DATE: March 4, 2014
TO: Andy Clark, International Land Group
FROM: Joy Navarrete, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2014.0008U for 33 Norfolk Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Kansai Uchida, at (415) 575-9048 or kansai.uchida@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Joy Navarrete, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: Tuesday, March 4, 2014  
Case No.: 2014.0008U  
Project Address: 33 Norfolk Street  
Block/Lot: 3521/053A and 093  
Zoning: WMUG (WSoMa Mixed Use – General District)  
Western South of Market (SoMa) Special Use District  
55-X Height and Bulk Districts  
Area Plan: Western SoMa Area Plan  
Project Sponsor: Andy Clark, International Land Group  
415-392-1111  
Staff Contact: Kansai Uchida – 415-575-9048  
kansai.uchida@sfgov.org

DISCLAIMERS:

Please be advised that this determination does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. It also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, a project approval of any kind, or in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below. The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health, and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site consists of two adjacent lots located on the northeast side of Norfolk Street, on the block bounded by Norfolk Street to the southwest, Folsom Street to the northwest, 11th Street to the northeast, and Harrison Street to the southeast. One of the lots (lot 053A) contains a single-story commercial warehouse building, and the other (lot 093) contains a surface parking lot.

The proposal includes demolition of the existing 2,900 square foot (sq ft) commercial building and surface parking lot, merging of lots 053A and 093, and construction of a new 20,000 sq ft, five-story mixed-use building. The building would contain nine residential units (eight two-bedroom units and one three-bedroom unit) totaling 15,500 sq ft, two ground floor retail spaces totaling 1,250 sq ft, and seven off-street garage parking spaces totaling 3,250 sq ft. The proposed building would have a rear yard at the second floor level and a green roof.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The proposed project requires environmental review per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) either individually, such as in a project specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) or Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or in a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project Final EIR (Western SoMa EIR). Environmental review may be performed in conjunction with the required Planning Department approvals listed in this letter, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted.

Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an EIR was certified do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR. Environmental review for such projects is documented in a CPE. The proposed project is located within the area of the Western SoMa Community Plan, which was evaluated in the Western SoMa EIR, certified in 2012. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, this project is likely to qualify for a CPE under the Western SoMa EIR. Development on the project site would potentially be subject to the mitigation measures promulgated therein.

Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

(i) **CPE Only.** In this case, all potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the Western SoMa EIR, and there would be no new significant impacts “peculiar” (unique) to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa EIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the Environmental Document Determination fee of $13,339, (b) the CPE certificate fee of $7,402, and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Western SoMa EIR.

(ii) **CPE + Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the Western SoMa EIR, and these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is prepared to address these impacts. In addition, a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Western SoMa EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the Environmental Document Determination fee of $13,339, (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value), and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Western SoMa EIR.

1 Documents in italics in this PPA are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center (PIC) at 1660 Mission Street, and online on the Planning Department’s website at: http://www.sfplanning.org.
(iii) **CPE + Focused EIR.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the Western SoMa EIR, and any of these new significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a Focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts. In addition, a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Western SoMa EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa EIR also applied to the proposed project. Additional mitigation measures may also be applied in the Focused EIR. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the Environmental Document Determination fee of $13,339, (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value), (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value), and (d) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Western SoMa EIR.

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) for the full scope of the project (demolition and construction). EEA forms are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1570. See "Studies for Project inside of Adopted Plan Areas – Community Plan Fees" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.

Below is a list of the studies that would be required based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) Application dated December 30, 2013:

1. **Archeological Resources.** The PPA Application does not indicate the depth of below-ground excavation or the type of foundation proposed. As part of the EEA, please provide this information so that Planning Department staff can evaluate the level of archeological review required, in conjunction with any geotechnical studies provided per the “Geology” discussion below. Depending on the anticipated depth of excavation and potential presence of archeological resources, Western SoMa EIR Mitigation Measures M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment and M-CP-4b Procedures for an Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources may be applied to the proposed project. If there is a potential impact to archeological resources, an additional study may need to be prepared by an archeological consultant listed in the Planning Department’s archeological consultant pool in accordance with the Planning Department’s consultant selection procedures.

2. **Historic Resources.** The existing building on the project site was evaluated in the South of Market Historic Resource Survey, an area wide survey, and was found ineligible for national, state, or local designation. As such, no additional analysis of historic resources is likely to be required.

The Western SoMa EIR found that construction activity can generate vibration that can cause structural damage in nearby buildings and included Mitigation Measures M-CP-7a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities and M-CP-7b: Construction Monitoring and Program for Historical Resources. These measures would apply to the proposed project because some of the buildings adjacent to the project site were determined to be historic resources by the South of Market Historic Resource Survey. Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a requires that the Planning Department determine whether adjacent or nearby buildings constitute historical resources that could be
adversely affected by construction-generated vibration. For those historical resources, and where heavy equipment would be used, Mitigation Measure M-CP-7b requires that the project sponsor undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired.

3. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would disturb in excess of 50 cubic yards of soil on a site with known prior industrial use. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.


Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EEA.

*Western SoMa EIR Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2*, which requires removal and disposal of any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls or mercury according to applicable laws, may also apply to the proposed project.

4. **Geology.** The PPA Application does not indicate the depth of below-ground excavation or the type of foundation proposed. As part of the EEA, please provide this information so that Planning Department staff can evaluate the potential for impacts related to geological conditions. This information is also needed to confirm whether a Geotechnical Report will be required, though it appears likely that one would be needed given the probable depth of excavation that corresponds to the proposed building’s 55-foot height. If a Geotechnical Report is required, it would need to be prepared by a qualified professional and should include recommendations for mitigating any identified potential impacts.

