee requirement by directly providing publicly-accessible child care onsite through an In-Kind Agreement (IKA), which could result in faster delivery of services.

The funding for Bessie Carmichael School may be provided by the CFD, and would occur upon accrual of revenues. As an ongoing allocation, it need not be bonded against, and would be disbursed annually to the School District, with community oversight.
The previous section describes the funding necessary for infrastructure and other investments to accommodate the significant number of jobs and housing units envisioned in the Central SoMa Plan, as well as to address social, economic, and environmental needs and achieve the Plan’s policy goals. To provide this funding, the City proposes requirements on new developments to help ameliorate and mitigate its impacts, in addition to the existing fees and development requirements in place. As stated previously, these requirements are designed to be consistent with the requirements of California Mitigation Fee Act and all proposed development impact fees have been evaluated against applicable maximum justified nexus amounts.

To help determine the requirements on new development, the City conducted a financial feasibility analysis (Financial Analysis of San Francisco’s Central SoMa Plan¹). This analysis utilized a Residual Land Value (RLV) model to evaluate the financial feasibility of prototypical development types (both before and after potential Plan adoption), estimate the amount of value created by the Plan, and test the financial impact of applying proposed development requirements and charges that would offset some amount of the new value created (a “land value capture” approach).

The resulting funding strategy includes different levels of requirements, based on the amount of development potential conferred on each property through adoption of the Plan (expressed as an increase in developable height and/or modifications to permit a greater number of land uses). All parcels in the Plan Area are assigned into one of several Central SoMa Public Benefit Tiers (Table 11), based on the amount of additional development potential created.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASED DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY</th>
<th>TIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-45 feet</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-85 feet</td>
<td>Tier B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 feet or more</td>
<td>Tier C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 12 and 13 below summarize what a specific new development project would be obligated to pay in impact fees and taxes, based on the Development Tier of the underlying parcel and proposed land uses. Figure 14 maps where these public benefit tiers occur in the Plan Area.

---

¹ Developed by Seifel Consulting Inc. Available for download at: https://sfplanning.org/project/central-soma-plan

² For areas currently zoned SLI or SALI and being rezoned to CMUO or WMUO, “additional development potential” is equal to the height limit proposed by the Central SoMa Plan. Elsewhere, “additional development capacity” is the change in height limit proposed by the Central SoMa Plan.

³ The Financial Analysis from December 2016 had four public benefit tiers; the prior Tier C (90-165 feet) and Tier D (165+ feet) are now collapsed into a single tier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>TIER A</th>
<th>TIER B</th>
<th>TIER C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee ($/GSF; office rate shown; Sec. 413)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee ($/GSF; Sec. 423)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Sustainability Fee ($/GSF; office rate shown; Sec. 411A)</td>
<td>800-99,999 GSF: $18.94</td>
<td>&gt;99,999 GSF: $19.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Fee ($/GSF; office and hotel rate; Sec 414 &amp; 414A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Impact Fee ($/GSF; office rate shown; CA Ed. Code Sec. 17620)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Fee ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% of construction cost (or direct provision on-site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central SoMa Community Infrastructure Fee ($/GSF; Sec. 433)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For projects seeking an Office Allocation of 50,000 square feet or more</td>
<td>$21.50</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other projects</td>
<td>$41.50</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mello-Roos Special Tax District (CFD; $/GSF/yr; Sec. 434)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2.00 (4% escalation annually for 25 years, 2% thereafter)</td>
<td>$2.75 (4% escalation annually for 25 years, 2% thereafter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Fee ($/GSF; Sec 432)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable Development Rights (# of Floor Area Ratios; Sec 128.1)</td>
<td>0 FAR</td>
<td>0 FAR</td>
<td>1.25 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately-Owned Public Open Space (POPOS; Sec 138)</td>
<td>1 square foot for every 50 GSF of development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) (# of Floor Area Ratios (FAR); Sec 202.8 &amp; 249.78)</td>
<td>0.4 FAR or replacement requirements per 2016’s Proposition X (Planning Code Section 202.8), whichever is higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For projects not seeking an Office Allocation, or providing &lt;50,000 square feet of Office</td>
<td>Replacement requirements per 2016’s Proposition X (Planning Code Section 202.8). For every gross square foot of PDR required, the project gets a waiver of four gross square feet (GSF) from the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 NOTE: These tables show the amount of requirements on new development at the time of Plan Adoption. Impact fees shall be updated on an annual basis as fees are indexed or otherwise changed. The Fee Register and related information can be found online at http://impactfees.sfplanning.org. The Financial Analysis from December 2016 had four public benefit tiers; the prior Tier C (90-165 feet) and Tier D (165+ feet) are now collapsed into a single tier.

5 The Mello-Roos Special Tax District rates and escalation shown apply to the Facilities Tax (estimated as the first 99 years of the district). The 4% escalation applies to the rate of increase for an individual project after its annexation into the district. Prior to annexation, the base rate escalates by 2% annually. After the district has been in place for 99 years, the tax will become a Services Tax and rates and escalation will be applied as specified in the adopted Rate and Method of Apportionment (RMA) document (Exhibit B of Board File No. 181170, available at: https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3781476&GUID=89240250-DC0A-4603-B6C3-FA658DEE56C0&Options=ID|Text&Search=central+soma+special+tax+district).
### CENTRAL SOMA REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT: RESIDENTIAL (2017 RATES)\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>TIER A</th>
<th>TIER B</th>
<th>TIER C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary Housing (Sec. 415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Site Option</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% for rental and 20% for condo, escalating annually, per the requirements of Planning Code Section 415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable Housing Fee and Off-Site Options</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% for rental and 33% for condo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee ($/GSF; Sec. 423)</strong></td>
<td>$21.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Sustainability Fee ($/GSF; Sec. 411A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-99 Units: $8.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+ Units: $9.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childcare Fee ($/GSF; Sec 414 &amp; 414A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9 Units: $0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ Units: $1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Impact Fee ($/GSF; CA Ed. Code Sec. 17620)</strong></td>
<td>$3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central SoMa Community Infrastructure Fee ($/GSF; Sec. 433)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mello-Roos Special Tax District</strong> (CFD; $/GSF/yr; Sec. 434)(^7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>(2% escalation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities Fee ($/GSF; Sec. 432)</strong></td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) [# of Floor Area Ratios (FAR); Sec 202.8 &amp; 249.78]</strong></td>
<td>Replacement requirements per 2016’s Proposition X (Planning Code Section 202.8). For every gross square foot of PDR required, the project gets a waiver of four gross square feet (GSF) from the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^6\) NOTE: These tables show the amount of requirements on new development at the time of Plan Adoption. Impact fees shall be updated on an annual basis as fees are indexed or otherwise changed. The Fee Register and related information can be found online at [http://impactfees.sfplanning.org](http://impactfees.sfplanning.org). The Financial Analysis from December 2016 had four public benefit tiers, the prior Tier C (90-165 feet) and Tier D (165+ feet) are now collapsed into a single tier.

\(^7\) The Mello-Roos Special Tax District rates and escalation shown apply to the Facilities Tax (estimated as the first 99 years of the district). After the district has been in place for 99 years, the tax will become a Services Tax and rates and escalation will be applied as specified in the adopted Rate and Method of Apportionment (RMA) document (Exhibit B of Board File No. 181170, available at: [https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3781476&GUID=B924D250-D9CA-43D3-BFC2-FA658DE34EFCC&options=ID|Text|&Search=central+soma+special+tax+district]).
The successful implementation of the Central SoMa Plan will require collaboration among a diverse array of agencies, community members, and private actors. This section describes the interagency governance bodies and processes that will be chiefly responsible for overseeing implementation of the Central SoMa Plan and its public benefits. In addition, a number of the aforementioned funding sources each have their own processes for implementation, administration, and monitoring.

**PLAN IMPLEMENTATION GOVERNANCE ENTITIES**

**San Francisco Controller’s Office**

The Controller serves as the chief accounting officer and auditor for the City and County of San Francisco, and is responsible for governance and conduct of key aspects of the City’s financial operations. The office plays a key role in implementing area plans by managing the City’s bonds and debt portfolio, and processing and monitoring the City’s budget. The department produces regular reports and audits on the City’s financial and economic condition and the operations and performance of City government.

The Controller’s Office, working in concert with the Mayor’s Office, IPIC, and other entities mentioned below, will also be responsible for overseeing a funding prioritization process in Central SoMa to help ensure that funds are allocated to public benefits in a logical and equitable manner.

The City is required to regularly report on impact fees revenues and expenditures. San Francisco Planning Code Article 4, Section 409 requires the San Francisco Controller’s Office to issue a biennial Citywide Development Impact Fee Report including:

- All development fees collected during the prior two fiscal years, organized by development fee account;
- All cumulative monies collected and expended over the life of each fee;
- The number of projects that elected to satisfy development impact requirements through in-kind improvements;
- Any annual construction cost inflation adjustments to fees made using the Annual Infrastructure Construction Cost Inflation Estimate published by the Office of the City Administrator’s Office of Resilience and Capital Planning; and
- Other information required pursuant to the California Mitigation Fee Act Government Code Section 66001, including: fee rate and description; the beginning and ending balance of the fee account; the amount of fees collected and interest earned; an identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended and the percentage of the cost of the improvement funded with fees; an approximate construction start date; and a description of any transfers or loans made from the account.

---

Within the Controller’s office, the Office of Public Finance (OPF) is responsible for issuing and managing the City’s general fund debt obligations. The OPF will be responsible for administering the Central SoMa CFD, including developing revenue projections and overseeing the bond issuance process. Its mission is to provide and manage low-cost debt financing of large-scale, long-term capital projects and improvements that produce social and economic benefit to the City and its citizens while balancing market and credit risk with appropriate benefits, mitigations and controls.

**Capital Planning Committee**

The Capital Planning Committee (CPC) makes recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on all of the City’s capital expenditures. The CPC annually reviews and approves the 10-year Capital Plan, Capital Budget, and issuances of long-term debt. The CPC is chaired by the City Administrator and includes the President of the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor’s Finance Director, the Controller, the City Planning Director, the Director of Public Works, the Airport Director, the Executive Director of the Municipal Transportation Agency, the General Manager of the Public Utilities System, the General Manager of the Recreation and Parks Department, and the Executive Director of the Port of San Francisco.

The IPIC fee revenue budgets and associated agency project work programs / budgets are incorporated as part of the 10-year Capital Plan. Updated every odd-numbered year, the Plan is a fiscally constrained expenditure plan that lays out infrastructure investments over the next decade. The Capital Plan recommends projects based on the availability of funding from various sources and the relative priority of each project. Enterprise departments (such as the San Francisco International Airport and Public Utilities Commission) can meet most needs from usage fees and rate payers. However, other fundamental programs that serve the general public (such as streets and fire stations) rely primarily on funding from the City’s General Fund and debt financing programs.

**Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC)**

The Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) is comprised of City staff members from various City Departments who are collectively charged with implementing capital improvements in connection with the City’s Area Plans: Eastern Neighborhoods (comprised of separate Area Plans for Central SoMa, Central Waterfront, East Soma, Mission, Showplace Square / Potrero, and Western Soma), Market Octavia, Rincon Hill, Transit Center District, Balboa Park and Visitacion Valley (including the Executive Park Subarea Plan and the Schlage Lock Master Development). Developments within these area plan boundaries are required to pay impact fees specific to the respective Plan geographies, which are allocated through the IPIC and Capital Planning processes towards priority projects and other infrastructure needed to serve new growth.

The IPIC is required to develop a capital plan for each Plan Area and an Annual Progress Report indicating the status of implementation of each of the Area Plans. This report includes a summary of the individual development projects (public and private) that have been approved during the report period, progress updates regarding implementation of the various community improvements in accordance with the Plan’s projected phasing, and proposed departmental work programs and budgets for the coming fiscal year that describe the steps to be taken by each responsible department, office, or agency to implement community improvements in each plan area. The IPIC Annual Progress Report is heard each year before the Capital Planning Committee, the Planning Commission,
and the Land Use and Economic Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors prior to finalization of the report. In addition, the IPIC Annual Progress Report, impact fee allocations, and related agency work programs and budgets are inputs to the City's 10-year Capital Plan, developed by the Capital Planning Committee.

Upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, the scope of IPIC's duties and areas of investment will expand. IPIC will be responsible for overseeing allocation of revenues from the Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD). It is anticipated that the City may issue one or more bonds secured by these CFD Special Tax revenues, in order to facilitate timely implementation of public benefits. Annually, the IPIC shall develop a five-year plan for proposed expenditures of Special Tax revenues (these plans will be coordinated with projected Bond Proceeds), as forecasted by the Office of Public Finance.

As needed, the sub-committees will be formed to deliberate on specific issues of relevance to a subset of IPIC agencies, and/or on funding areas that involve non-City public agencies (such as the regional transportation funds). In the latter case, Joint Communities Facilities Agreements (JCFAs) will be formed for projects involving allocation of CFD funds to non-City public agencies.

The IPIC will also oversee administration of capital funding for environmental sustainability projects.

The Board of Supervisors has final authority over CFD revenue expenditures, based on recommendations by the Director of the Office of Public Finance, the Capital Planning Committee, and the IPIC.

**Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee (ENCAC)**

The Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee (ENCAC) is the central community advisory body charged with providing input to City agencies and decision makers with regard to all activities related to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans. The group was established as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, and is comprised of 19 members representing the diversity of the plan areas, including renters, homeowners, low-income residents, local merchants, and community-based organizations.

The ENCAC is established for the purposes of providing input on the prioritization of Public Benefits, updating the Public Benefits program, relaying information to community members regarding the status of development proposals in the Eastern Neighborhoods, and providing input to plan area monitoring efforts as appropriate (described further in the Plan Monitoring & Reporting section below). The ENCAC serves an advisory role, as appropriate, to the Planning Department, the IPIC, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors.

The ENCAC also advises on the allocation of development fees to public benefits in each of the EN Plan Areas. These recommendations are advisory, as an input to the IPIC and Capital Planning Committee processes described above.

During the adoption of the Central SoMa Plan in 2018, the Planning Commission recommended that the ENCAC be split into two and that a new South of Market CAC (SoMa CAC) be established that would encompass East, West, and Central SoMa. This is due to the large geography of the existing CAC, and the increase in complexity expected.

---

2 More information is available at: https://sfplanning.org/project/eastern-neighborhoods-citizens-advisory-committee-cac.
as the Central SoMa Plan is implemented. The creation of the SoMa CAC is pending approval of legislation that was introduced at the Board of Supervisors in December 2018 (Ordinance no. 181215).

**SoMa Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (CAC)**

The mission of the SoMa Stabilization Fund CAC is to stabilize the SoMa community and promote equity through strategies that mitigate the impact of development, by providing grant funding for a range of social services and infrastructure projects, including: affordable housing and community asset building, small business rental assistance, development of new affordable homes for rental units for low income households, rental subsidies for low income households, down payment assistance for home ownership for low income households, eviction prevention, employment development and capacity building for SOMA residents, job growth and job placement, small business assistance, leadership development, community cohesion, civic participation, cultural preservation, and community based programs and economic development.

The SoMa Stabilization Fund CAC receives revenues through impact fees in the Rincon Hill Area Plan. Funds from that plan area are expected to diminish as the neighborhood is nearing full buildout. As discussed in this document, the Central SoMa Plan includes funding for social services and cultural preservation needs that could potentially be directed to the SoMa Stabilization CAC, which would advise the City on how to spend funds, similar to the group’s current activities. This change is pending approval of legislation that was introduced at the Board of Supervisors in December 2018 (Ordinance no. 181215).

**PLAN MONITORING & REPORTING**

City agencies will be required to monitor and report on the implementation of the Central SoMa Plan, similar to the process in other established plan areas. The Planning Department, in coordination with the EN CAC, will be required to develop a Central SoMa Monitoring Report concurrently with the Eastern Neighborhoods Monitoring Report (scheduled to be updated in 2021, and at five-year intervals thereafter). This community and data-driven report will provide information on the residential and commercial development in the plan area, revenues from impact fees and other sources, and public/private investments in community benefits and infrastructure, and will include the following components:

- Central SoMa Implementation Matrix
- Development Activity
- Public Benefit
- Fees and Revenues
- Agency Responsibilities
- Budget Implications

Consistent with the procedure in other Plan Areas, this report shall be discussed at a hearing of the Planning Commission, and then forwarded to (and possibly heard at) the Board of Supervisors.
This section provides further information on the purpose, administration, and uses of various funding sources at time of Plan Adoption. For the most updated information on these funding sources, consult the Planning Code and associated legislation.

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

**Inclusionary Housing Program (Sec. 415)**

The Inclusionary Housing Program (Planning Code §415) requires new market-rate residential development projects to provide funding for affordable housing, either through direct on-site provision or via payment of the Affordable Housing Fee. Revenues from this Fee are directed to the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), which utilizes the Fee to develop 100 percent affordable housing development and/or preservation of existing affordable units. Revenues from the Affordable Housing Fee may typically be used anywhere within the city. However, as discussed in Section III above, fees generated by projects within Central SoMa will be required to be expended within SoMa (i.e., the area bounded by Market Street, the Embarcadero, King Street, Division Street, and South Van Ness Avenue).

**Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee (Sec. 413)**

The Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee (§413) is a citywide impact fee levied on new non-residential developments of 25,000 GSF or greater. Analogous to the Affordable Housing fee, revenues from this Fee are directed to MOHCD, which utilizes the Fee to develop 100 percent affordable housing development and/or preservation of existing affordable units. Revenues from the Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee may typically be used anywhere within the city. However, as discussed in Section III above, Fees generated by projects within Central SoMa will be required to be expended within SoMa (i.e., the area bounded by Market Street, the Embarcadero, King Street, Division Street, and South Van Ness Avenue).

**TRANSPORTATION**

**Transportation Sustainability Fee (Sec. 411A)**

The Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF; §411A) is a citywide impact fee assessed on both Residential and Nonresidential development, with funds directed to the Controller’s Office and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for programming and administration. Funds are allocated to projects specified in the Expenditure Program shown in Table 15 below: state of good repair projects (capital maintenance), system capacity expansion, complete streets projects, and regional transit improvements. Some uses are exempt from
paying the fee, including smaller market-rate residential projects (20 units or fewer), 100% affordable housing projects, and most nonprofit owned and operated uses.

### Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>% ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Capital Maintenance</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Expansion &amp; Reliability Improvements - San Francisco</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Expansion &amp; Reliability Improvements - Regional Transit Providers</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets (Bicycle and Pedestrian) Improvements</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although TSF funds may be spent on transportation system improvements citywide, the Planning Code specifies that revenues will prioritize new/existing area plans and areas anticipated to receive significant new growth.

**Central SoMa Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 433)**

In order to achieve the Plan’s objective of ensuring that the area is well-served by transit, a new Central SoMa Fee (Sec. 433) is proposed on new residential and nonresidential development that would be used to fund local transit improvements within Central SoMa. The fee will be collected by the Planning Department and programmed through the IPIC and Capital Planning process, similar to other area plan impact fees.

**PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, & REPAIR (PDR)**

**Preservation of Production, Distribution & Repair Uses (Proposition X; Sec. 202.8)**

Preserving Production, Distribution & Repair (PDR) space is a critical strategy to ensure ongoing economic diversity in the Plan Area. Preservation of existing space will naturally occur on sites where industrial protective zoning remains, such as along the freeway west of 4th Street (an area that is adjacent to other PDR uses and ill-suited for new development due to its lot configuration). In addition, preservation of PDR uses in much of the rest of the Plan Area will be necessitated based on the requirements of San Francisco’s Proposition X, passed by the voters in November of 2016. This Proposition, codified in Section 202.8 of the Planning Code, requires retention or replacement of PDR space ranging from 50% of existing space (in areas zoned MUG or MUR before adoption of the Central SoMa Plan) to 75% (in areas zoned SLI or MUO before adoption of the Central SoMa Plan) to 100% (in areas zoned SALI before adoption of the Central SoMa Plan).

**Creation of Production, Distribution & Repair Uses (Sec. 249.78)**

In addition to the PDR preservation requirements of Proposition X (as discussed above), the Plan will require large office development to provide new PDR space of an area equivalent to 0.4 FAR (40 percent of their lot area). This amount of PDR may exceed what is already required.
The Planning Department will be responsible for overseeing compliance with these requirements, as part of the development review process. The process will verify Planning Code requirements are met to ensure that spaces are suitable for PDR use (including elements such as ceiling heights and parking/loading requirements).

**PARKS & RECREATION**

**Privately-Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS) Requirement (Sec. 138)**

Currently, the Plan Area has a great deficit of open spaces and recreation facilities, and significant investment will be needed to meet demand from new growth. In addition to providing new and rehabilitated public parks and recreation facilities, the Central SoMa Plan will also require larger nonresidential developments to provide Privately-Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS), similar to the requirement in the Downtown Area Plan. Much of this space will be located outdoors at street level, open seven days a week. Some developments will have the option of providing space indoors and/or paying an in-lieu fee. All new office projects will be required to provide one square foot of POPOS for every 50 occupied square feet of office use. Unlike the policy in the Downtown C-3 districts, Central SoMa requires that this space be provided at ground level (for up to 15% of the parcel area), and provides an incentive for “active” recreation uses (including playgrounds, athletic courts, community gardens or dog runs).

The Planning Department is the agency primarily responsible for reviewing and approving POPOS proposals as part of the associated development application.

**SCHOOLS & CHILDCARE**

**School Impact Fee (CA Education Code Sec. 17620)**

The School Impact Fee (enabled by CA State Education Code §17620) is a citywide impact fee on new/expanded Residential and Non-Residential developments, with funds directed to the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) for new capital facilities serving the public school population. Funds are not required to be spent in the Plan Area; revenues are programmed at SFUSD’s discretion based on current and future projections of growth in the school-aged population in each neighborhood.

**Child Care Fee (Sec. 414 & 414A)**

The Child Care Fee (Planning Code §414 & 414A) is a citywide impact fee collected on Office and Hotel projects greater than 25,000 GSF and on Residential and residential care developments adding more than 800 square feet of net new space. Funds are directed to the Human Services Agency Office of Early Care & Education and the Low-Income Investment Fund (LIIF, a non-profit child care developer contracting with the City) to develop new capital facilities for child care services. Funds may be spent citywide and are not required to be spent within the Plan area.
CULTURAL PRESERVATION & NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION

Transferable Development Rights (TDR; Sec. 128.1)

In order to support the preservation of historic resources in the Plan Area, Central SoMa includes a Transferable Development Rights (TDR) requirement, similar to the requirement in the Downtown Area Plan. Non-residential development projects in Public Benefits Tier C will be required to purchase the equivalent of 1.25 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) worth of TDR credits from historic buildings in exchange for the right to build to higher densities. In essence, the program allows historic properties to sell “excess” development capacity (e.g. since the historic resource precludes building to similar densities as surrounding parcels), providing funds for building restoration and maintenance. Although the Planning Department administers and enforces the TDR program, the transactions themselves are implemented privately and purchase terms (i.e. prices) are not regulated by the City.

Community Facilities Fee (Sec. 432)

The Community Facilities Fee is a new impact fee that would be applicable to all new development in the Plan Area. Fees will be collected by the Planning Department and directed to MOHCD to support the development of new space for nonprofit community facilities, such as health clinics and job training sites. The City, potentially in partnership with nonprofit developers, will use the funds to develop new space for community facilities. This may take several forms, such as a centralized hub for nonprofit space and/or a network of individual sites. In addition, the City is exploring the potential to provide such spaces collocated with new affordable housing developments, developed by MOHCD and its partners.

AREA-PLAN & MULTI-CATEGORY FUNDING SOURCES

Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Sec. 423)

The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee (Planning Code §423) is an area plan impact fee that was adopted concurrently with the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan in 2008. The Central SoMa Plan Area is an Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, being constituted of areas that were formerly parts of the East SoMa and Western SoMa Plan Areas. Projects in Central SoMa will continue to pay the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee, which is administered by the Planning Department and the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) in consultation with the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee (ENCAC). Funds are used to pay for infrastructure within the following Plan Areas: East SoMa, Showplace/Potrero Hill, Mission, Central Waterfront, Western SoMa, and Central SoMa. Funds are allocated into public benefit categories shown in table 16 below.
Table 16
EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACT FEE EXPENDITURE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>% ALLOCATION (RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)</th>
<th>% ALLOCATION (NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets: Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements, Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD; Sec. 434)

A Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) is an ongoing tax to pay for necessary infrastructure and services. The Central SoMa Plan proposes to establish a Mello-Roos CFD that would be paid by new developments receiving a significant upzoning through the Plan (Non-Residential Tier C and Residential Tiers B & C). This CFD will be established through a legal formation process roughly concurrent with the adoption of the Central SoMa Plan.

CFDs are beneficial for infrastructure planning because they offer a reliable and predictable revenue stream, as the taxes are paid annually over the life of the subject development project for a set term defined by the CFD (as opposed to a one-time payment for impact fees). In addition, the CFD could be established to fund both capital infrastructure and ongoing operations & maintenance, the latter of which is a critical funding need that cannot legally be funded by impact fees. Finally, a CFD provides the City with the option to bond against the future revenue stream, thus providing funding to build needed infrastructure much sooner, ideally before or at the same time as the anticipated new development.

OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING

The fees and requirements discussed above are largely designed to mitigate the infrastructure needs created by new development. However, there are already substantial needs in the neighborhood. The responsibility for responding to some needs will need to be shared with a broader set of stakeholders than just new developments (sea level rise mitigation, for instance). As such, additional revenue sources will be needed to create a fully sustainable neighborhood. These additional revenue mechanisms will require interdepartmental efforts that continue after the Plan’s adoption, and may require future authorization by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. A few potential sources of additional funding are described below.

General Fund

The City’s discretionary property tax proceeds are deposited into the General Fund, and are available for the appropriation to any public purpose, including operations, programs, maintenance, and capital projects.
Theoretically, these revenues could be directed to the Plan Area to accelerate the delivery of public benefits, or to fund other public benefits not identified here.

**Grants & Bonds**

Many local, state, and federal agencies offer potential grants to fund needed capital projects. In particular, regional and state funds earmarked to facilitate higher density development near major transit infrastructure (such as the One Bay Area Grants run by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission) are a good fit for the goals of the Plan and could potentially be paired with matching local funds.

Other local bond measures may provide additional opportunities to fund projects identified here or in the future. For instance, San Francisco voters have adopted multiple bond measures in recent years to fund new or renovated parks and open spaces.

**Direct provision through Development Agreements and other negotiated conditions of approval**

The Plan’s Key Development Sites and other sites with significant development potential represent another potential mechanism to provide needed infrastructure. Project sponsors may elect to provide some of these community benefits directly, through mechanisms such as a Development Agreement or other negotiated condition of approval. These benefits may be provided in-lieu of some other requirement, or they may be voluntarily provided above and beyond the development requirements. It is impossible to predict how many projects would opt to do this; however, a number of the initial project proposals for the Key Development Sites do include some amount of voluntary community benefits.
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GUIDE TO URBAN DESIGN
PURPOSE

- To convey design guidance that is specific to Central SoMa in a way that complements and supplements the requirements of the Planning Code and Urban Design Guidelines; and
- To visually demonstrate Central SoMa Plan bulk controls.

CONTENTS

1. **Additional Architectural Guidance** This section contains additional guidance for implementing the architectural vision for the Plan Area beyond what was written under Objective 8.6 of the Plan;

2. **Calculating Skyplane** This section contains a graphical explanation of how to calculate the apparent mass reduction requirements contained in Implementation Measures 8.3.3.1, 8.4.1.3, and 8.4.1.4;

3. **Visualizing Bulk Controls** This section contains a graphical representation of the implementation of the skyplane, mid-rise, and tower controls contained in Implementation Measures 8.3.3.1, 8.3.3.2, 8.3.3.4, 8.3.4.1, and 8.3.4.2; and

4. **Neighborhood Renderings** This section contains renderings of how the Plan Area might look from street level after development of a substantial number of its anticipated buildings.
This section contains additional guidance for implementing the architectural vision for the Plan Area conveyed by Plan Objective 8.6: “Promote high quality architecture that enhances the neighborhood.” Specifically, it includes guidance around the following Implementation Measures:

8.1.2.1 Provide fixtures, furnishings, and art at interior and exterior ground floor openings to invite and support use of adjacent public areas

8.6.2.1 Utilize application of “skyplane” as a device to create interestingly shaped buildings

8.6.2.2 Harmonize new building designs with existing neighborhood materials but in a contemporary or reinterpreted way

8.6.2.3 Recognize and enhance existing local form and geometry variations to support neighborhood-specific architecture

8.6.2.4 Employ innovative architectural ideas for larger projects that provide a clear organizing principle for design

8.6.3.2 Utilize material systems that visually diminish upper facades

8.6.5.1 Modulate larger projects vertically or horizontally, whichever is more appropriate, to reflect surrounding lots and massing patterns

8.6.5.2 For projects with more than one building, recognize and respond to the existing pattern of long blocks, open spaces, and large and small streets

8.6.5.3 Vary the roofs of buildings for projects with long facades.
Developing Site Concepts and Massing

Unlike downtown, the South of Market long blocks, low-rise buildings, and wide streets provide a more open experience of sun and sky. Central SoMa alleys contrast this “bigness” with more human-scaled environments.

Below are suggested, not prescribed, means that meet the intention of the implementation measure.

**Support Lots of Sky**
Employ the flexibility of skyplane to creatively shape upper mass away from large streets and alleys. When employing skyplane, consider the building base to be the prominent and durable architecture and the upper building portion above the urban room as a more recessive, sculptural or even ethereal component. Consider volumetrically sculpting the tops of buildings to reflect the human scale, for example: contemporary versions of the mansard roof, indentions for smaller-scale balconies, clock towers, or light boxes that express interior use.

**Enhance Horizontality**
While vertical articulations are common in most of San Francisco, designers working in the southern portion of Central SoMa should consider how horizontal geometry reads more strongly. The long blocks of Central SoMa offer opportunities for large floorplate buildings but long undifferentiated facades, however, are not ideal for a positive street experience. Consider developing a modulated horizontality to express the existing environment, but with other articulations and fine-grained texture to create a visually compelling urban room.

**Precinct-Specific Form**
Central SoMa has several distinct building clusters that require more nuanced site design considerations, for example: 5th and Brannan, South Park, 5th and Howard, smaller residential enclaves, and parcels close to the freeway. Note and respond to urban form types and scales within these areas including nearby proposed projects.

**Enhance a Scale-shift**
Recognize the scale changes from the large street environments to the small scale alleys by relating facade textures and modulation to equivalent heights.
and proportions. Consider how building or landscape corners turn between these two environments and how the pedestrian experience can transition. Examine building openings that lead to alleys or open spaces for opportunities as gateways. Include neighborhood landmark features such as clock towers, special geometry, refined materials, coloration or other demarcating devices.

**Engage Wide Streets**
The existing wide streets of Central SoMa will remain and be reinforced as the streetwall heights are designed to match their widths. Alternating big and small gaps are a familiar pattern in the pedestrian experience of Central SoMa. Designers should consider the cadence, proportions, and widths of alleys and wide streets in developing mid-block passages, entries to POPOS and courtyard spaces.
Selecting Contextual Materials

Central SoMa has rich and varied histories that have left material patterns and scales. Contemporary architecture and construction techniques should express their time, but thoughtfully within the lineage of the neighborhood.

Below are suggested, not prescribed, means that meet the intention of the implementation measure.

Express Industrial Legacy
Consider re-introducing familiar elements from historic building elements, for example: sawtooth light portals, longer spans for open floorplates, corrugation for texture and articulation, roll up doors to support active street frontages, and small wall openings to highlight the human scale. These elements should not be considered an industrial aesthetic but rather a reinterpretation of their benefits for contemporary programs and uses.

Provide masonry buildings
Designers should consider using materials that offer textures or geometries at the scale of brick. While brick is not endemic to all of Central SoMa, its scale of texture, however, is a familiar pattern demonstrated in earlier eras, such as corrugated metal, plate steel, industrial sash windows, larger window spans, frame buildings, and load-bearing masonry buildings with large spans. Consider contemporary materials that employ similar logics for scale, texture and access but avoid mimicry or appropriation.