5. **Shadow.** The proposed project would include construction of a building that is over 40 feet in height, and would require a shadow fan analysis. If the shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff determines that the project could cast shadows on recreational resources, you would be required to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a detailed shadow study. The consultant would be required to prepare a scope of work for review and approval by the Planning Department prior to commencement of the analysis.

6. **Noise and Vibration.** The proposed project would include construction near existing sensitive noise receptors (dwelling units located near the project site). Depending on the anticipated construction vibration levels and duration (see the “Historic Resources” discussion above), construction noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures may apply to the proposed
7. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, with nine dwelling units and 1,250 sq ft of retail space, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants.\(^2\) Therefore an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required.

However, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In addition, San Francisco has partnered with the BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed the “Air Pollutant Exposure Zone,” were identified. Land use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project’s activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. Although the proposed project is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, and is not currently subject to Article 38 of the Health Code because it has fewer than ten dwelling units, improvement measures may be recommended for consideration by City decision makers such as exhaust measures during construction and enhanced ventilation measures as part of building design.

8. **Greenhouse Gases.** Potential environmental effects related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the proposed project need to be addressed in a project’s environmental evaluation. The project sponsor would be required to submit a completed GHG Compliance Checklist Cover Sheet and Table 1 for Private Development Projects\(^3\) demonstrating that the project is in compliance with the identified regulations. Please be specific and provide detailed information in the discussion column to clarify how the proposed project would comply with each item. This information will be reviewed by the Environmental Planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.\(^4\) Projects that do not comply with a GHG-related regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

---

\(^2\) BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.


9. **Stormwater Management.** The project must comply with the City’s Stormwater Management Ordinance, which requires the preparation of a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP). Responsibility for review and approval of the SCP is with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. The project’s environmental evaluation would generally evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and low impact design approaches would reduce potential negative effects of stormwater runoff. This may include environmental factors such as the natural hydrologic system, city sewer collection system, and receiving body water quality. More information on stormwater management may be found at [http://stormwater.sfwater.org](http://stormwater.sfwater.org).

10. **Tree Disclosure Affidavit.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any tree identified in the Affidavit for Tree Disclosure must be shown on the Site Plans with the size of trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit an Affidavit along with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans.

11. **Bird-Safe Building Ordinance.** The project would be subject to Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, which addresses Location-Related Standards and Feature-Related Standards. The project’s environmental evaluation would generally discuss how the implementation of bird-safe design standards would reduce potential adverse effects on birds due to the lighting, glazing, balconies, and so forth.

12. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site as well as owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Please provide two sets of these mailing labels at the time of application submittal.

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

The project requires the following Planning Department approvals. These approvals may be reviewed in conjunction with the required environmental review, but may not be granted until after the required environmental review is completed.

1. **A Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 304 to allow the number of off-street parking spaces to exceed five spaces. Planning Code Section 151.1 establishes the maximum amount of off-street parking for specific land uses. The maximum number of off-street parking spaces for the residential component is two spaces and the maximum number of off-street parking spaces for the commercial component (assuming general retail) is three spaces. Therefore, the total maximum number of off-street parking spaces is five spaces.

---


The Conditional Use Authorization is subject to a public hearing before the Planning Commission and must meet the findings of Sections 303 and 101.1(b) and be consistent with the General Plan.

2. A Variance from the Zoning Administrator, which may be coupled with the Conditional Use Authorization, is required per Planning Code Section 305 to allow the project to encroach into the minimum required rear yard setback established in Section 134. Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard setback of at least 25% of the lot depth at the ground floor and each succeeding level. As proposed, a portion of the project encroaches into the minimum required rear yard setback. A Variance is also required to allow the project to feature bay window obstructions that exceed the maximum 15 foot length as prescribed in Section 136.

3. A Building Permit Application is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.

4. A Building Permit Application is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Conditional Use Authorization applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center (PIC) at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org. Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Project Sponsors are encouraged to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. Additionally, many approvals require a public hearing with an associated neighborhood notification. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.

This project is required to conduct a Pre-application meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the “Permits & Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Resource Center” tab.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project. For the purpose of providing these comments, the ground floor units along Clara Street are considered non-residential. Designation of these units as residential may alter some of the comments below.

1. Western SoMa Community Plan. The subject property falls within the boundary of the Western SoMa Community Plan (“Plan”).
Western SoMa has a diverse pattern of land uses that integrate various housing types, commercial and office activities, industrial space and institutions. The Plan addresses local, citywide and regional needs in the neighborhood through focused infill housing opportunities that build on existing residential areas with nearby residential services and by capitalizing on focused real 21st Century business opportunities that meet local and broader strategic needs. New development should add to the rich mixture of uses in the area, improve livability and be well designed, compatible with the scale of surrounding development, and consistent with neighborhood character.

The following community driven planning principles were developed for Western SoMa for the area by the Task Force:

• Mitigate to the fullest extent possible neighborhood impacts resulting from new development.
• Stabilize the neighborhood against speculative land use proposals and developments.
• Promote safety in all areas of the public realm (e.g., streets, sidewalks, parks, etc.).
• Maintain and encourage the existing community cultural diversity.
• Proposed new land use development shall primarily serve the needs of existing residents and businesses. Citywide and regional needs are subordinate to existing local needs.
• Maintain and promote diversity (e.g., day/night, living/working, spectrum of uses, etc.) of neighborhood land uses.
• Provide clear and simple community planning policies and zoning recommendations.
• Generally maintain the existing scale and density of the neighborhood.
• Promote environmental sensitivity in new development projects.
• Encourage nurturing characteristics and maximize opportunities for seniors, families, youth and children.
• Develop and maintain local accountability and monitoring mechanism.
• Provide periodic reassessment of the community plan.
• Maximize general environmental quality and health.

Please refer to the Western SoMa Area Plan for more guidance and to ensure general conformity with the policies of the Plan. Information on the Plan can be found on the Planning Department’s website at: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3545

2. Density Maximization & Affordable Housing Provision. It is the Department's priority to give precedence to the development of all new net housing, and to encourage the direct building of more affordable housing and the maximization of permitted density, while maintaining quality of life and adherence to Planning Code standards.

The Western SoMa Plan includes the following policies promoting infill and affordable housing:

POLICY 3.2.2 Encourage in-fill housing production that continues the existing built housing qualities in terms of heights, prevailing density, yards and unit sizes.

OBJECTIVE 3.3 ENSURE THAT A SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE OF THE NEW HOUSING CREATED IS AFFORDABLE TO PEOPLE WITH A WIDE RANGE OF INCOMES
POLICY 3.3.3 Encourage a mix of affordability levels in new residential development.

POLICY 3.5.2 Prioritize the development of affordable family housing, both rental and ownership, particularly along transit corridors and adjacent to community amenities.

In addition, the Housing Element of the General Plan has the following policies that encourage density in appropriate locations, such as near transit, and that promote the creation of new permanently affordable housing:

POLICY 4.5 Ensure that new permanently affordable housing is located in all of the City’s neighborhoods, and encourage integrated neighborhoods, with a diversity of unit types provided at a range of income levels.

POLICY 13.1 Support “smart” regional growth that locates new housing close to jobs and transit.

The project proposes to add 15,500 square of residential resulting in 9 units, just short of the 10 units that trigger Section 415 of the Planning Code, which requires 12% of units be Below Market Rate (BMR) units. Also, the plans demonstrate an unfulfilled capacity that more than 9 units could be developed.

The Department strongly encourages increased density on the site, while maintaining the required bedroom mix and livability of the units. Per the Director’s Bulletin No. 2, if the project were to maximize density and include 20% on-site BMRs, it would qualify for priority processing:

2. Western SoMa Community Plan Impact Fees. The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fees apply to the project as outlined in the Western SoMA Public Benefits Program document as outlines in Section 423 et seq. Fees shall be charged and assessed per net new gross square footage on residential and non-residential uses within the Plan Area. Fees shall be assessed on mixed use projects according to the gross square feet of each use in the project, see Planning Code Section 423.3 for more information.

The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document, with an option for the project sponsor to defer payment to prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy upon agreeing to pay a deferral surcharge in accordance with Section 107A.13.3 of the San Francisco Building Code.

3. Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits. Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City and satisfy relevant Area Plan Development Impact fees through such improvements. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee from the Planning Commission. The project sponsor, City, and CAC coordinate the design, valuation, and terms of the agreements. This is not a required process; however an in-kind improvement must be determined to be eligible, be prioritized, and recommended by the
Planning Department and (when applicable) the relevant CAC. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code. Currently, there are no identified Eastern Neighborhoods priority improvements near the project site that staff would recommend for an in-kind at this time. However, this may change depending on the timeframe of the project and the proposed in-kind improvement.

More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreements on the Planning Department website:

4. Rear Yard. As proposed, the project does not meet the minimum rear yard setback requirement established in Section 134 which requires the project to provide a rear yard setback of at least 25% of the lot depth at the ground floor and each succeeding level. Pursuant to Section 823 (Western SOMA Special Use District), only corner lots are eligible to request a rear yard modification from the Zoning Administrator pursuant to Sections 134(f), 134(e), and 307(h); therefore, a Variance would be required to seek a rear yard modification in accordance with Section 305.

5. Obstructions. Pursuant to Section 136, bay window shall not exceed 15 feet in length and shall be reduced in proportion from the line establishing the required open area by means of 45 degree angles drawn inward from the ends of such 15-foot dimension. This provision is applied to bay window obstructions in a plan view, therefore, the proposed off-setting of the 2nd and 3rd story bay windows projecting into the required open area results in a cumulative bay window length that exceeds the maximum 15-foot length permitted. A Variance would be required to seek an obstruction modification in accordance with Section 305. The department encourages the provision of code complying obstructions.

6. Usable Open Space. Section 823 (Western SOMA Special Use District) requires that dwelling units within Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use Districts provide 80 square feet per unit of usable open space regardless of whether the open space is privately or publicly accessible. With a total of 9 dwelling units, the project is required to provide a minimum of 720 square feet (9 x 80sf = 720sf) of usable open space. Any space credited as common usable open space shall be at least 15 feet in every horizontal dimension and shall have a minimum area of 300 square feet. Roof decks shall not qualify as required private or common usable open space pursuant to Section 135. A roof deck is defined as a deck located on the roof of the highest story of a building, or a deck at the highest story of a building if the enclosed gross floor area of that story is less than 50 percent of the gross square footage of the footprint of the subject building. The project plans depict a rectangular-shaped, paved, open outdoor area measuring approximately 96-feet wide by 15-feet deep (1,440 sf) with perimeter landscaping located at the rear of the second floor level which may qualify as non-publicly accessible common usable open space and meet the minimum amount required, however this area should be labeled accordingly and will be subject to additional character of space standards outlined in Section 135.