Offer Gritty Architecture
Repeatedly noted by residents as both a benefit and detriment, the “grit” of Central SoMa can be positively interpreted as environments that are “eclectic,” “surprising,” or “hardy.” Provide durable materials at the ground floor that are more rugged and resilient. Consider using facade systems that allow for small-scale flexible or modular insertions that would be easy to repair or swap for a change in technology, artistic exploration, or other future adaptation. Offer pedestrian scale indentions at the ground floor that could host seating or outdoor work areas. Support production activities being visible from or extending into the alley network.

Support Historic Character
Adaptively re-use existing fabric in innovative ways. This includes developing very contemporary language or “hyphenations” with older low-rise buildings.
Programming Architecture to Support Public Space

Central SoMa’s history of industrial and art production have fostered it as a place of innovation and experimentation. Consider how furnishings and programming will help Central SoMa support this character and evolve over time.

Below are suggested, not prescribed, means that meet the intention of the implementation measure.

Support the Alley Experience
Alleys in Central SoMa foster both quiet residential neighborhoods and industrial overflow. Rather than being just utilitarian, they can sponsor art, outdoor workspace or places to hang out. The Department recommends thoughtfully inventing alley way uses that can support full and safe pedestrian use while still facilitating loading and the other rougher functional uses needed by PDR uses at the ground level.

Offer Mid-Block Surprises
To animate alleys and public open space, offer and program small spaces that are flexible for different activities, for example, fold out galleries, flexible kiosks, micro-retail, art or lighting installations, playful street furnishings, or places for outdoor workshops or maker activities. Create stewardship programs that support or host curated events or activities. Where panels, solid surfaces, or other less pedestrian-friendly elements are required for utilitarian purposes, consider those as opportunities for art, special materials, or display.

Provide Maker Spaces
As a place of production, Central SoMa favored interior uses that were rough, eclectic, and supported invention and less pristine or tightly honed activities. Consider PDR as an active ground floor use where making or distributing material goods can be a recognized human endeavour through the use of transparency, openings, lighting, and doorways. Consider inventing ways for this use to invite pedestrian views or engagement through affiliated retail or more organized cultural events.
This section contains a graphical explanation of how to calculate the “skyplane” requirements contained in Section 270(h).

**PART 2: CALCULATING SKYPLANE**

1. **STEP 1** Form the Skyplane by creating a plane between the Base Height and Height Limit and lot boundaries.

2. **STEP 2** Determine intersection points on the Skyplane by projecting lines from the upper mass to the lot line directly across the street.

3. **STEP 3** Connect the intersection points to determine the area of Projected Building Mass on the skyplane.

4. **STEP 4** Divide the remaining area from the total Skyplane to determine the Apparent Mass Reduction percentage.
This section contains a graphical representation of the implementation of the skyplane and tower controls contained in Implementation Measures 8.3.3.1, 8.3.3.2, 8.3.3.4, 8.3.4.1, and 8.3.4.2. It includes images for three kinds of buildings:

- **Buildings taller than 160 feet** subject to tower controls
- **Buildings above 85 feet but not taller than 160 feet** subject to skyplane controls
- **Buildings 85 feet and less** subject to skyplane controls when fronting on narrow streets and alleys
Bulk Controls for Buildings Taller than 160’

Central SoMa will allow a handful of buildings taller than 160 feet, to punctuate important intersections (such as at the Caltrain station). To support height at these locations while still supporting light, air, and sun access to the streets, the Plan includes:

- **Bulk Controls for Buildings Taller than 160’**

Below is a majority but not complete depiction of code requirements.
**TOWER BULK CONTROLS**

**TOWER SEPARATION**

**IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE 8.3.3.4**

When there is an existing tower, the second tower should be at least 115'. The distance between towers may be reduced to a minimum of 85' if the difference in the height of the two towers is at least 50' and the bulk of the second tower is reduced relative to the reduction in tower separation, such that at 85', the maximum tower bulk shall be 10,000 sf.

**TOWER REDUCTION**

**IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE 8.3.4.2**

For towers 250’ or more, the upper 1/3 of any tower must feature minimum bulk reductions of 15% of the floorplate and the maximum diagonal of 7.5%.

**TOWER BULK**

**IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE 8.3.4.2**

No residential or hotel use would be allowed to have a floor exceed 12,000 gsf. The average floor for commercial uses cannot exceed 15,000 gsf and no single floor may exceed 17,000 gsf. The maximum horizontal dimension would be 150’. The maximum diagonal dimension would be 190’.

Photo by Daniel Austin Hoherd, Flickr (CC BY-NC 2.0).
Bulk Controls for 130’ or 160’ Tall Buildings

Central SoMa is primarily designed to be a mid-rise district, with buildings of 85 feet to 160 feet. To support this density while still supporting light, air, and sun access to the streets, the Plan includes:

- **STREET TYPES**
  - Major St width = 82.5’
  - Minor St width = 35’

- **LOT COVERAGE**
  - For residential use, generally 80% and for commercial use, POPOS at grade (15%) requirements may reduce amount of allowable lot coverage.

- **SKYPLANE**
  - Mid-rise buildings will be required to substantially reduce what is visible from the street based on site orientation and streetwidth proximity.

- **STREETWALL SETBACK**
  - A 15’ setback between 65’ to 85’ is required along interior property lines and public ROWs. On major streets, this is only required for 60% of the lot frontage.

- **MID-BLOCK ALLEY**
  - On a lot longer than 200’, a mid-block alley may be required.

- **MASS BREAK**
  - Maximum building length is 300’

Below is a majority but not complete depiction of Code Requirements.
### SKYPLANE APPARENT MASS REDUCTION %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height:</th>
<th>Building Face is on:</th>
<th>South elevation %:</th>
<th>North elevation %:</th>
<th>At height:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160'</td>
<td>35' wide street 82.5' wide street</td>
<td>70% 70%</td>
<td>100% 80%</td>
<td>above 35' above 85'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130'</td>
<td>35' wide street 82.5' wide street</td>
<td>85% 50%</td>
<td>100% 67%</td>
<td>above 35' above 85'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bulk Controls for Buildings 85’ or Shorter

Small streets and alleys in Central SoMa offer special neighborhood character. To maintain this character by supporting light, air, and sun access to these streets, the Plan includes:

- **Bulk Controls for Buildings 85’ or Shorter**

Below is a majority but not complete depiction of Code Requirements.
**SKYPLANE APPARENT MASS REDUCTION %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Building Face is on</th>
<th>South elevation %</th>
<th>North elevation %</th>
<th>At height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85'</td>
<td>35' wide street</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>above 35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65'</td>
<td>35' wide street</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>above 35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 65'</td>
<td>35' wide street</td>
<td>10' at 1.25x St width</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>above 35'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section contains simple renderings of how the Plan Area might look from street level after development of a substantial number of its anticipated buildings. It is intended to depict the scale and definition of the urban room and not specific building or street design. It includes views from the following vantages:

A  Fifth and Brannan looking northwest
B  Fourth and Townsend looking northwest
C  Fourth and Bryant looking southeast
D  Third and Brannan looking southwest

View key locations of renderings found on the following pages.

SF Digital Model by SOM; Diagram by SF Planning
A.1 View from Fifth and Brannan looking northwest (existing).

A.2 View from Fifth and Brannan looking northwest (potential). This view, looking towards Market Street, depicts both tower and mid-rise projects that will better frame the urban room, complemented by wider sidewalks and more greening.
B.1 View from Fourth and Townsend looking northwest (existing).

B.2 View from Fourth and Townsend looking northwest (potential). Looking northwest of development potential. This view looking towards Market Street is next to the highest tower height in the plan area. The visual experience of the tower is more from a distance (see view on opposite page) than from the street.
C.1 View from Fourth and Bryant looking southeast (existing).

C.2 View from Fourth and Bryant looking southeast (potential). This view, looking towards the Caltrain station, again shows how new and old can co-exist and maintain the neighborhood’s diversity of building types and architecture.
D.1 View from Third and Brannan looking southwest (existing)

D.2 View from Third and Brannan looking southwest (potential). This view, looking towards the Flower Mart, depicts the potential to add a substantial amount of development potential while maintaining many of the existing buildings and openness to the sky.
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KEY DEVELOPMENT SITE GUIDELINES
KEY DEVELOPMENT SITE GUIDELINES

PURPOSE
The Central SoMa Plan Area contains a number of “key development sites” - large, underutilized development opportunities with lot areas ranging from 25,000 square feet to well over 100,000 square feet (see Figure 1). By providing greater direction to the development of these sites, the City has an opportunity to maximize public benefits and to ensure that their development directly delivers critical public benefits, such as:

- Affordable housing, per Plan Policy 2.3.1: “Set affordability requirements for new residential development at rates necessary to fulfill this objective;”
- Protections and incentives for production, distribution, and repair space, per Plan Policy 3.3.4: “Provide incentives to fund, build, and/or protect PDR;”
- A large hotel serving the Convention Center, per Plan Policy 3.5.1: “Allow hotels throughout the growth-oriented parts of the Plan Area;”
- Pedestrian access, per Plan Policy 4.1.9: “Expand the pedestrian network wherever possible through creation of new narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections;”
- New public parks, per Plan Policy 5.2.1: “Create a new public park in the highest growth portion of the Plan Area” and Plan Policy 5.2.2: “Create a new linear park along Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets;”
- A new public recreation center, per Plan Policy 5.3.1: “Increase the amount of public recreation center space, including the creation of a new public recreation center;”
- Child care, per Plan Policy 2.6.2: “Help facilitate the creation of childcare facilities;” and
- Public plazas, per Plan Policy 5.5.1: “Require new non-residential development and encourage residential development to provide POPOS that address the needs of the community.”

Finding space on which to locate these kinds of public assets is tremendously difficult in a highly developed neighborhood like SoMa. But on these key development sites, the City can partner with the developer to address the unique design challenges that could constrain the creation of these amenities in exchange for their provision.

The draft Key Development Site Guidelines contained in this document are intended to help fulfill the opportunities for public benefits and address these design challenges. In doing so, these Guidelines are intended to help implement Objective 8.5 and Policy 8.5.1 of the Central SoMa Plan. Objective 8.5 states, “Ensure that large development sites are carefully designed to maximize public benefit,” whereas Policy 8.5.1 states, “Provide greater direction and flexibility for large development sites in return for improved design and additional public benefits.” The intent is for these guidelines to be further refined and codified with the adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, with additional refinement to occur as these projects seek entitlement from the City.
Figure 1

KEY DEVELOPMENT SITES

SITE 1: “5TH AND HOWARD”

SITE 2: “4TH AND HARRISON”

SITE 3: “PARK BLOCK”

SITE 4: “FLOWER MART”

SITE 5: “88 BLUXOME/ TENNIS CLUB”

SITE 6: “WELLS FARGO”

SITE 7: “4TH AND TOWNSEND”

SITE 8: “4TH AND TOWNSEND”

CENTRAL SOMA
The following information is contained for each key development site:

- The existing conditions on the site (as of January 2018);
- Its development potential, based on proposed zoning and height limit;
- The “Potential Public Benefits,” which, as the name implies, describes the public benefits that could be provided on the site that are not otherwise required by the Plan, tailored to the unique potential of the site;
- The “Potential Flexibility,” which describes the potential exceptions from the Plan’s Implementation Measures that may be necessary to achieve the increased public benefits, tailored to the unique circumstances of each site and of provision of the potential public benefits; and
- The “Design Guidelines,” which describe site-specific strategies to best implement the Plan’s policies where such explicit direction is not already given by the Plan.
**Existing Conditions**

The 31,000 square foot site currently contains a large surface parking lot covering most of its area. It also includes two small two-story commercial buildings, one fronting Howard Street with parking in the rear and one extending from Howard Street to Tehama Street.