7. Street Trees. Section 138.1 requires one 24-inch box street tree for every 20 feet of property frontage for new construction. With a property frontage of 100 feet, the project is required to provide 5 street trees. The project plans do not provide any street trees, and therefore the project does not comply with this provision. The applicant may seek a waiver from the street tree requirement subject to Zoning
Administrator approval. To receive a preliminary street tree waiver assessment, the applicant should submit a Tree Referral Form (see attached) to the Department of Public Works (DPW).

8. Bird Safety. Section 139 establishes Bird-Safe standards for new building construction to reduce bird mortality from circumstances that are known to pose high risk to birds and are considered to be “bird hazards”. The two circumstances regulated by this Section are 1) location-related hazards, where the siting of a structure creates increased risk to birds and 2) feature-related hazards, which may create increased risk to birds regardless of where the structure is located.

The project site does not pose a location-related bird hazard since it is located more than 300 feet beyond an urban bird refuge. Feature-related hazards include free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet and larger in size. Any structure that contains these elements shall treat 100% of the glazing on feature-specific hazards. Detailed architectural plans that specify the materials, colors and finishes of the project have not yet been provided in order to determine whether the project satisfies this code section.

9. Transparency and Fenestration. Section 145.1 requires that at least 60% of the ground floor street frontage which contains active uses be visually transparent into the building. Detailed architectural plans that specify the materials, colors and finishes of the project have not yet been provided in order to determine whether the project satisfies this code section.

10. Parking Arrangement and Curb Cut Limits. Section 155 requires that driveways crossing sidewalks shall be no wider than necessary for ingress and egress, and shall be arranged, to the extent practical, so as to minimize the width and frequency of curb cuts, to maximize the number and size of on-street parking spaces available to the public, and to minimize conflicts with pedestrian and transit movements. Staff believes the proposed parking layout which includes two 10'-0” wide curb cuts off of Norfolk Street, could be rearranged to provide a more efficient parking layout that reduces the number of curb cuts to only one.

11. Additional Height Limits for Narrow Streets in the South of Market Mixed-Use District. Section 261.1 requires the front façade to have 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 narrow street (Norfolk Street). With a narrow street width of 25 feet, a 10 foot setback must be provided at a height of 31.25 feet (1.25 x 25 feet) from the front property line. As proposed, a portion of the front façade encroaches into this required setback area and therefore does not comply (please note, this provision is not variable through a discretionary review process since the Code does not allow Variances from height requirements).

12. Shadow Analysis. Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project does not cast shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission.
13. Parking Area. Although there is no parking requirement in the WMUG District, Section 154 establishes minimum area requirements for standard and compact parking spaces. The minimum area required for a standard parking space is 144 square feet and the minimum area for a compact parking space is 112.5 square feet. Upon reviewing the project plans, it appears the standard parking spaces don’t meet the minimum 144 square feet area requirement. Parking spaces should be re-labeled to ensure parking type accuracy, and to ensure parking above the maximum permitted is not provided.

14. Bicycle Parking. Section 155 requires this project to provide at least 9 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces for the residential component and at least 2 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces for the commercial (assuming general retail uses) component. Upon reviewing the project plans, it appears the project provides only 10 bicycle parking spaces whereas a total of 11 bicycle parking spaces are required. Please see Zoning Administrator Bulletin #9 for bicycle parking design standards.

15. Stormwater. Projects that disturb 5,000 square feet or more of the ground surface must comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines and submit a Stormwater Control Plan to the SFPUC for review. To view the Guidelines and download instructions for preparing a Stormwater Control Plan, go to http://stormwater.sfwater.org/. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

16. Recycled Water. The City requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas for new construction projects larger than 40,000 square feet. Please see the attached SFPUC document for more information.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. Site Design, Open Space, and Massing. The orientation and location of the rear yard is appropriate in relation to current existing uses that are likely to remain. The rear yard will not be likely augmented by adjoining rear yards in the foreseeable future, and will therefore need to be self-sufficient in the ability to provide light, air, and open space for the project. To provide quality dwellings the Planning Department encourages the rear yard to meet the minimum 25% lot area intended by the code, and demonstrate how it can be usable. Furthermore, the building and rear yard configuration allows the opportunity for double-aspect units. To enhance the residential quality, the Planning Department encourages this be exploited more. The massing of the upper floors may be subject to reduction per alley height controls.

2. Street Frontage. The Planning Department appreciates the high ground floor. At this stage the design intent for the ground floor façade looks residential. A more open commercial storefront design may be appropriate. The Planning Department recommends the storefront be pulled toward the street wall, with setbacks, if desired for entrances. The landscaping shown does not contribute to the
functional width of the narrow sidewalk. Please provide enlarged plans and elevations of the storefronts on all facades.

3. **Vehicle Circulation, Access and Parking.** The Planning Department is concerned by the amount of ground area that is devoted to parking in the current proposal. There is no minimum parking requirement in the WMUG District, and the proposed project provides more parking than what is permitted in Section 151.1 of the Planning Code. The Planning Department strongly recommends reducing the number of parking spaces to the quantity allowed as of right. The Planning Department encourages investigating mechanical stackers or lifts, to reduce the parking ratio and/or the parking footprint.

The Planning Department recommends eliminating one of the two curb cuts. A single 12 foot wide opening for residential parking ingress and egress should be sufficient for the limited number of parking spaces and anticipated trips.