**Development Potential**

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, there is potential for approximately four to five hundred thousand square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site. This site is currently under the ownership of a non-profit housing development organization, and the expected development on the site would consist of a residential project with a very high percentage of affordable housing.

**Potential Public Benefits**

This site has the potential to provide a substantial amount of affordable housing, approximately 400 housing units, at least 2/3 of which would be affordable to very low, low, and moderate income San Franciscans. This would greatly exceed the percentage of below market rate housing otherwise required for the site.

**Potential Flexibility**

**Height**

The site could contain two buildings – one of 300 feet and one of 180 feet. To maximize affordable housing units, the Plan could allow the 180-foot building to utilize the height to be treated as a mid-rise building rather than a tower (per Implementation Measure 8.5.1.2), in which case it would be allowed to have floor plates larger than 12,000 square feet and be within 30 feet of the adjacent tower.

**Massing**

Where buildings are taller than 160 feet, the Plan requires a 15-foot setback along all property lines at a height of 85 feet (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2). To maximize affordable housing units, the Plan could allow a partial reduction this setback requirement. However, at that height, design techniques including articulation (and not simply materiality and surface treatments) must be used to distinguish the streetwall podium from the tower. The Plan could also modify the apparent mass reduction requirement (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1) along Howard Street for the 180-foot building.

**Design Guidelines**

**Parking and Loading Access**

To minimize conflicts on Howard and 5th Streets, any parking and loading for provided on this site shall be accessed off of Tehama Street.
Existing Conditions
The 102,000 square foot site currently contains four single-story buildings, including automobile parking for commuters and other non-residential uses.

Development Potential
Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for approximately one million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits
Because of its large size, the site has the potential to provide space for one or more of the following as described further below: 1) an affordable housing site, 2) affordable space for production, distribution, and repair, 3) a public recreation center.

Affordable Housing Site
This site contains the potential for dedicating a portion of the site for a 100% affordable housing development while still including a large footprint for a substantial commercial development. Should this site yield an affordable housing site, the preferred location would be interior to the block facing Harrison Street, with a size of between 15,000 – 30,000 square feet (which is the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development’s preferred size for affordable housing developments).

Production, Distribution, and Repair
Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). While the City cannot require that this space be subsidized as part of the Plan, the project sponsor could provide affordable rents to through a development agreement or other mechanism.

Public Recreation Center
Because of its large size and development potential, this site contains the potential to include the new public recreation center being sought by the City. Such a recreation center could be stand-alone, or for purposes of site efficiency, incorporated into the affordable housing site or a proposed office development. Any proposed recreation center should coordinate the amenities and offerings with those available at the Gene Friend Recreation Center located at 6th and Folsom Streets.

Potential Flexibility
Height
If providing on-site affordable housing and/or a recreation center, the Plan could allow up to 25 feet of additional height on the buildings on the site (per Implementation Measure 8.5.1.2).

Massing
The Plan’s “skyplane” requirements mandate mass reduction from 50-80% along street-facing property lines (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1). If required to provide on-site affordable housing and/or a recreation center without diminishing overall project development potential, the Plan could allow a reduction of the “skyplane” requirements along some combination of Harrison Street and 4th Street. This reduction would be designed to shift the building mass in a manner that emphasizes the corner of 4th and Harrison.
Design Guidelines

Mid-Block Connections
Per Planning Code Section 270.2, the site will be required to provide a mid-block connection between Harrison and Perry Streets. The mid-block connection should be located in the middle-third of the block.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80
Current pedestrian conditions along 4th Street under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could provide or contribute to public art, lighting and other improvements in coordination with the City.

Parking and Loading Access
Any parking and loading provided shall be accessed off of Perry Street and/or the new mid-block alley.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)
New development is required to provide POPOS, on-site or within 900 feet of the project. A good location for this project’s POPOS is off-site under the I-80 freeway, on the west side of 4th Street, where it could serve to activate the street (in keeping with Implementation Measures 4.1.10.1 and 5.3.2.1). If provided on-site, the project’s POPOS should be an inviting indoor space along 4th Street as well as the mid-block alley between Harrison Street and Perry Street.
Existing Conditions
The site currently contains five buildings. There is a
four story, 65,000 square foot commercial building
on Harrison Street between 2nd Street and Vassar
Place. To the west of Vassar Place, covering the full
lot from Harrison Street to Perry Street, is a four story,
150,000 square foot historically significant commercial
building. West of that building are three two-story
commercial buildings fronting Harrison Street with
parking lots fronting Perry Street.

Development Potential
Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning
parameters, there is potential for approximately 1.2
million square feet of total development at this site
across all uses, including any office, residential, retail,
hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits
As a large site, the site has the potential to deliver one
or more of the following as described further below: 1)
increased affordable housing, 2) affordable space for
production, distribution, and repair, 3) a large hotel, 4)
child care, and 5) pedestrian experience under I-80.

Affordable Housing Site
The collection of parcels west of the site’s historic
building has been proposed for a residential tower.
With additional development potential, the site could
potentially exceed the affordability levels required by
the Plan.

Production, Distribution, and Repair
Any proposed office building on this site would be
required to provide PDR space (per Implementation
Measure 3.3.3.1). While the City cannot require that this
space be subsidized as part of the Plan, the project
sponsor could provide affordable rents to through a
development agreement or other mechanism.

Large Hotel
The City is seeking large hotels (400 rooms or more) in
the proximity of the Moscone Convention Center (as
discussed in Implementation Measure 3.5.1.1). This site
could accommodate such a hotel. The Plan as adopted
also allows the project sponsor to build residential
uses instead of hotel, provided that it exceed the
affordability levels already required by the Plan.

Childcare
Neighborhood support services, particularly childcare,
are critical to support the vision of Central SoMa
and maintain a diversity of residents in the Plan
area, consistent with Draft Plan Objective 2.6. The
proposed site would have the potential to provide an
on-site child-care facility, to support the expanding
population.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80
Perry Street runs between this site and the AC Transit
bus storage facility, and is largely underneath the
I-80 freeway. In addition, Perry Street dead-ends
before reaching 2nd Street. The result is that existing
conditions are unattractive and unsafe, as well as
lacking connectivity. This project may have the
opportunity to incorporate public realm and street
improvements that connect Perry Street to both
2nd Street and Vassar Street and thereby improve
the connectivity. Additionally, the project could
provide or contribute to public art, lighting and other
improvements along the bus facility and otherwise
under I-80.
**Potential Flexibility**

**Height**
The Plan contains two potential height limits for this key development site – a lower height and a higher height that could only be achieved through provision of the affordable housing and large hotel described above. This would include up to 350 feet east of Vassar Place, 200 feet on the Lot 105 and 350 feet on the collection of parcels to its west.

**Massing**
The Plan’s tower controls establish a maximum floorplate of 12,000 square feet for hotels (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2) and a minimum distance of 115 feet between any two towers (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.4). Achieving the City’s desired minimum number of hotel rooms on-site could require the hotel tower to exceed the Plan’s proposed maximum floor size and dimensions, as well as its minimum tower separation. However, such a tower would be required to be set back to the maximum degree possible from Harrison Street.

**Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)**
The Plan’s POPOS requirements state that the development’s POPOS should be open to the sky (per Implementation Measure 5.5.1.1). However, the location of the site adjacent to the freeway is not highly conducive to an outdoor POPOS. Simultaneously, a use that activates 2nd Street for pedestrians is very important along that busy street. As such, the Plan could allow an exception to the requirement that the POPOS be open to the sky, and instead provide an enclosed POPOS, as long as it is at sidewalk grade and has a clear ceiling height of at least 25 feet and meets other standards for design and performance.

**Lot Consolidation**
To maintain historic neighborhood character, the Plan bans consolidation of lots containing buildings with historic or neighborhood-character buildings (per Implementation Measure 7.6.1.1). As shown in Plan Figure 7.2, several parcels fronting Harrison and 2nd Streets would not be allowed to consolidate with other parcels under this provision. However, on this large site, this requirement may impact the ability to achieve both public benefits and superior design and potential for public benefits. Therefore, the Plan could allow the project to consolidate these lots.

**Design Guidelines**

**Mid-Block Connections**
The development site has the potential to add a portion of Lot 112. If this occurs, the development should connect Vassar Place all the way from Harrison Street to Perry Street. However, a second mid-block connection in addition to Vassar Place is unlikely to provide an important pedestrian route, given the availability of Vassar Street and the lack of a mid-block connection south of Perry Street, and could diminish from the street wall along Harrison Street. Therefore, the project may not be required to develop a second mid-block connection.

**Parking and Loading Access**
Parking and loading should be provided off of Perry Street or Vassar Place, but not 2nd Street or Harrison Street.
Existing Conditions
The site currently contains a large wholesale flower market consisting of single-story warehouses, smaller shops, parking, and ancillary facilities. Additionally, there is a surface parking lot at the corner of 5th and Brannan that has been used to store utility vehicles. Located at the north end of the site is a shared easement that serves as a service drive for the wholesale flower market and its northern neighbors.

Development Potential
Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for at least 2.4 million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits
As a large collection of parcels, the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) a replacement Flower Mart at subsidized rents, 2) an affordable housing site.

Wholesale Flower Market
Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). It is important that such space be provided for the current wholesale flower market tenants as well as future operators, and that the facility is provided at affordable rents to ensure their longevity and financial success. The City and the project sponsor are considering a development agreement to ensure that this occurs.

Affordable Housing Site
Current plans for the site do not contemplate the inclusion of housing, due to potential conflicts with the operations of the wholesale flower market. However, if such conflicts were mitigatable, and housing were contemplated on the site, such housing could also provide space for on-site affordability. The large size of the site could enable the potential for a 100% affordable housing development of 15,000 – 30,000 square feet, potentially at the corner of 6th and Brannan, while still including a substantial commercial development.

Potential Flexibility
Massing
The site design is driven by the wholesale flower market’s need for a continuous ground floor operation of almost three acres. Given this consideration, the City could allow the following exceptions to the streetwall (per Implementation Measure 8.1.3.1), skyplane (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1), tower separation (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.4), tower bulk (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2), setback requirements (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2), and building length (per Implementation Measure 8.5.2.2):

● The potential for the building at the corner of 5th and Brannan to have its 15-foot setback would occur up to a height of 105 feet rather than 85 feet;
● The “mid-rise” portion of the building above the wholesale flower market to go to 200 feet rather than 160 feet, provided this increase is only located internally to the block along the mid-block connection created by the project;
● A reduced setback at 85 feet along 5th Street and Morris Street for a small percentage of the building;
● A reduced setback for the tower proposed at the corner of 6th and Brannan Streets;
● A waiver of the the bulk reduction in the top 1/3 of the tower;
● An ability to exceed the maximum building length of 300 feet if the project still contains an architectural mass break (respecting the intent of Planning Code Section 270.1) and is largely permeable and open to the elements at the ground floor; and
● A waiver of the narrow streets setback and skyplane requirements at the new midblock east-west paseo and expanded service lane.

**PDR Space**
To ensure no net loss of PDR due to the Plan, the Plan proposes 100 percent replacement of PDR space in areas being rezoned from SALI to PDR (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). However, by increasing the efficiency of the current wholesale flower market, it is possible to have the same amount of businesses and workers on a smaller footprint. As such, the Plan could allow an exception to the 100 percent replacement requirement.

**Lot Consolidation**
To maintain historic neighborhood character, the Plan bans consolidation of lots containing buildings with historic or neighborhood-character buildings (per Implementation Measure 7.6.1.1). As shown in Plan Figure 7.2, the site parcels fronting both 5th and 6th Streets that would not be allowed to consolidate with other parcels. On this large site, this requirement runs counter to the ability to achieve superior design and potential for public benefits. Therefore, the Plan could allow the project to consolidate these lots.

**Design Guidelines**

**Mid-Block Connections**
Per Planning Code Section 270.2, the site will be required to provide multiple mid-block connections. These should be utilized to create an alley network on this block – one of the few in SoMa without one. This should include an east-west connection through the entire block, potentially as an extension of Freelon Street. This should also include a north-south connection from Brannan Street to the east-west connection.

**Pedestrian Experience under I-80**
Current pedestrian conditions along 5th Street under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could provide or contribute to public art, lighting or other improvements in coordination with the City.

**Parking and Loading Access**
Parking and loading should be provided off of an existing or new alley or service drive. Given the size and industrial nature of this site, it may require multiple parking access points.

**Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)**
Due to the site’s size, there are multiple ways to meet the intent of the POPOS requirement. This could include pedestrianizing a large portion of the required mid-block connections. This could also include a large centralized public space on the site. Any such space should be oriented to maximize sunshine.
Ground Floor Activation
Presuming the replacement wholesale flower market is at the ground floor, it will be important to ensure that the facility is designed to support activation at this level during the afternoon and evening hours when the wholesale flower market typically has no to low activity. The portion of the building fronting POPOS should be lined with active commercial and/or community uses that serve the local population into the evenings and weekends.
SITE 5: “PARK BLOCK”

Existing Conditions
The site includes a nearly 100,000 square foot parcel (Lot 045) fronting Brannan and 5th Streets that includes a two-story building of approximately 40,000 square feet that formerly was a San Francisco Chronicle printing plant (now partially used for animal care), as well as a large parking lot. The site includes three parcels fronting Brannan Street, including a 60,000 square foot “L” shaped parcel (Lot 052) currently owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and used primarily for open air storage of light poles. The other two lots are each about 19,000 square feet and contain low-rise industrial structures; one (Lot 051) contains a one-story auto body shop and the other (Lot 050) is used for additional storage by the SFPUC.

Development Potential
Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for approximately one million one hundred thousand square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits
As a large collection of parcels, the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) a public park, 2) an affordable housing site, 3) affordable space for production, distribution, and repair.

Public Park
The Central SoMa Plan has identified this site as the preferred location for a new public park (as discussed in Implementation Measure 5.2.2.1). The potential park on this site could be up to an acre in size (~43,000 square feet), with a minimum desirable size of approximately three-quarters of an acre (~32,000 square feet). If located on the interior to this typical large SoMa block, it would be protected from noise and traffic by its location and could be accessed by up to six public streets based on implementation of the design recommendations discussed below. Given the limited opportunities to identify a site for a park of this size, the creation of this park is a very high priority of the Plan.

Affordable Housing Site
This site contains the potential for development on a portion of the site (between 12,000 – 18,000 square feet) of a 100% affordable housing development while still including a large footprint for a substantial commercial development. Should this site yield an affordable housing site, the preferred location would include a significant frontage facing the proposed park, which would directly benefit the residents and help provide “eyes” on the park around the clock throughout the week, in addition to that provided by the new adjacent commercial buildings, as well as ensuring a diversity of uses fronting the park.

Production, Distribution, and Repair
Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). While the City cannot require that this space be subsidized as part of the Plan, the project sponsor could provide affordable rents to through a development agreement or other mechanism.
Potential Flexibility

Height
If providing a public park and/or on-site affordable housing, the Plan could allow up to 25 feet of additional height on the buildings on the site (per Implementation Measure 8.5.1.2).

Massing
The Plan’s “skyplane” requirements mandate mass reduction from 50-80% along street-facing property lines (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1). Recognizing that the proposed park substantially reduces the site’s development potential, the Plan could allow the “skyplane” requirements to be reduced on this site, as viewed from Brannan, 5th, Bryant, and Welsh Streets. This reduction would shift the building mass in a manner that increases sun access to the park by moving it towards the corner of 5th and Brannan, towards Welsh Street, and towards Bryant. The buildings would still need to establish a strong streetwall of 65 feet to 85 feet along the major streets, step back substantially above that height, and use architectural techniques to render the upper portion deferential to the lower portion.

Design Guidelines

Mid-Block Connections
The new mid-block connections required on this site should connect and extend the existing dead end alleys directly to the public open space, and increase the pedestrian permeability through the interior of this block, as follows:

1. Connect the two ends of Welsh Street: This alley would provide east-west pedestrian access through the block and remove two dead-end conditions.

2. Connect Freelon Street to 5th Street. This alley would provide east-west pedestrian access through the block and remove a dead-end condition.

3. Connect Freelon Street to Brannan Street: This connection should provide direct access to the proposed park (discussed above) from Brannan Street. The intersection of this mid-block connection with Brannan Street should be located as far to the east as possible, in order to effectively reduce the block length, provide most direct alignment to the park, and most closely align with both a proposed mid-block pedestrian crossing on Brannan Street and with a required mid-block connection on block 3786 (“88 Bluxome/Tennis Club” site).

4. Connect Bryant Street to Welsh Street: This connection should provide direct access to the proposed park from Bryant Street.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80
Current pedestrian conditions along 5th Street under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could contribute to this improvement in coordination with the City.

Parking and Loading Access
Any parking and loading provided shall be designed to minimize conflicts with the use of and access to the public park.
Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)
As required by the Plan, the site will provide a significant amount of POPOS. This space should be located adjacent to the proposed public park to expand its size, and/or designed to enhance access to the park (via making the new mid-block connections pedestrian-only).

Ground Floor Activation
Activation of the park is critical. As required by the Plan, the park shall be lined with active uses, particularly retail, community uses (e.g., childcare), and PDR. To maximize activation, the ground floor uses should be diversified, in terms of users and time of use. Residential uses should be located facing to the park to provide additional eyes on it round the clock.

Light and Wind in the Public Park
The park and the development must be designed cooperatively to ensure that the project remains feasible and that the park does not reduce the site’s development potential. That being said, the massing and design of the buildings should afford the park a substantial amount of sunshine and a minimum amount of wind to ensure its use and enjoyment.
Existing Conditions
The site includes a 6,000 square foot single-story building containing a Wells Fargo bank branch and a chain coffee shop, as well as a large parking lot.

Development Potential
Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, there is potential for approximately three- to four-hundred thousand square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits
As a single, relatively modest sized parcel the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) affordable space for production, distribution, and repair, 2) a public recreation center.

Production, Distribution, and Repair
Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). While the City cannot require that this space be subsidized as part of the Plan, the project sponsor could provide affordable rents to through a development agreement or other mechanism.

Public Recreation Center
This site contains the potential to include the new public recreation center being sought by the City. Any proposed recreation center should coordinate the amenities and offerings with those available at the Gene Friend Recreation Center located at 6th and Folsom Streets.

Potential Flexibility
Massing
Since the site is proposed to be zoned at 200 feet, it could choose to develop as a tower, subject to the rules discussed in Implementation Measure 8.3.3.4, and the exceptions discussed here would not be necessary. However, if the site chooses to develop subject to the controls of a mid-rise building, with a maximum height of 160 feet, it could provide significantly more light and air onto Freelon Alley than the tower scenario. To support this outcome, the Plan could allow 1) an alteration of the skyplane requirements so that there is still significantly more light and air on Freelon Street than under the tower scenario, though less than otherwise required by Implementation Measure 8.4.1.1, and 2) a minor reduction in apparent mass reduction on Brannan Street. Such a gesture could help emphasize the importance of the corner of 4th and Brannan Streets.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)
To maximize development potential on the site, and in return for the public benefits described above, the City could allow the POPOS not open to the sky, as long as it has a clearance of at least 25 feet and meets other standards for design and performance included in Implementation Measure 5.5.1.1.

Design Guidelines
Mid-Block Connections
Per Planning Code Section 270.2, the site may be required to provide a new mid-block connection connecting 225-foot long lot frontages on Brannan and Freelon. However, given the existing permeability of the block (via such alleys as Freelon, Welsh, Zoe, and Ritch), such an alley is not necessary. If provided,
it should serve as a POPOS and be activated by uses within the development.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80
Current pedestrian conditions along 4th Street under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could provide or contribute to improvements in coordination with the City.

Parking and Loading Access
Any parking and loading provided shall be accessed off of Freelon Street, rather than 4th Street or Brannan Street.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)
Part of the POPOS requirement on this site can be met through the required five foot setback along 4th Street, which is necessary to provide adequate sidewalk widths (see Implementation Measure 4.1.1.2). As per the remaining POPOS requirement, notwithstanding the potential exception discussed above, a good location for this project’s POPOS is off-site under the I-80 freeway, where it could serve to activate the street (in keeping with Implementation Measures 4.1.10.1 and 5.3.2.1). If such a POPOS is infeasible, the site should consider a pedestrianized mid-block connection on the eastern end of the property (as discussed above) or through a setback along Freelon Street. The POPOS should not be provided as a “carve out” along 4th or Brannan Streets that diminishes from the streetwall provided by the building (per Implementation Measure 8.1.3.1).
Existing Conditions

The site is currently utilized as a private recreational facility, most prominently featuring the city’s only indoor tennis courts.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for approximately one million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, recreational, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits

This large site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) an affordable housing site, 2) public recreation center, 3) Bluxome Linear Park.

Affordable Housing Site

This site contains the potential for dedicating a portion of the site (between 15,000 – 30,000 square feet) for a 100% affordable housing development while still including a large footprint for a substantial commercial development. Should this site yield an affordable housing site, the preferred location would be interior to the block.