4. **Architecture.** The proposed building is located adjacent to a historic district, which creates the opportunity and obligation to respond to the qualities of those buildings. The Planning Department recommends horizontal and vertical modulation as appropriate to be compatible with adjacent architecture. The offset staggered bays, while visually interesting, may not be Code compliant. Cues for scale, proportion, materials and general architectural character should be taken from the large industrial frame facades.

Because of the adjacent open space and relatively low heights of the adjacent building in relation to the proposed building’s height, the side facades will be visible. All visible sides of the building should be treated in a similar manner as the main facades.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **Friday, September 4, 2015**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosure:  
- Neighborhood Group Mailing List  
- Interdepartmental Project Review Application  
- Bicycle Parking Requirements: Design and Layout  
- SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet
cc: Andy Clark, Project Sponsor  
Christoper Townes, Current Planning  
Kansai Uchida, Environmental Planning  
Claudia Flores, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
Jerry Robbins, MTA  
Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>TITLE OR FUNCTION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Peskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415-986-7014</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Simi</td>
<td>Local Field Rep</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22</td>
<td>2085 Third Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-355-1322</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adsimi@nccrc.org">adsimi@nccrc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Lantberg</td>
<td>Research Analyst</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22 c/o NCCRC Research</td>
<td>265 Hegewischer Road, Ste. 220</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94621</td>
<td>510-430-9706 x109</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron@nccrc.org">aaron@nccrc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Community Design Center</td>
<td>5 Thomas Melton Circle, #128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
<td>415-886-1235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:htn3782@earthlink.net">htn3782@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Villa-Lobos</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Community Leadership Alliance</td>
<td>P.O. Box 642201</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-921-4192</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@communityleadershipalliance.net">admin@communityleadershipalliance.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Shanahan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Residential Builders Association</td>
<td>1717 17th Street, Ste. 200</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-252-1900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grace@nccrc.org">grace@nccrc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Sousa</td>
<td>Public Works Coordinator</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Construction and Engineering</td>
<td>795 Folsom Street, Rm.426</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-1243</td>
<td>415-644-7043</td>
<td><a href="mailto:la4524@att.com">la4524@att.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Garland Public &amp; Community Relations</td>
<td>535 Green Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-531-2911</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marshagarland@att.net">marshagarland@att.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>0 Coalition for Adequate Review Council</td>
<td>364 Page Street, #36</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-345-9333</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mke@sfbrtc.org">mke@sfbrtc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Theriault</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SF Building and Construction Trades Council</td>
<td>1188 Franklin Street, Ste. 203</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-900-1457</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja.trauss@gmail.com">sonja.trauss@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Trauss</td>
<td></td>
<td>SF Bay Area Association of Renters</td>
<td>1552 7th Street</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94607</td>
<td>415-292-3656</td>
<td>smwilliamslaw.com</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Law Office of Stephen M. Williams</td>
<td>1934 Dividens Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-362-2778</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hestor@earthlink.net">hestor@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Hestor</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>870 Market Street, #1128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-362-2778</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hestor@earthlink.net">hestor@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Gulliksen</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>San Francisco Tenants Union</td>
<td>558 Capp Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-5525</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ted@sfu.org">ted@sfu.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>LAST</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>Cabande</td>
<td>Organizational Director</td>
<td>South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)</td>
<td>1110 Howard Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabande@somcan.org">acabande@somcan.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)</td>
<td>474 Valencia Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-362-2500</td>
<td>poeder@org</td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Market Street Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 458</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-362-2500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maduch@pacbell.net">maduch@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mission Creek Harbor Association</td>
<td>300 Channel Street, Box 10</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-902-7635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corinne.woods@cs.com">corinne.woods@cs.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Falk</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Tendenton Neighborhood Development Corporation</td>
<td>201 Eddy Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-776-2151</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dfalk@tmnd.org">dfalk@tmnd.org</a>; <a href="mailto:caddings@tmnd.org">caddings@tmnd.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Ecker Owners Association</td>
<td>16 Jessie Street Unit 301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ethanhough@gmail.com">ethanhough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Halian Street Homeowners Association</td>
<td>1 Brush Place</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-626-6650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:woflgk@earthlink.net">woflgk@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 6</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102- 4689</td>
<td>415-654-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.kim@sfgov.org">jane.kim@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:april.veneracion@sfgov.org">april.veneracion@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org">Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Carpinelli</td>
<td>Board President</td>
<td>Dogpatch Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>934 Minnesota Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41507</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jc@carpinelli.com">jc@carpinelli.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Conn.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41502</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Melo</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</td>
<td>366 Tarith Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41503</td>
<td>415-552-2401</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim.melo@comcast.net">jim.melo@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>Liddell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>403 Main Street #813</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41505</td>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kliddell2001@yahoo.com">kliddell2001@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>LMNOP Neighbors</td>
<td>1047 Minna Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41503</td>
<td>415-734-1953</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LMNOP@yak.net">LMNOP@yak.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association</td>
<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41507</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@everestdf.com">keith@everestdf.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Magnani</td>
<td></td>
<td>American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>65 Ninth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41503</td>
<td>415-655-6201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stffice@afsc.org">stffice@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvis</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41502- 6526</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvisphilips@gmail.com">marvisphilips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Sanoan Development Centre</td>
<td>2065 Sunnydale Avenue #100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41534</td>
<td>415-655-6201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 Bayview, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon Hill Residents Association</td>
<td>75 Folsom Street #1800</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41505</td>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rfbement@sbcglobal.net">rfbement@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Minotti</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill</td>
<td>1206 Mariposa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41507</td>
<td>415-553-5969</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodmnotti@hotmail.com">rodmnotti@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>Community Advocate</td>
<td>TMDCO Impact Group</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41503</td>
<td>415-426-6819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@tmddo.org">sonja@tmddo.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41503</td>
<td>415-861-6345</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mikes.grisso@sfgov.org">mikes.grisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@tmddo.org">courtney.pash@tmddo.org</a></td>
<td>Bayview, Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market, Visitacion Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Loo</td>
<td></td>
<td>York Realty</td>
<td>243A Shipley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41507- 1010</td>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorkloo@gmail.com">yorkloo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NAME</td>
<td>LAST NAME</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)</td>
<td>474 Valencia Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td>podersf.org</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Plater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wild Equity Institute</td>
<td>474 Valencia Street Suite 295</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:plater@wedequity.org">plater@wedequity.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayview, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Golden Gate Park, Lakeshore, Mission, Outer Sunset, Presidio, Seacliff, Twin Peaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy</td>
<td>Choy</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Coleridge St. Neighbors</td>
<td>157 Coleridge Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-2990</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrydate@gmail.com">chrydate@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernal Heights, Mission, Noe Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Campos</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 9</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94102-4689</td>
<td>415-554-5144</td>
<td><a href="mailto:David.Campos@sfgov.org">David.Campos@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Hilary.Ronen@sfgov.org">Hilary.Ronen@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Nate.Albee@sfgov.org">Nate.Albee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Carolyn.Goossen@sfgov.org">Carolyn.Goossen@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernal Heights, Mission, Outer Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Dolores United</td>
<td>9A Abbey Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-309-5518</td>
<td>davi d@vigilant e.com</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:henderson@boglobal.net">henderson@boglobal.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Steering Committee Member</td>
<td>Friends of Upper Douglass Dog Park</td>
<td>750 27th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94131</td>
<td>415-215-1711</td>
<td><a href="mailto:limehouse10@gmail.com">limehouse10@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Glen Park, Mission, Noe Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Meko</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Soma Leadership Council</td>
<td>3445 Tenth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-552-2401</td>
<td>j <a href="mailto:m.meko@comcast.net">m.meko@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Barrbay</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Liberty Hill Resident Association</td>
<td>50 Liberty Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-695-0960</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vitabarbie@earthlink.com">vitabarbie@earthlink.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Barkowit</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>East Mission Improvement Association (EMIA)</td>
<td>1320 Florida Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-824-3617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfpark@mac.com">sfpark@mac.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association</td>
<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>keith@everest sf.com</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>Bogatay</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>3676 20th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-863-3950</td>
<td><a href="mailto:missionds@earthlink.net">missionds@earthlink.net</a>, <a href="mailto:peter@missionds.org">peter@missionds.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Grandados</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mission Economic Development Association</td>
<td>2301 Mission Street #301</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-3334</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, Outer Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94102-6526</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td>marvi <a href="mailto:phillips@gmail.com">phillips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Hamphill</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Dolores Heights Improvement Club-DRC</td>
<td>P.O. Box 14426</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-824-2346</td>
<td>p a m <a href="mailto:.hamphill@gmail.com">.hamphill@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Mission, Noe Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Hainecke</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>30 Hill Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:libertyhillneighborhood@gmail.com">libertyhillneighborhood@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Mission, Noe Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Noe Street Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>33 Noe Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pocohaen@gmail.com">pocohaen@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Mission, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Lesser</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Mission Merchants Association</td>
<td>555 Laurel Avenue #501</td>
<td>San Mateo CA</td>
<td>94041</td>
<td>415-979-4171</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phnain@maw.com">phnain@maw.com</a>; <a href="mailto:mmha@protocol-sf.com">mmha@protocol-sf.com</a>; <a href="mailto:info@protocol-sf.com">info@protocol-sf.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1320 Florida Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Quigley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1038 Valencia Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:seanquigley@paertongate.com">seanquigley@paertongate.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Mission, Potrero Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td>1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-861-0345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>Astrachen</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Central 26th Street Neighborhood Coalition</td>
<td>3443 26th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-285-3960</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zaz@intersticearchitects.com">zaz@intersticearchitects.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW
Effective: February 1, 2009

Interdepartmental Project Reviews are mandatory for new construction projects that propose buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Projects identified as such, must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit.

Project Sponsors may elect to request an interdepartmental review for any project at any time, however, it is strongly recommended that the request is made prior to the submittal of the aboverelated applications.

The Planning Department acts as the lead agency in collaboration with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI); the Department of Public Works (DPW); and the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). Staff from each of these disciplines will attend your meeting.

Interdepartmental Project Review fees:
1. $1,059 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. $1,530 for all other projects.

Please note that $345 of these fees are non-refundable. If your project falls under the second type of fee, and you cancel your meeting, $1,185 will be refunded to you.

To avoid delays in scheduling your meeting, provide all information requested on this form and submit your request with a check in the appropriate amount payable to the San Francisco Planning Department. Requests may be mailed or delivered to San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Ste. 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2414. Those wishing more specific or more detailed information may contact the Project Review Meeting Coordinator at (415) 575-6926.

Please note: All returned checks are subject to a $50.00 bank fee.

Interdepartmental Project Reviews are scheduled no sooner than two weeks from the receipt of the request form and check.
Submittal requirements:

All projects subject to the mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review shall be required to submit the following minimum information in addition to their request form:

1. Site Survey with topography lines;
2. Floor Plans with occupancy and/or use labeled of existing and proposed;
3. Existing and proposed elevations;
4. Roof Plan; and
5. Pictures of the subject property and street frontages.