Public Recreation Center

This site contains the potential to include the new public recreation center being sought by the City. For purposes of site efficiency, such a recreation center could be incorporated into the affordable housing site or a proposed office development. Any proposed recreation center should coordinate the amenities and offerings with those available at the Gene Friend Recreation Center located at 6th and Folsom Streets.

Bluxome Linear Park

The site contains the potential to create the new linear park along Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets. While part of this requirement could meet the Plan’s POPOS requirements (per Implementation Measure 5.5.1.1), construction of the entire park would likely exceed the amount of required POPOS.

Potential Flexibility

Height

If providing an on-site affordable housing and/or a public recreation center, the Plan could allow up to 25 feet of additional height on the buildings on the site (per Implementation Measure 8.5.1.2).

Massing

The Plan’s “skyplane” requirements mandate mass reduction from 50-80% along street-facing property lines (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1). In return for the public benefits discussed above, the City could allow a reduction of the “skyplane” requirements along some combination of Bluxome, Brannan, and 5th Streets. This reduction would be designed to shift the building mass in a manner that emphasizes the corner of 5th and Brannan Streets. For the potential tower on the western portion of the site, the design should explore ways to increase floorplates and dimensions in a fashion that is minimally visible from the street, given the depth of the development lot. For the potential mid-rise building in the eastern portion of the site, it may be necessary to add mass on the upper floors to account for development capacity lost in providing the additional public benefits. These potential exceptions should be mindful of potential shadow impacts on the proposed park on the north side of Brannan Street (see “Park Block” site).
Production, Distribution, and Repair
The Plan requires that any proposed office building on the site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). The City could allow this PDR requirement to be waived in return for providing more than one of the public benefits discussed above.

Design Guidelines
Mid-Block Connections
Per Planning Code Section 270.2, the site will be required to provide a mid-block connection between Brannan and Bluxome Streets. The mid-block connection between Brannan and Bluxome Streets should be located in the middle-third of the block. While a new mid-block connection could be required east from 5th Street, it is unlikely that such a connection would benefit the circulation pattern in the area, and is therefore not a priority.

Parking and Loading Access
Any parking and loading provided shall be accessed off of Bluxome Street, rather than 5th Street or Brannan Street. To minimize disruption of the proposed linear park along Bluxome, this loading should occur as far east on the site as possible.

Light and Wind in the Public Park
The development on the site should consider its effects on shadows and wind on the proposed Bluxome Street linear park, balancing this issue against other massing considerations on the site.
Existing Conditions
The site currently has several uses. On the triangular lot fronting 4th Street is a single-story building hosting two retail uses – a restaurant and a coffee shop. On the triangular lot fronting Townsend Street is a single story furniture store. In the northeast corner of the site are two residential condominiums and a commercial condominium. These are connected via a driveway to a curb cut at the intersection of 4th and Townsend.

Development Potential
Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for approximately one million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits
As a large collection of parcels, the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) an architectural identifier for the Plan Area, 2) pedestrian access to transit.

Architecture
The corner of 4th and Townsend is the intersection of two rail lines – Caltrain and the Central Subway. The Plan seeks to emphasize the importance of this location by establishing the Plan Area’s highest height limits. Additionally, the Plan seeks to use distinctive architecture to demarcate the importance of this site and serve as an identifier of Central SoMa on the skyline.

Pedestrian Access to Transit
The ongoing upgrades to Caltrain and the completion of the Central Subway are both going to bring a lot of new people to the intersection of 4th and Townsend Streets. To facilitate the movement of these pedestrians across this busy intersection, this development sites should consider ways to facilitate pedestrian movement through this block, including a new connection to Lusk Street. It should also consider incorporation of underground pedestrian access to the Caltrain station.

Potential Flexibility

Land Use
The Plan requires parcels larger than 40,000 square feet south of Harrison Street to be primarily non-residential (per Implementation Measure 3.1.1.1). The Plan could allow this site to be a primarily residential development, with potential for ground floor retail. This exception would be tied to the provision of non-residential development beyond otherwise required at an affiliated site (i.e., the Park Block site, currently proposed for development by the same sponsor).

Massing
The site has the potential for two towers designed in an architecturally superior way. Given this consideration, the City could allow exceptions to tower separation (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.4), tower bulk (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2), and setback requirements (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2), as follows:

- A reduced tower separation between the two buildings, so that there is a perceived separation of approximately 50 feet on the lower half of the tower and 70 feet on upper third of the building;
• Allow the expression of the desired 50 foot height difference be within the massing of each tower, rather than between towers;
• An increase in the bulk such that the towers may have an individual floorplate of more than 12,000 square feet until the upper third of the towers, and the top 1/8 of the towers must have floorplates of no more than 8,000 square feet each;
• A waiver from the streetwall requirement to allow the setbacks below the podium to be gradual and to exceed five feet;
• An increase in the plan dimension and diagonals of the towers up to 270 feet;
• A reduced setback at 85 feet along Townsend Street, though this setback could be no less than 10 feet

**Design Guidelines**

**Parking and Loading Access**
To minimize impacts to transit vehicles traversing the intersection of 4th and Townsend Streets, all vehicle access to the site must be from Townsend Street at the eastern edge of the site. New curb cuts are not permitted along 4th Street.

**Public Plaza**
The City requires residential projects to provide open space, and provides an incentive to make such open space publicly accessible. This site would be a good location for one or more such public open spaces, which could include a substantial, accessible, and inviting public plaza.
CENTRAL SOMA KEY STREETS GUIDANCE

PURPOSE
This Key Streets Guidance document will further the implementation of the Central SoMa Plan by providing street-specific guidance for the neighborhood’s major east-west and north-south streets: 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, and Townsend. This additional guidance will benefit City agencies, the community, and major development project sponsors as the design of these “key streets” is considered and implemented over the 25-year Plan horizon.

Although the Central SoMa Plan area only includes four to five blocks of each key street, the visions and benefits described in this guidance could inform planning for the entire length of each roadway corridor. For ease of use, this document is organized by street, which is how most of these improvements will be implemented. As with much of the Plan, an underlying goal is to thoughtfully leverage each future investment to maximize quality of life for everyone living, working, and playing in Central SoMa. In the neighborhood, streets and sidewalks occupy over 70% acres - nearly one-third of the land area. As such, our investments in these streets should emphasize creating healthy, vibrant, and green places for people to walk, gather, recreate, and experience nature.

RELEVANT PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES
Goal 4 of the Central SoMa Plan (contained in Chapter 4) is to “Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit.” Chapter 4’s comprehensive suite of Objectives and Policies seeks to improve mobility and reduce traffic congestion through street and sidewalk improvements that support and prioritize sustainable transportation modes (walking, biking, and transit). In addition, Goal 6, “Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood,” recognizes complete streets and sidewalks as critical opportunities to amplify environmental sustainability and resilience (air quality, stormwater management, urban flooding, greening/biodiversity, and energy use). Together, the Objectives and Policies of this chapter also support the City’s larger climate mitigation (greenhouse-gas reduction) goals.

1 SFMTA, SFDPW, SF Planning, SFPUC, and SF Environment (as needed)
Figure 1
NEIGHBORHOOD MOBILITY AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS SUMMARY

- Protected / striped bicycle lane
- Transit-only lane / transit route
- Sidewalk widening (general pedestrian improvements on every street)
- Green Connections & major greening opportunities (street trees on every street)
**UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS AND DESCRIPTIONS**

Pedestrian comfort, greening, resiliency, and resource efficiency are concepts applicable to all of Central SoMa’s streets. This section describes these concepts in more detail.

- **Pedestrian comfort** includes amenities along sidewalks and medians that contribute to safe, convenient, and attractive walking environments. Such improvements help fulfill the City’s pedestrian safety policies (especially Vision Zero) and sustainability policies (such as having 80% of all trips be by sustainable means by 2030). Elements include wider sidewalks to accommodate increased populations, signalized crosswalks and bulb outs to improve crossings, street trees and landscaping for experience of nature and more, furnishings and other public amenities for respite and gathering, and improved lighting and public art.

- **Greening** refers to a mix of street trees for shade and beauty, landscaped medians and sidewalks for pollinator habitat, green infrastructure incorporated as urban design and place making elements, and living walls on adjacent building facades. These elements may be incorporated throughout streets, sidewalks, medians and bike lane buffers, and adjacent open spaces. Local air quality, mental health, biodiversity, stormwater management, micro-climate comfort, and environmental justice issues are all enhanced through a robust integration of nature into the built environment. In Central SoMa, special attention is needed on the identified Green Connections (2nd Street and Folsom Street) and around/under the elevated freeway. The Plan directs all landscaping throughout the neighborhood to use climate appropriate and habitat supportive plants, which prioritize native or non-native/non-invasive species (see www.sfplantfinder.org for an easy-to-use tool for plant selections that support this biodiversity vision).

- **Resilience and resource-efficiency** tools include those that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and energy use include well-designed and appointed streets that encourage walking/biking/transit (sustainable mobility), publicly accessible electric vehicle charging, and LED streetlights. Well-designed green infrastructure helps reduce urban flooding impacts by detaining and slowing precipitation that falls on streets and sidewalks. This is especially helpful in already built urban centers like Central SoMa where raising site elevations on a project-by-project basis is challenging. Advanced stormwater management also provides downstream benefits to the City’s wastewater system by reducing water volumes in the combined sewer system. Finally, stormwater is a non-potable water source that if captured, detained, and treated properly may be used for local park irrigation and street cleaning.
This table summarizes the information contained in the following pages.

### Street Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>Pedestrian Improvements</th>
<th>Transit Improvements</th>
<th>Curb Space Demand Mgmt</th>
<th>Protected Bike Lanes</th>
<th>Street Trees</th>
<th>Enhanced Infrastructure</th>
<th>Green Infrastructure</th>
<th>SF Green Connection</th>
<th>LED Street Lights (CSP)</th>
<th>LED Street Lights (SFPUC)</th>
<th>EV Charging Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Proposed Amenity Summary*
Vision

Howard Street is the westbound companion to eastbound Folsom Streets to its south. It is envisioned as a one-way roadway with two travel lanes and a two-way protected bicycle lane. Identified in the SFMTA’s Fiscal Year 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program from 3rd to 11th streets, Howard Street is a key piece of the neighborhood’s pedestrian and bicycle network, as well as a major conduit for people biking from downtown through SoMa to areas further south and west.