Planned unit developments or projects with an acre or more of land area shall be required to submit the following additional information:

1. Existing and proposed street names and widths;
2. Location of any existing train tracks; and
3. Location of any existing and proposed easements.

In order for the Interdepartmental Project Review to be most effective and beneficial to you, it is strongly recommended that any issues, concerns and/or specific questions are submitted with this request directed to each discipline.
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW APPLICATION FORM

APPLICATION DATE: ____________________________________________

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name ___________________________ Phone No. ( ) ________________
Address ___________________________ FAX No. ( ) ________________
Owner ___________________________________________________________________

PROJECT INFORMATION:
Address ___________________________________________________________________
How many units does the subject property have? __________________________
Assessor’s Block/Lot(s) ___________________________ Zoning District ____________
Height and Bulk Districts ___________________________ Located within Geologic Hazard Zone? Y □ N □

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE OF MEETING/SPECIFIC QUESTIONS:
(Use attachments if necessary)
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Square Footage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hotel Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Square Footage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previously contacted staff ___________________________________________________________________
Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) ________________________________
PURPOSE:
Sections 155.1 through 155.3 of the Planning Code regulates bicycle parking requirements. This bulletin specifically regulates design and layout requirements for bicycle parking both for Class One and Class Two bicycle parking spaces.

RULING:
The San Francisco Planning Department has adopted and shall implement the following standards for bicycle parking.

Types of Bicycle Parking
The Planning Code requires two types of bicycle parking: 1) Class One spaces are “Spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, non-residential occupants, and Employees”; and 2) Class Two spaces are: “Spaces located in a publicly-accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use.”

Bicycle parking spaces are generally in form of lockers or racks. Bicycle lockers can be used to satisfy the requirements for Class One bicycle parking and bicycle racks can be used to satisfy Class Two bicycle parking. Bicycle racks when located in a locked area or attended facility can also satisfy the requirements of Class One bicycle parking.

Bicycle Dimensions
Standard dimensions for a typical bicycle are 2’ wide by 6’ long. All bicycle lockers or racks shall provide a 2’ by 6’ feet space for each bicycle unless specified in this bulletin for certain types of bicycle racks and lockers. Any type of bicycle parking that does not match the requirements of this bulletin may be verified by the Zoning Administrator.
Class One Bicycle Parking

Class 1 bicycle parking includes bicycle lockers or bicycle rooms or cages, where each bicycle can be individually locked. Bicycle lockers provide secure space with a separate access door for every bicycle. Lockers shall provide a minimum of 6 feet depth and a 2’ wide access door. Lockers can come in a triangular shape for space efficiency as shown in Figure 1.

All aisles that provide access to a locker shall be minimum 6 feet wide.

In cases where Class 1 bicycle parking are provided as Class 2 bicycle parking (any acceptable racks in the Class 2 section identified below) in a garage, cage or otherwise locked room, certain clearances need to be provided as described in the next section of this Bulletin. Such facilities may provide space efficient bicycle racks instead of the common racks described below. Requirements for space efficient bicycle parking spaces are described later in this bulletin.

Class Two Bicycle Parking

Bicycle racks are the most common form of Class 2 bicycle parking. Bicycle racks come in many forms and shapes. The most common types are the inverted U and the circular racks. The dimensions of such racks are shown here:

All bicycle racks shall:
- support bicycles at two points of contact in order to prevent bicycles from falling;
- allow locking of bicycle frames and wheels with U-locks;
- use square tubes to resist illegal rack cutting;
- minimize maintenance costs (galvanized finish resists corrosion);
- not require lifting of a bicycle;
- be mounted securely to the floor; and
- provide visibility to approaching cyclists and pedestrians with a minimum height of 33 inches.
Bicycle Parking Requirements: Design and Layout

Some acceptable and unacceptable types of bicycle racks are shown below:

**Acceptable**
These bicycle racks provide two points of support for bicycles. They are constructed with square tubed material which makes them resistant to cutting.

**Unacceptable**
These bicycle racks either provide only one point of support for bicycles, are constructed with round tubed material which makes them prone to cutting, or do not allow locking a frame and wheel directly to the rack with a U-lock.
Clearance Requirements for Bicycle racks

a. Clearance from a vertical obstruction (wall, curb, bollards) for parallel and perpendicular racks

b. Minimum Vertical Clearance

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CEILING OR ROOF} & \\
\geq 7' \text{ Vertical Clearance}
\end{align*}
\]

c. Maximum grade

d. Distance between parallel racks with or without an aisle

\[
\begin{align*}
\geq 3' & \\
\geq 5' \text{ if Aisle}
\end{align*}
\]

e. Clearance for rows of racks with side or middle aisles

f. Minimum width of access hallways to the bicycle parking facility and allowable constrictions
Space Efficient Class One Bicycle Parking

Some types of bicycle racks, while not meeting the clearance requirements established above, are designed in a way that would meet the basic requirements of an appropriate bicycle rack. Such racks provide a more space efficient layout which can serve smaller buildings; or where layout limitation in the buildings exist. Two major types of such racks include lift-assistant double-decker racks and vertical racks. Below the minimum spacing measurements of such designs are provided. Other types of space efficient bicycle racks not listed in this bulletin may be verified as acceptable by the SFMTA.