Key Features & Co-Benefits

- Pleasant and safe pedestrian realm with sufficient sidewalks, shorter and more frequent crossings, greening, furnishings/gathering spaces, and art.
- Safe cycling with a two-way protected bike lane on the south side of the street, in between the existing sidewalk and new median strip.
- A new median in envisioned to protect the bicycle lane users and for a mix of loading, greening, and other public amenities.
- Landscape areas should be included in medians, bulb-outs, and sidewalks as feasible. As complementary to local stormwater management, landscape areas should also be considered for functional green infrastructure, such as rain gardens and bioswales. Especially on the blocks between 4th and 6th streets, these systems may also provide downstream system benefits and help minimize urban flooding on 5th Street.
Vision

Functionally, Folsom Street is the eastbound companion to westbound Howard Street. In the City’s General Plan, Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, and Central SoMa Plan, it is envisioned as a civic boulevard linking multiple existing and emerging neighborhoods in the SoMa area and beyond. Folsom Street is also identified in San Francisco’s Green Connection Plan as SoMa’s main traverse. Thus, designs should foster linkages between inland open spaces and the Bay, and provide verdant habitat for native plants and wildlife. Identified in the SFMTA’s Fiscal Year 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program from the Embarcadero to 11th Street, Folsom Street is a key piece of the neighborhood’s transit and bicycle network, as well as a major conduit for people that bike downtown from adjacent neighborhoods to the south and west. As part of a robust planning process, Folsom Street is intended to maintain one-way travel on two to three lanes and include the amenities outlined.

Key Features & Co-Benefits

- Dedicated transit-only lane to increase bus speeds and reliability, along with new and enhanced boarding areas and bus shelters with real-time schedules to enhance user experience.
- Safe cycling with a one-way protected bike lane situated in between the existing sidewalk and protective new median strip, which will accommodate a mix of passenger and commercial loading, greening (street trees and green infrastructure), and other public amenities.
- Pleasant pedestrian realm comprised of enhanced existing sidewalks, wider sidewalks on the north side of the street between 4th and 8th Streets, shorter and more frequent crossings, landscaping, sidewalk furnishings, and art. In addition to buffering cyclists from vehicle traffic, the new median will also expand the usable space for public respite and stormwater management to reduce urban flooding, especially on the bike lane.
- Landscape areas should be included in medians, bulb-outs, and sidewalks as feasible. As complimentary to local stormwater management, landscape areas should also be considered for functional green infrastructure, such as rain gardens and bioswales. Especially on the blocks between 4th and 6th Streets, these systems may also provide downstream system benefits and help minimize urban flooding on 5th Street.
**Vision**

Harrison and Bryant streets are a couplet recognized as major regional freeway access corridors for vehicles entering or exiting the San Francisco Bay Bridge. Both roadways are also identified as important local transit corridors. Therefore, neither are seen as appropriate roadways for people that bike. As pedestrian safety and comfort is a priority throughout SoMa, sidewalk and street crossing improvements are important, especially in around freeway on and off ramps.

SFMTA’s SoMa improvement strategy does not include Bryant or most of Harrison in its list of capital projects priorities. Therefore, it is understood that four of the existing five general traffic lanes on each street could be retained, with the fifth lane converted to transit-only during daytime/peak hours. Off-peak, both curb lanes would be used for on-street parking. Similarly, on-street parking would be limited to off-peak hours, but curbside loading pockets would be provided where needed.

In general, the Central SoMa Plan prioritizes healthy air quality improvements for all local residents and workers. Since a bulk of today’s impacts center around emissions from vehicles traversing the neighborhood on the elevated I-80 freeway impacts, as well as queuing and idling at on and off ramps, parallel and adjacent Harrison and Bryant streets (and the areas beneath the freeway) provide key opportunities to add protective and filtering layers of urban greening, such as significant tree canopies, living walls, and the neighborhoods larger green infrastructure investments.

**Key Features & Co-Benefits**

- Pedestrian safety and comfort improvements will be made along with major development projects, recognizing that the current sidewalks (typically 8’ wide) are insufficient and below the City’s Better Streets standards. Additionally, the 5th Street project will include pedestrian improvements to the 5th/Harrison and 5th/Bryant freeway ramps.

- Significant greening and tree planting is to be implemented along the freeway corridor to help mitigate current air quality impacts, which depends on the streetscapes of Harrison and Bryant streets to support these aims.
Vision
Brannan Street is the east-west spine of the southern half of the Plan area where substantial employment and residential growth is expected. Currently it is a two-way street with narrow sidewalks and no provisions for safe bicycle travel. The street is envisioned to retain two-way operations but re-balance Brannan Street to function as a neighborhood hub. For the stretch of Brannan between the Embarcadero and 8th Street, the SFMTA Fiscal Year 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program identifies sidewalk improvements and protected bicycle lane in both directions, and reduced vehicle lanes. As with 5th Street, required streetscape improvements associated with major development projects will be coordinated to contribute maximum benefits to an enhanced roadway condition for people that walk, bike, and take transit.

Key Features & Co-Benefits
● Protected bike lanes in both directions.
● Sidewalk improvements, such as enhanced crossings, street trees, and landscaping; note, sidewalk widening may occur along blocks with major new developments.
● Opportunities for green infrastructure rain gardens and bioswales, especially on the blocks between 4th and 6th streets, to help manage local stormwater and minimize local urban flooding on downstream 5th street, as well as contribute to the streets overall greening goals.

Vision
Townsend Street is important due to the density of residents, bicycle use, and proximity to Caltrain. Currently conditions vary greatly - east of 4th Street, Townsend functions like other SoMa streets. West of 4th Street it lacks some of the basic amenities, such as sidewalks. Townsend Street between 8th and 4th is also part of the Vision Zero High Injury Network. Envisioned improvements support better walking, biking, and transit service. Long-term, these efforts will be tied into improvements related to changes to the Caltrain station and yard, which are tied to the proposed High Speed Rail project.

Key Features & Co-Benefits
● New and/or improved transit boarding areas.
● Protected bike lanes in both directions.
2ND STREET

Vision

Incorporating community input, the SFMTA SoMa Improvement Strategy describes 2nd Street as a primary bike, transit, and pedestrian thoroughfare, as well as a ‘green connector’ for the neighborhood. Second Street is a major, near-term capital project delivered by SFMTA and SFDPW, which includes a repaved street curb-to-curb with protected bicycle lanes, wider sidewalks and additional signalized crosswalks, and transit amenities. Landscape features are included, although not designed to function as green infrastructure. Construction is underway and is estimated to conclude in Fall 2019.

Key Features & Co-Benefits

- Protected one-way bicycle lane facilities in both directions to enhance safety and provide a major piece of the City’s bike network.
- Transit boarding islands in both directions to improve service speeds and user experience.
- Landscaped bulb-outs to improve pedestrian (ADA) safety at crossings and connect people to nature.
- Road diet to accommodate the above removes one vehicle travel lane in each direction.

3RD AND 4TH STREETS

Vision

Third and Fourth Streets connect the City’s downtown commercial center, Moscone convention center, major cultural institutions, Caltrain station (4th and King), and Mission Bay (hospital, university, office, and residential clusters with interconnected parks system). Currently they are auto-centric one-way couplets with multiple traffic lanes, narrow sidewalks, and no facilities for safe bicycle travel. A priority transit lane was added to northbound Third Street and the Central Subway is under construction. The portion of 4th Street south of the freeway will soon include a center-running, above-ground light rail, while the northern balance will be tunnelized below ground; in SoMa, new transit stations are planned at Folsom and between Bryant/Brannan.

SFMTA identifies both streets for longer-term capital projects such as pedestrian improvements, transit lanes and facilities, and curb management. On 3rd Street, these projects span the entire length through SoMa, while on 4th Street, they focus on the portion north of Harrison to coordinate with the Central Subway. The Central SoMa Plan prioritizes the rebalancing of both streets to better support these sustainable transportation upgrades, as well as their important civic role to support higher-density pedestrian activity.

Key Features & Co-Benefits

- Major transit improvements, including the City’s new underground subway.
- Pedestrian improvements, such as enhanced crossings, street trees, and other amenities to support the anticipated activity levels along these major civic linkages.
- Calmed vehicle traffic, more appropriate to a denser urban environment.
### Vision

The City’s Bicycle Plan identifies 5th Street as an important north-south bicycle corridor and suggests improvements. The SFMTA Fiscal Year 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program has identified 5th Street as a smaller near-term capital project from Market to Townsend streets, focusing on more minor yet potentially impactful upgrades. For example, envisioned improvements include restriping the street to add conventional (non-protected/buffered) bike lanes in both directions, and adding sidewalk bulb outs at intersections to facilitate safer pedestrian crossings. The portion between Market and Harrison streets also serves as a local transit corridor. Timing of any improvements may be impacted by the Central Subway construction schedule on 4th Street, during which transit has been being diverted to 5th Street.

Per the Central SoMa Plan, any north-south street traversing under the freeway should enhance pedestrian and bike comfort under the elevated infrastructure using sufficient and aesthetically pleasing lighting (including illuminated art installations), widened and beautified sidewalks, and safe bicycle lanes. 5th Street, especially south of the freeway, will also host some of the plan area’s largest development projects, and associated mobility needs of an expanded daytime employee population. This quadrant will also include the new Central SoMa public park and Bluxome Alley linear park, both of which have critical linkages to and from 5th Street.

Finally, 5th Street and its surrounds comprise some of the lower-lying topography of the neighborhood; in fact, portions of 5th Street around and under the freeway sit on top of the historic Hayes Marsh and thus serve as key points in its watershed. The complete length of 5th Street is an important linkage in the neighborhood’s stormwater and urban flood management network—by integrating green infrastructure into new landscape areas along its length, the corridor can also provide important neighborhood greening benefits.

### Key Features & Co-Benefits

- Pedestrian safety and comfort improvements, such as bulb outs as key crossings, street trees, and furnishings. Sidewalk widening may be possible adjacent to major development projects, recognizing that the current sidewalks do not meet the City’s Better Streets standards.
- Tree planting and landscaped bulb outs are envisioned to add habitat-supportive greening along the length of 5th Street.
Vision
The 6th Street corridor is a Vision Zero priority due to its high concentrations of pedestrian collisions, injuries, and fatalities. The SFMTA Fiscal Year 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program includes 6th Street as a near-term capital project; planning and environmental review is underway and construction is estimated to begin in Winter 2019. The proposed project includes safety improvements for all modes. From Market to Folsom, vehicle travel lanes are to be removed to accommodate wider sidewalks and conventional bike lanes in both directions. South of Folsom, 6th Street is identified as a regional freeway access and transit corridor, but will also include pedestrian safety improvements such as bulb-outs, new signals and crosswalks, and enhanced lighting.

Key Features & Co-Benefits
- Road diet reducing four lanes to two; one lane in each direction from Market Street to Folsom Street.
- Wider sidewalks, corner bulb-outs, new traffic signals, and new crosswalks at targeted intersections to encourage slow, calm, and predictable movement.
- Streetscape improvements such as distinct paving, street furniture, and pedestrian-scale lighting.

5TH STREET, CONTINUED

• Localized air quality improvements, not only through transportation demand management strategies, but also through 5th Street’s opportunity to help mitigate air quality impacts through functional greening.
• Urban flood management (and associated co-benefits) through integration of cost efficient and most effective green infrastructure investments; typically, on 5th Street this would take the form of bioswales and rain gardens, which slow, filter, and help redirect peak flows.
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