**Double-decker Lift Assistant Racks**

These bicycle racks allow stacking of bicycles providing a lift assistance pull-out tray. Manual lifting of bicycles off the ground is not necessary to mount the bicycle on the top trays. These racks satisfy the Class 1 bicycle parking requirements when located in a caged or locked facility. The trays alternate in height off the ground which allows a smaller required clearance between bicycles (17\textquotedbl). The required aisle space is 5 feet.

**Vertical Bicycle Racks**

These bicycle racks allow parking bicycles in a vertical position. This type of rack require manual lifting of bicycles in order to mount to the rack. Vertical bicycle parking may satisfy up to only a third of required bicycle parking per Planning Code Section 155.1 (c). A minimum 16\textquotedbl of distance between racks are required to allow for easy mounting. The required aisle space is 5 feet.
Converting Automobile Parking to Bicycle Parking

Section 151 of the Planning Code allows replacing required automobile parking space with bicycle parking in order to satisfy the bicycle parking requirements. Bicycle parking spaces provided in lieu of automobile parking spaces shall comply with clearance requirements as illustrated here. It is important to note that the minimum distance from the bicycle rack to the automobile parking space is 5’.

Per Planning Code Section 155.1(a) an aisle shall provide a minimum 4’ clear path from the front or rear of the bicycle to any wall or obstruction. Each bicycle rack shall have at least one such aisle on its side. Typically, bicycle wheels extend two feet beyond bicycle racks.
Characteristics of Different Types of Bicycle

The layout requirements established above are based on measurements of a standard bicycle (2’ by 6’). When designing a bicycle parking space, especially Class 1 spaces, project sponsors are encouraged to consider other types of bicycles, as well as bicycles with trailers or child seats. These types of bicycles are especially important for projects that include 2-3 bedroom units. The Table below provides the dimensions for different types of bicycles. Larger clearances are recommended to accommodate parking of bicycles longer and/or wider than a typical bicycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Type</th>
<th>Dimensions (Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Bicycle</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Bicycle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandem Bicycle</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo Bicycle</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle + Trailer Bike</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle + Child Trailer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Child Seat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recumbent Bicycle</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle Parking Signage

Section 155.1 of the Planning Code requires signage for Class Two bicycle parking in certain circumstances. When signage is required, the following design layout shall be followed. Such signage shall be located at every entrance that provides access to bicyclists. The plaque shall include:

- the bicycle logo and the letter “P” as illustrated below;
- the location of the facility, if not visible from the point where the plaque is installed;
- the directions or best path to the facility, if not visible from the point where the plaque is installed (ex. At the end of the hallway or Use the elevators for one level down)
- the contact information of the manager or entity responsible to maintain the facility.

If necessary, there shall be multiple plaques installed to create a clear path to the bicycle parking facility.

The plaque shall not be smaller than 12” by 12” and shall use non-reflective materials and provides clear contrast between the lettering and the background.

Signage template: to be designed by Gary
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Recycled Water Installation Procedures for Developers

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas under the following circumstances:

- New or remodeled buildings and all subdivisions (except condominium conversions) with a total cumulative area of 40,000 square feet or more
- New and existing irrigated areas of 10,000 square feet or more

The following are procedures to guide developers and property owners with the installation of recycled water service lines. The diagram on the reverse, shows how and where the lines are to be installed, and the required backflow prevention.

Number of Water Lines Coming onto a Property
Three to four lines:
1) Fire
2) Potable water domestic
3) Recycled water domestic
4) Recycled water irrigation (if property has landscaping)

Number of Water Meters
One water meter required for each water line.

Required Backflow Prevention
Fire line – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Potable water domestic – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Recycled water domestic – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Recycled water irrigation line – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer

All backflow preventers must be approved by the SFPUC’s Water Quality Bureau.

The backflow preventer for domestic water plumbing inside the building, and the recycled water system must meet the CCSF’s Plumbing Code and Health Code.

Pipe Separation
California Department of Public Health regulations require new water mains and new supply lines to be installed at least 4-foot horizontally from, and one foot vertically above a parallel pipeline conveying recycled water.

Pipe Type
- Transmission lines and mains – ductile iron
- Distribution and service lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Irrigation lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Dual-plumbing – piping described in Chapter 3, Appendix J of the City and County of San Francisco Plumbing Codes

**SFPUC must sign off on pipe type prior to installation. Contact the City Distribution Division at (415) 550-4952.

Temporary Potable Water Use Until Recycled Water Becomes Available
The potable water line will be used to feed the recycled water lines(s) until such time that recycled water becomes available. When recycled water becomes available, the cross-connection will be broken by the SFPUC, and the potable and recycled water lines will be totally separated. Before recycled water is delivered to the property, cross-connection and backflow testing will take place to assure separation.

Under no circumstances are developers or property owners to "t-off" of the potable water line to the recycled water lines(s).

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

Recycled Water Ordinances
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
(415) 554-3271

Recycled Water Plumbing Codes
Department of Building Inspection
(415) 558-6054

Backflow Prevention
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Quality Bureau
(650) 652-3100

New Service Line Permits
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Service Bureau
(415) 551-3000
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NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST APPROVED BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.
2. BACKFLOW PREVENTION FOR DOMESTIC WATER PLUMBING INSIDE THE BUILDING MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.
3. BACKFLOW PREVENTER FOR RECYCLED WATER SYSTEM MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

HEAVY LINES:
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION. SFPUC RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF NEW SERVICE UP TO THE END OF METER ASSEMBLY.

LIGHT LINES: & _____
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION. OWNERSHIP REMAINS WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER.