DATE: May 16, 2013
TO: Albert Costa, Theodore Brown and Partners
FROM: Rick Cooper, Planning Department
RE: Case No. 2005.0759E: 725-735 Harrison Street (aka “Harrison Gardens”)

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Jessica Range, at (415) 575-9018 or Jessica.Range@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Rick Cooper, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: May 16, 2013
Case No.: 2005.0759E
Project Address: 725 Harrison Street (aka “Harrison Gardens”)
Zoning: Service, Light Industrial (SLI)
   45-X/55-X/85-X
Area Plan: Proposed Central Corridor Plan Area
Project Sponsor: Albert Costa, Theodore Brown and Partners
   (415) 986-0101
Staff Contact: Jessica Range – (415) 575-9018
   Jessica.Range@sfgov.org

DISCLAIMERS:

Please be advised that this determination 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.

This Preliminary Project Assessment letter is being provided at the request of the project sponsor and
reflects the project description as provided in the amended Environmental Evaluation Application dated
February 21, 2013 “amended project.” It is acknowledged that this project description reflects project
revisions from the previous project description for Planning Department Case File No. 2005.0759E. 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 proposal is a fourth revision to a previous project for which an initial environmental evaluation was submitted on August 12, 2005, Planning Department Case File No. 2005.0759E and amended on February 15, 2006, July 17, 2008, and February 21, 2013. The project site is located on the block bounded by Harrison Street to the north, Fourth Street to the west, Perry Street to the south, and Third Street to the east. Existing buildings on the project site include one and two-story commercial buildings as well as a surface parking lot. Existing uses and gross square feet (gsf) of uses for the project site are as follows: 27,500 gsf commercial; 5,500 gsf offices; 38,600 gsf parking; 35,000 gsf vehicle storage; and 35,000 gsf additional storage. The project site also includes general advertising signs, which are proposed to remain. The amended project proposal would demolish all existing buildings and construct one mid-rise and one high-rise office building that together total 730,940 gsf. At the corner of Fourth and Harrison streets, the proposal includes construction of a new 16-story, 404,082 gsf office building with a proposed height of 240 feet. The high-rise office building would have floor plates of approximately 25,700 gsf. The remainder of the site would include construction of a six-story, 95-foot tall office building connected to the high-rise building at the ground floor. The mid-rise office building would have floor-to-floor heights of 15 feet and two inches. The average area of the mid-rise floor plate would be 54,476 gsf, for a total of 326,858 gsf. The amended project proposal also includes construction of a two-level subterranean parking garage with up to 575 parking spaces and 113 bicycle spaces. Six on-street loading spaces would be designated on Perry Street to serve the proposed project.

PLANNING CONTEXT:

The project site is located within the East SoMa area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, adopted in 2008. Based on the East SoMa Plan the eight parcels which comprise the project site are currently zoned Service, Light Industrial (SLI) with height and bulk limits between 45-X, 55-X and 85-X. The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR, certified in 2008.¹


The project site also falls within the proposed Central Corridor Plan area, a community planning process that initiated in 2011. A draft Central Corridor Plan was released in April 2013, with proposed changes to the allowed land uses and building heights in the Plan area, including a strategy for improving the public...
realm within the Plan area and vicinity. The Central Corridor Plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which is currently underway. The draft Plan and its proposed rezoning are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in late 2014.

As part of the Central Corridor Plan process, the Planning Department has developed preliminary recommendations for new land use controls as well as new height and bulk controls for the plan area. The most recent plan concepts, which are available for download at http://centralcorridor.sfplanning.org, were presented at a public workshop on June 13, 2012. These concepts form the basis of the draft Central Corridor Plan (draft Plan), though they are subject to change and refinement. The draft Plan includes two height alternatives. The EIR will study the Central Corridor’s Mid-Rise Height Alternative and a modified High-Rise Height Alternative, which vary for the project site. The High-Rise Height Alternative is based on the Central Corridor’s High-Rise Alternative, although modified to include consideration of additional height increases on certain sites as requested by various project sponsors. These height alternatives will be included in the Central Corridor EIR’s analysis as Options A and B. Option A proposes height limits ranging from 85 to 130 feet on the project site. Option B proposes height limits between 85 feet and 240 feet on the project site. Option B as analyzed in the EIR should not be confused with the High-Rise Alternative included in the draft Central Corridor Plan. With respect to the project site, the Central Corridor Plan’s High-Rise Alternative would rezone the corner of Harrison and Fourth streets to allow for a height of 160 feet. The Central Corridor EIR, however, will analyze a height limit of 240 feet for this parcel. At this point it is unknown which height option, if any, would ultimately be approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Further comments in this Preliminary Project Assessment are based on the draft Plan concepts published to date, which are contingent on the approval of the proposed Central Corridor Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (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. The proposed land uses (office) and building heights are not consistent with either the East SoMa Plan and/or the proposed height options being studied in the Central Corridor Area Plan EIR. The amended project proposes a 95-foot height for the mid-rise building which would not be consistent with the draft Plan’s proposed height limits or the height limits studied in the EIR. Thus, it is unlikely that the proposal, as currently presented, would qualify for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE). However, the proposed project would be assessed based on the height districts in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlement is sought. If the proposed project does not fit within the height and density identified for the project site in
the certified EIR and adopted Central Corridor Plan, the proposed project would be precluded from a CPE under the Central Corridor Plan as discussed below.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The proposed project initially requires environmental review either individually, likely in a project-specific EIR, or in a CPE under the Central Corridor Plan EIR. As stated above, the proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR, certified in 2008. However, since the proposed project is not consistent with the development density (zoning) identified in the area plan, it is not eligible for a CPE under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR. Given that the project site is within the geographic area evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR, any development on the project site would potentially be subject to the mitigation measures promulgated therein. Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the area plan final EIR that may be applicable to the proposed project are included below, under the applicable environmental topic. However, it should also be noted that mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR (including those referenced below) could be refined, augmented, or superseded under the Central Corridor Plan EIR.

As discussed above, the project site is located within the Central Corridor Plan area, and will likely be included in the Central Corridor Plan and associated EIR. If the proposed project is determined to be consistent with the development density and building height and bulk limits ultimately adopted as part of the Central Corridor Plan, it may be determined to be eligible for a CPE under the Central Corridor Plan EIR once that EIR is certified and the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have adopted new zoning controls. However, as discussed above, the current proposal is not consistent with proposed height options being studied in the EIR and the proposal would need to be revised to be consistent with the adopted development density in order to qualify for a CPE.

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

1. **CPE Only.** In this case, all potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the underlying area plan EIR, meaning there would be no new “peculiar” significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan EIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, in addition to the Environmental Document Determination of $13,004 are: (a) the $ 7,216 CPE
certificate fee; and (b) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the underlying plan EIR. Fees for the preparation of the Central Corridor Plan EIR have yet to be determined.

2. **CPE and Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.** One or more new significant impacts of the proposed project specific to the site or the project proposal are identified that were not identified in the underlying plan area EIR. If any new significant impacts of the proposed project can be mitigated, then a focused Mitigated Negative Declaration to address these impacts is prepared together with a supporting CPE certificate to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the underlying plan area EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying plan area EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, in addition to the Environmental Document determination of $13,004 are: (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the underlying plan EIR. Fees for the preparation of the Central Corridor Plan EIR have yet to be determined.

3. **CPE and Focused Environmental Impact Report (EIR).** One or more new significant impacts of the proposed project specific to the site or the project proposal are identified that was not identified in the underlying plan area EIR. If any new significant impacts of the proposed project cannot be mitigated, then a focused EIR to address these impacts is prepared together with a supporting CPE certificate to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the underlying plan area EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, in addition to the Environmental Document Determination of $13,004 are: (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; (b) one-half of the standard EIR fee; and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the underlying plan EIR. Fees for the preparation of the Central Corridor Plan EIR have yet to be determined.

Should the proposal be revised to be consistent with the development density in the Central Corridor Plan, the project could qualify for analysis under the CPE process. Alternatively, the proposed project could be analyzed individually, as proposed, in a separate environmental document. This would obviate the proposed project’s reliance on the certification of the Central Corridor Plan EIR.

An amended **Environmental Evaluation Application** for the proposal was submitted on February 21, 2013. Should the proposal be revised to address comments in this Preliminary Project Assessment, a revised Environmental Evaluation Application would be required for the full scope of the project.
(demolition and new construction). It is acknowledged that environmental review of the previous project proposal was substantially underway prior to the February 21, 2013 amended application. Thus, many of the studies described below are in various stages of completion. Given the amendments to the project proposal, the scope of these studies will need to be revisited to reflect the current project proposal. Additionally, the project sponsor would be charged for staff time and materials should the environmental evaluation cost exceed that of the fees collected to date. Based on the Department’s preliminary review, the following topic areas require further study to fully evaluate the February 21, 2013 amended Environmental Evaluation:

a. **Aesthetics.** The proposed project consists of demolition of existing one-and two-story buildings and construction of two new office buildings reaching heights of 95 feet and 240 feet. CEQA requires that a lead agency evaluate a project’s effect on a neighborhood’s visual quality and character, as well as effects on visual resources and scenic vistas within the area’s broader context. Given the degree of visual change anticipated, the Department would require photomontages of the proposed project buildings from to-be-determined public viewpoints within its surroundings. At minimum, the Department requires “before” and “after” photos of the site from a number of near-, mid- and long-range vantage points to illustrate the project’s effect on views, with a particular focus on the project’s potential to alter views from public areas including street view corridors identified in the General Plan. Draft viewpoints were submitted to the Department in 2006 based on a previous project proposal. The environmental review would determine the adequacy of these viewpoints, which may be revised based on the level of visual sensitivity, as well as to evaluate the project’s potential effects on the skyline and urban form.

b. **Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER).** The Department has recently completed a Historic Resources Survey for the South of Market Area. This survey confirms the presence of at least three potential historic resources on the project site including the following: (1) 401-425 Fourth Street (Block 3762/Lot 112) which appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation, (2) 735 Harrison Street (Block 3762/Lot 116) which appears to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and (3) 120 Perry Street, which also appears to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Other eligible resources exist adjacent, or in close proximity to, the project site. The proposal includes demolition of all three eligible resources on site, which would result in a site-specific significant historic resources impact. Furthermore, the proposed demolition of the entire project site could have a significant adverse effect on the context of the subject property and design of the new buildings could have adverse effects on nearby off-site resources.
While the environmental review for previous project proposals on the site have included an analysis of historic resources impacts in a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE), this evaluation would be revisited in light of the findings in the South of Market Historic Resources Survey. More information about the South of Market Historic Resources Survey is available at: http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1826. The HRE should focus on evaluating the impacts of the proposed project on identified historical resource(s), to be prepared by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in Historic Architecture or Architectural History. The HRE should focus on the evaluation of the proposed project for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Secretary’s Standards), including assessing compatibility of the proposed design with adjacent historic resources. The environmental review would be required to analyze project alternatives for significant site-specific impacts, such as the proposed demolition of historic resources. Thus, the environmental analysis will need to consider preservation alternatives that avoid or substantially lessen the project’s impact to historic resources. The HRE must be prepared by a qualified firm listed in the Department's Historic Preservation Consultant Pool. The Department will provide the project sponsor with a list of three consultants from the Historic Preservation Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, at (415) 558-6325 to coordinate the selection of a consultant. A general scope of work for the HRE is included on page 35 of the San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16, and it is strongly recommended that the consultant submit a revised scope of work to the Department’s Preservation Division for review prior to drafting the report. San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16 is available at www.sfplanning.org under “Historic Preservation.”

c. **Archeological Resources.** The proposed project includes demolition, excavation, grading, and foundation work to a depth of 20 feet below grade. The project site lies within the Archeological Mitigation Zone J-1: Properties with Previous Studies from the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR; therefore Mitigation Measure J-1 would apply. Mitigation Measure J-1 applies to properties for which a final archeological research design and treatment plan (ARDTP) is on file at the Northwest Information Center and the Planning Department. An Archeological Resource Study for a previous proposal on the project site was prepared by Archeo-Tech in 2007. The environmental review would include an evaluation of the adequacy of the previously submitted Archeological Resources Study. Should this evaluation conclude that additional analysis is

---

necessary, the project sponsor would be required to retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology to prepare an addendum to the previous Archeological Resources Study under the direction of Planning Department staff. The addendum to the Archeological Resources Study would evaluate the potential effects of the project on CEQA-significant archeological resources with respect to the site- and project-specific information absent information in existing archeological reports. It is likely that the project sponsor would be responsible for undertaking a pre-construction testing and evaluation program for the discovery of potential archeological resources on the site, along with appropriate treatment and application of a data recovery plan for resources that may be discovered. The Planning Department’s list of approved archeological consultants is available at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological_Review_consultant_pool.pdf.

d. **Transportation Study.** The proposed project requires a Transportation Impact Study (TIS). A final scope of work for the previous project proposal was approved in 2006. The environmental review process would include updating the approved scope of work to reflect the current proposal as well as the current understanding of the existing and future cumulative environment, including build out of the Central Subway project and implementation of the Central Corridor Plan. The TIS would need to be prepared by a qualified consultant working at the direction of the Department staff. The Planning Department’s list of approved transportation consultants is available at http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Transportation_consultant_pool.pdf. Please see “Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review” on the Planning Department’s website and “Miscellaneous Fees” in the Planning Department’s current Fee Schedule for Applications. As noted on the Fee Schedule, there is a separate fee required for San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) review of the transportation report.

e. **Noise.** The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR identified a number of noise mitigation measures applicable to construction as well as siting of noise generating uses (including Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and other rooftop equipment). The project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level) and sensitive noise receptors (including residential uses) exist directly adjacent to the project site. The Eastern Neighborhoods Noise Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 (Construction Noise) are intended to reduce construction-related noise impacts. Mitigation Measure F-1 applies to pile driving activities and would require that piles (if included in foundation design) be pre-drilled. Mitigation Measure F-2 would require construction projects near noise sensitive land uses to implement noise attenuation measures. Project sponsors would be required to submit a plan to
DBI that outlines the noise attenuation measures to be implemented during the construction phase.

The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR also identified Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise Generating Uses, which applies to new developments including commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short-term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity. Given that the proposed project consists of office uses, which may include noise generating equipment and that residential uses exist adjacent to the project site, Mitigation Measure F-5 would be required. This mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor prepare an analysis that includes at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site and include at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). This analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would comply with the use compatibility requirements in the General Plan and San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code), would not adversely affect nearby noise sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project or its site that warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the project. Should concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by a qualified acoustical analyst or engineer during the environmental review process.

The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR also identified Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments intended to protect the project’s common open space from existing ambient noise levels. Compliance with this mitigation measure requires that site design consider elements that would shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources (e.g., the elevated I-80 freeway) and/or construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space.

f. Air Quality Analysis. The proposed project includes demolition of existing one and two-story buildings and the construction of two new office buildings reaching heights of 240 feet and 95 feet, and totaling 731,000 gsf. Project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR identified a significant impact related to construction air quality and included Mitigation Measure G-1: Construction Air Quality. Subsequently, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred to as 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 Control Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by DPH.

Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure G-1: Construction Air Quality also requires projects to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other toxic air contaminants. The proposed project is located in an area that experiences poor air quality (termed “air pollution hot spot”) and would require that construction equipment meet best available control technology standards for reducing equipment exhaust. These standards generally require construction equipment to meet Tier 4/Interim Tier 4 emissions standards (equipment rated Tier 2 with a Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter also meets this standard) and are applicable to all off-road equipment rated 25 horsepower or greater and operating for 20 or more total days.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR identified a significant impact related to uses that emit Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) and included Mitigation Measure G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM and Mitigation Measure G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs (Toxic Air Contaminants).

The proposed project exceeds the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants and would require an air quality analysis to determine potential air quality impacts. This analysis shall be conducted by a qualified air quality consultant. As part of the air quality analysis, the proposed project will be screened against air quality impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR and/or the Central Corridor Plan EIR. Any applicable mitigation measures identified in these plan EIRs would be required.

g. Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects. Potential environmental effects related to greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed project need to be addressed in a project’s environmental evaluation. An electronic version of the Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist Table 1 for Private Development Projects is available on the Planning Department’s website at http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1886. The project sponsor would be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. 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. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

h. **Shadow Study.** Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new buildings above 40 feet that would cast new shadow on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. The proposed project would result in construction of 240-foot tall and 95-foot tall buildings. A preliminary shadow analysis indicates that the proposed project would potentially cast new shadow on South Park, a nearby property owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, as represented in the plan set for the February 21, 2013 Environmental Evaluation addendum. Additionally, CEQA requires an evaluation of shadow impacts on non-Recreation and Park Department open spaces, including privately-owned, publicly-accessible open space. A detailed shadow study must be conducted by a qualified shadow consultant to evaluate impacts on affected parks and open spaces that are under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department as well as other open spaces. The Planning Department will provide additional guidance on preparing a detailed quantification of shadow square-foot-hours affecting the pertinent open space(s). The consultant should prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the shadow analysis. Please see additional Department comments below in the “Preliminary Project Comments” section.

i. **Wind Analysis.** The proposed project would involve construction of two buildings over 80 feet in height. An initial wind evaluation was conducted for a prior proposal on the project site that consisted of construction of six nine-story buildings. The project proposed in the February 21, 2013 Environmental Evaluation addendum differs considerably from the previous proposed project and includes construction of a 240-foot tall tower on the corner of Fourth and Harrison streets. The proposal also includes a 95-foot tall mid-rise office building. Therefore, a supplemental wind analysis is required that may include wind tunnel testing. The wind analysis shall be prepared by a qualified consultant who would be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the analysis.

j. **Water Supply Assessment.** CEQA Guidelines Section 15155 and Section 10910 through 10915 of the California Water Code (often referred to as Senate Bill 610) require the preparation of a Water
Supply Assessment (WSA) for certain large projects that meet the definition of a water-demand project to determine whether projected water supplies will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the project in addition to existing and planned future uses. If the project is served by a public water system, the governing body of the public water system, in this case the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), is required to: (1) determine if the projected water demand of the project was considered in the most recently adopted urban water management plan; and (2) prepare a project-specific WSA. The SFPUC is required to provide the WSA to decision-makers before consideration of project approval. The proposed project is considered a water demand project and therefore, a project-specific WSA is required. This requirement pertains to a project regardless of whether the project may qualify for a CPE. In order to prepare the WSA, specific information is required as to the project’s water demand. The proposed project will require a Water Demand Memorandum to be submitted to the SFPUC. As part of this memorandum, the project sponsor shall provide a complete accounting for all proposed water uses, including but not limited to indoor uses (toilets, sinks, showers, etc.), cooling applications, outdoor uses (irrigation, fountains) and process water or industrial uses. The SFPUC will complete the WSA within approximately 90 days of receipt of the Water Demand Memorandum. Upon completion of the WSA, the SFPUC will submit the WSA to its commission for consideration. Commission meetings are held twice a month. If the requested memo is not provided by the project sponsor in a timely manner, the SFPUC may request a 30-day extension to complete preparation and adoption of the WSA.

k. **Flood Notification.** The project is located on a lot that has the potential to flood during storms. Contact Cliff Wong at the SFPUC at (415) 554-8339 regarding the following requirements. Applicants for building permits for either new construction, change of use or change of occupancy, or for major alternations or enlargements shall be referred to the SFPUC at the beginning of the project approval process for a review to determine whether the project would result in ground-level flooding during storms. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, DBI, or the Successor to the Redevelopment Agency. The SFPUC and/or its delegate (San Francisco Department of Public Works, Hydraulics Section) will review the permit application and comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. The permit applicant shall refer to the SFPUC requirements for information required for the review of projects in flood prone areas. Requirements may include provisions of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters.
l. **Stormwater Management.** Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor is required to prepare and submit a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) to the SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. The SCP shall demonstrate compliance with the City’s Stormwater Design Guidelines. 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. For more information on the SFPUC’s stormwater management requirements, see [http://stormwater.sfwater.org](http://stormwater.sfwater.org).

m. **Hazardous Materials.** A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and Phase II Environmental Site Characterization were previously prepared for the project site in February and October of 2007, respectively. Results of these studies indicate that the project site is on the State of California’s Water Resources Control Board list of leaking underground storage tanks and on the California Environmental Protection Agency’s Cortese List of known contaminated sites. According to the Phase I ESA, fourteen underground storage tanks were removed from six separate locations on the project site in 1996. These documents confirm the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds and lead. Levels of lead appear to exceed the State of California’s regulatory thresholds for hazardous waste and would require that excavated soils be disposed of at a registered hazardous waste facility. Environmental review will confirm the adequacy of the Phase I and Phase II ESAs in light of the amended February 21, 2013 project and will be routed to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) for review. It is likely that mitigation measures will be required to ensure the proper handling of hazardous materials. DPH may also recommend the project sponsor enroll in its Voluntary Remedial Action Program (VRAP). Such recommendations would likely be included in the environmental review document as site-specific mitigation measures. Under a CPE these impacts would be referred to as “peculiar,” site-specific impacts, unless the Central Corridor Plan EIR includes a programmatic mitigation measure regarding the handling of hazardous materials. Please note that the DPH recovers a fee for their review. The current fee schedule can be found at: [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp). More information on DPH’s Voluntary Remedial Action
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Program may be found at:

Additionally, the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR identified Mitigation Measure L-1 Hazardous Building Materials, which required subsequent projects to properly dispose of any polychlorinated biphrenols (PCB) such as flourescent light ballasts or any other hazardous building materials in accordance with applicable local, state and federal laws.

n. Geotechnical. Per the Planning Department GIS database, the project site is located within an area of liquefaction potential. A geotechnical report was prepared for a previous proposal that consisted of construction of six nine-story buildings with one level of subterranean parking. The current proposal is considerably different and includes two below grade parking levels with a 240-foot tall tower on the corner of Fourth and Harrison Streets, which may require substantially different construction techniques. A revised geotechnical report is required for the amended project to make a determination as to whether the project would result in any environmental impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface sediment. To assist Department staff in their determination, it is recommended that you provide an updated geotechnical investigation with boring logs for the proposed project that specifies the potential range of foundation recommendations including any soils improvement measures for the project as currently proposed. This study will also inform the archeological review.

o. Tree Planting and Protection Checklist. 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 Tree Planting and Protection Checklist must be shown on the Site Plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Although the February 21, 2013 amended Environmental Evaluation Application indicates that there are no trees on the project site, the project sponsor is required to submit a completed Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the Environmental Evaluation application.

As described above, should a revised proposal be consistent with the development density adopted for the Central Corridor Area Plan, the project would qualify for environmental review under the CPE process. If any of the additional analyses determine that mitigation measures not identified in the area plan EIR are required to address peculiar impacts, the environmental document will be a community plan exemption plus a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration. If the additional analyses identify impacts that cannot be mitigated, the environmental document will be a community plan exemption with a focused initial study/EIR. Given the proposed demolition of historic resources, even if the project qualifies for a CPE, it would require a focused EIR to address the project-specific impacts to historic
resources. A CPE with a focused initial study/EIR would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool: (http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf).

Please see “Studies for Project inside of Adopted Plan Areas - Community Plan Fees” in the Planning Department’s current Fee Schedule for Applications. Environmental evaluation applications are available at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org.

This environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted.

**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. Note that the subject parcel is within the Central Corridor Plan area, with associated rezoning tentatively scheduled to be completed in late 2014. Please be advised that this review is based on the draft Central Corridor Plan published in April 2013 and the Central Corridor Plan rezoning concepts presented to the public at a public workshop on June 13, 2012, and is contingent on the approval of the proposed Central Corridor Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

1. **Zoning.** The project site is currently located within SLI (Service/Light Industrial) District. The draft zoning concepts published in June 2012 as part of the Central Corridor planning process indicate that a reclassification to MUO (Mixed-Use Office) is being considered for the site. The project would be assessed based on the zoning in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlement is sought.

2. **Height District.** The project site is located within the 40-X, 55-X and 85-X height and bulk districts. The envisioned height and bulk designation for the project site in the proposed draft Plan area ranges between 85 to160 feet. The project would be assessed based on the height districts in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlement is sought. The height of the proposed project would exceed existing height limits and those proposed in the Central Corridor Plan. Regardless of whether or not the height districts identified in the Central Corridor Plan area are approved, in order for the project to proceed as proposed, the Board of Supervisors would need to approve a Height District Reclassification for the subject parcel.
The Central Corridor EIR will study two height options, which vary for the project site. Option A proposes height limits ranging from 85 to 130 feet. Option B proposes height limits between 85 feet and 240 feet. At this point it is unknown which height option, if any, would ultimately be approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. However, proposed heights reflected in the February 21, 2013 amended Environmental Evaluation exceeds proposed height options being studied in the Central Corridor Area Plan EIR.

3. **Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 25,000 gross square feet.

4. **Shadow Analysis.** A preliminary shadow fan analysis was conducted which indicated that the proposed project could potentially result in shadow impacts on nearby property owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (see “Preliminary Project Comments” below). As a result, the project must be approved by the Recreation and Park Commission. For more information, please contact:

   Karen Mauney-Brodek  
   Deputy Director for Park Planning  
   Planning and Capital Division  
   30 Van Ness, 4th Floor  
   City of San Francisco  
   Recreation and Parks  
   Karen.Mauney-Brodek@sfgov.org  
   (415) 575-5601

5. **Office Allocation.** An Office Allocation from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 321 et seq. to establish more than 25,000 gross square feet of new office space within the City. Please be advised that as of the date of this letter, the Small Cap contains 1,215,167 square feet and the Large Cap contains 3,758,749 square feet. As proposed, the project would fall under the large cap office allocation.

6. **A Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the subject property.

7. **A Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.
Applications 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 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 substantially impact the proposed project.

1. **Central Corridor Plan.** The subject property is located within the ongoing Central Corridor Plan area, initiated in 2011. The draft Central Corridor Plan, generally bounded by Second, Sixth, Townsend and Market Streets, was published in April 2013. The draft plan will be evaluated in an EIR which commenced in April 2013. The draft Plan proposes changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and will include a strategy for improving the public realm in this area. The Plan and its rezoning are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in late 2014.

   The draft Plan includes recommendations for new land use controls as well as new height and bulk controls for the subject property. The draft Central Corridor Plan is available for download at http://centralcorridor.sfplanning.org. When applicable, comments related to the draft Central Corridor Plan are included in this section.

2. **Eco-District.** An Eco-district is a neighborhood or district where residents, community institutions, property owners, developers, and businesses join together with city leaders and utility providers to meet sustainability goals and co-develop innovative projects at a district or block-level. The Department has identified the Central Corridor Plan area as an Eco-District. All
major new development in the Plan area will be expected to participate in the Eco-District program and the Sustainability Management Association set up to guide it. Please see http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=3051 or contact Kate McGee at (415) 558-6367 for more information.

3. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** 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. 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 Planning Department approval of the first construction building permit. 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.

4. **Land Use.** The subject property is within the Service/Light Industrial (SLI) district, which only permits office use for design professionals. Any other office use is not permitted. The project site is located within the 45-X, 55-X and 85-X height and bulk districts, which do not permit the project’s proposed height and bulk. Therefore, the project could not be approved under existing zoning.

The draft Plan recommends rezoning the subject property to the Mixed-Use Office (MUO) zoning district, in which the proposed office use would be allowed. The office use is generally consistent with key objectives of the draft Plan, which include providing support for substantial development in a transit-rich area and favoring office development over other kinds of growth, particularly on large parcels. The draft Plan concepts also include a new Special Use District south of Harrison Street that would limit new residential development to smaller parcels or, on larger parcels, as a component in a mixed-use project with major commercial development. The proposed office use would need to conform to Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requirements.

5. **Urban Form: Height.** In recognition of the desire to accommodate more growth in the area, the draft Central Corridor Plan recommends changing the height limit of the subject property to between 85 and 130 feet. Additionally, the draft concepts include a High-Rise Height Alternative, which would allow additional height, up to a maximum of 160 feet, on a portion of the subject property. In either scenario, any portion of the building exceeding 85 feet in height would be subject to additional setback requirements and bulk restrictions. At a minimum, 15-foot setbacks...
would be required above a height of 85 feet along all property lines. Please note that existing requirements in Eastern Neighborhoods districts for mid-block alleys and massing reduction for large projects would continue to apply.

The proposed building height of 240 feet is greater than the Mid-Rise and the High-Rise alternatives proposed in the draft Central Corridor Plan. However, the Department is evaluating a 240-foot height limit for this parcel in the Central Corridor Plan EIR. The Plan publication and ongoing EIR analysis is not an indication of which heights will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan and is not a guarantee that the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve the proposed heights or whether these bodies will modify the existing height limits. Additionally, the proposed 95-foot tall mid-rise building exceeds existing height limits, those proposed under the Central Corridor Plan, and those evaluated in the Central Corridor EIR.

6. **Urban Form: Bulk-Horizontal Mass.** Planning Code Section 270.1 requires any project with a frontage of more than 200 feet to incorporate one or more mass reduction breaks in the building that reduce the horizontal scale of the building into discrete sections not more than 200 feet in length. The minimum dimensions required for such a break are 30 feet of width and 60 feet of depth above 25 feet. The project should provide code-complying horizontal mass breaks.

7. **Shadow Study.** The proposed project would involve construction of buildings greater than 40 feet in height and would therefore require a shadow study. A preliminary shadow analysis indicates that the proposed project would potentially cast new shadow on South Park, a nearby property owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, as represented in the plan set submitted with the amended Environmental Evaluation Application dated February 21, 2013. As discussed under ‘Environmental Review,’ above, a detailed shadow study must be conducted by a qualified shadow consultant to evaluate impacts on affected parks and open spaces that are under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department.

8. **General Advertising Sign.** The project proposes to retain the two existing double-facing general advertising rooftop sign structures on either end of the project site as described in the amended Environmental Evaluation application dated February 21, 2013. These structures are not shown on the revised project plans. The plans should be revised to include the location of the each of the four signs, with height and dimensions and rooftop or ground attachment details. These signs are lawfully nonconforming signs. Under Section 604(h) of the Planning Code, a lawfully nonconforming sign may remain “until the end of its normal life” but may not be “replaced, altered, reconstructed, relocated, intensified or expanded in area or in any dimension.” The Planning Department would prefer that these signs be removed as part of the proposed project.
However, should you choose to retain these signs, information regarding how construction of the proposed project could or would occur such that these signs would not be replaced, altered or reconstructed should be provided. If you have any questions regarding this information, please contact Jonathan Purvis, General Advertising Sign Program Coordinator at (415) 558-6354 or jonathan.purvis@sfgov.org.

9. **Transportation Demand Management Program.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 163, an agreement would be required between the project sponsor and the Planning Department to ensure that transportation brokerage services are provided for the life of the project.

10. **Car sharing.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 166, the project would be required to provide car share spaces. For the proposed 575 off-street parking spaces, 12 car share spaces are required.

11. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Sections 155.4 and 155.5 provide requirements for bicycle parking in new commercial and residential developments. The February 21, 2013 amended Environmental Evaluation application indicates the project would provide 113 bicycle spaces. Please note that currently the bicycle parking requirements in the Planning Code are under review for substantial changes that would likely affect the requirements for this project. The Planning Commission initiated a proposed amendment to the bicycle parking requirements in August 2012 and an adoption date is pending. For review of potential changes, please see: [http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cppackets/2011.0397T.pdf](http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cppackets/2011.0397T.pdf). These proposals are currently under review and are subject to change. The minimum amount and type of bicycle parking would be required.

12. **Parking and Loading.** New curb-cuts on Harrison Street would require a Conditional Use Permit and would not be allowed on Fourth Street. Access to parking and loading is recommended to occur primarily or exclusively from Perry Street. The proposal includes 575 parking spaces. The draft Central Corridor Plan recommends retaining and strengthening existing parking maximums in the area. The plan also recommends that parking for commercial uses and any parking available to the general public meet the pricing requirements of Planning Code Section 155(g) and study of an area-wide parking target as suggested by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority’s San Francisco Transportation Plan.

13. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 411 et seq., the Transit Impact Development Fee would apply to this project. Please be aware that an ongoing process – the Transportation Sustainability Program – may eventually replace the Transit Impact
14. **Eastern Neighborhood Impact Fees.** The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee applies to the Project. Fees shall be 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. Currently, the project is within the Impact Fee Tier 2, however the Fee Tier applicable to this project will be revised upon any rezoning of the property to increase height limits, density allowances, or allowed uses, such as would be necessary for the proposed project to proceed. The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees would continue to apply upon adoption of the Central Corridor Plan. However, due to the anticipated rezoning, one or two additional fee tiers may be added.

The Eastern Neighborhoods 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.

15. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** In any zoning district, streetscape and pedestrian elements in conformance with the Better Streets Plan shall be required per Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2), if all the following conditions are present: (1) the project is on a lot that (a) is greater than one-half acre in total area, (b) contains 250 feet of total lot frontage on one or more publicly-accessible rights-of-way, or (c) the frontage encompasses the entire block face between the nearest two intersections with any other publicly-accessible rights-of-way, and (2) the project includes (a) new construction; (b) addition of 20 percent or more of gross floor area to an existing building; or (c) alteration greater than 50 percent of the existing square footage of a building.

The project triggers the requirements identified in the Better Streets Plan by meeting Conditions 1(a), (b) and 2(a). Project sponsors shall submit a streetscape plan to the Planning Department showing the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the subject property. The Department may require streetscape improvements as part of conditions of approval.
Streets fronting the project site are classified as Mixed Use Streets in the San Francisco Better Streets Plan. The minimum sidewalk width for Mixed Use Streets is 12 feet, but the recommended width is 15 feet. Perry Street is the only street fronting the project-site that meets the minimum sidewalk width requirements. The Department may require sidewalks adjacent to the site be widened to meet recommended widths.

If street improvements are being considered, project sponsors should contact the Department of Public Works (DPW) as early as possible to understand the process and requirements for permitting street improvements. For more information on process, guidelines, and requirements for street improvements, refer to www.sfbetterstreets.org. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

16. Streets and Sidewalks. In addition to the comments outlined above, the draft Central Corridor Plan proposes a number of changes to Harrison Street. The street would be reduced to four lanes of traffic, with two curb-side lanes that would be used for on-street parking only during off-peak hours. One parking lane would serve as an additional peak-period travel lane and the other as a transit-lane during the day.

As mentioned above, Fourth Street’s current 10-foot wide sidewalks are below the minimum standards of the San Francisco Better Streets Plan. However, due to constraints in the roadway as a result of the Central Subway project, widening is not possible within the public right-of-way. Therefore as part of the development’s open space requirements, a five-foot setback from the property line is recommended along Fourth Street to effectively widen the sidewalk to 15-feet.

17. Open Space. Planning Code Section 135.3 requires the project to provide one square foot of open space for every 250 occupied square feet of retail space, and one square foot of open space for every 50 occupied square feet of office space. The plans provided for the proposed project do not indicate compliance with this requirement. If the open space provided does not meet the minimum requirements, an in-lieu fee may be paid per Planning Code Section 426. Please be aware that while under the current Planning Code, non-residential open space is not required to be open to the public in the MUO District, the Central Corridor planning process will most likely propose a change to require all new non-residential development to provide publically-accessible open space, similar to requirements in the Downtown (Section 138 of the Planning Code).

18. Mid-Block Connection and Crosswalk. The draft Central Corridor Plan recommends expanding the Plan area’s network of mid-block connections to serve a dual-role as small scale public spaces and as a means of accessing larger parks. The draft Plan proposes extending the provisions of
Planning Code Section 270.2 to the entire Central Corridor Plan area, requiring the provision of new publically accessible mid-block rights-of-way and access easements on large lots with more than 300 feet of street frontage of any street. The proposed project’s street frontages on both Harrison and Perry streets exceed this threshold. The plan specifically recommends a new mid-block pedestrian passage through the project site connecting Harrison Street to Perry Street, and schematically recommends aligning this mid-block connection with Lapu Lapu Street to the north. A new mid-block pedestrian crosswalk is proposed at this location.

19. Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits. Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. 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 Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the value of the improvements. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code.

More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website. Projects proposed in the Central Corridor Plan area could potentially qualify for in-kind funds are described below. These improvements have not been identified as a near-term priority project by the Interdepartmental Plan Implementation Committee or the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee. However, some of the improvements may still be eligible for in-kind credit.

- Nearby opportunities for in-kind improvements identified in the draft Central Corridor Plan include:
  - Creation of a new signalized mid-block pedestrian crosswalk across Harrison Street aligned with Lapu Lapu Street.
  - Open Space enhancements adjacent to Alice Street Community Gardens on Lapu Lapu Street, such as shared street treatments or converting parking spaces into open space.
  - Funding the installation of decorative lighting or art to improve pedestrian comfort and the aesthetic appearance of Third and Fourth Streets beneath Interstate-80.

20. Tree Planting and Protection Checklist. As discussed above under “Environmental Review,” a Tree Planting and Protection Checklist must be filled out and submitted with the Large Project Authorization application.
21. **Child Care Requirements.** This project would be subject to the child care requirements, and/or the associated in-lieu fee, of Planning Code Section 414 et seq.

22. **Public Art.** This project would be subject to the public art requirements of Planning Code Section 429 et seq.

23. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** Chapter 83 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, passed in 1998, established the First Source Hiring Program to identify available entry-level jobs in San Francisco and match them with unemployed and underemployed job-seekers. The intent is to provide a resource for local employers seeking qualified, job ready applicants for vacant positions while helping economically disadvantaged residents who have successfully completed training programs and job-readiness classes.

The ordinance applies to: (1) any permit application for commercial development exceeding 25,000 square feet in floor area involving new construction, an addition or a substantial alteration which results in the addition of entry level positions for a commercial activity; or (2) any application which requires discretionary action by the Planning Commission relating to a commercial activity over 25,000 square feet, but not limited to conditional use; or (3) any permit application for a residential development of ten units or more involving new construction, an addition, a conversion or substantial rehabilitation.

The project is subject to the requirement. For further information or to receive a sample First Source Hiring Agreement, please see contact information below:

Ken Nim, Workforce Compliance Officer
CityBuild, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City and County of San Francisco
1 South Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94102
Direct: 415.701.4853, Email: ken.nim@sfgov.org
Fax: 415.701.4897
Website: [http://oewd.org/Workforce-Development.aspx](http://oewd.org/Workforce-Development.aspx)

24. **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/](http://stormwater.sfwater.org/). Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.
25. **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 of projects larger than 40,000 square feet. Please see the attached SFPUC document for more information.

26. **Green Landscape Ordinance.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires permeable paving and street trees to be installed by the property owner or developer in the case of construction of a new building, relocation of a building, or addition of gross floor area equal to 20 percent or more of the gross floor area of the existing building. The minimum installation shall be one 24-inch box tree for each 20 feet of property frontage along each street or alley, with each remaining 10 feet requiring one additional tree.

27. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Planning Code Section 139 outlines bird-safe standards for new construction to reduce bird mortality from circumstances that are known to pose a high risk to birds and are considered to be "bird hazards." Feature-related hazards may create increased risk to birds and need to be addressed. Any feature-related hazards, such as free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, or balconies must have broken glazed segments 24 square feet or smaller in size. Please review the Standards for Bird Safe Buildings and indicate the method of window treatments to comply with the requirements where applicable.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

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

1. **Building Massing, Site Design, and Orientation.** The proposed heights significantly exceed what is allowed under the current zoning (45 to 85 feet). The proposed heights also exceed what is envisioned in the proposed Central Corridor Plan area for this site. The basic urban form and land use principles of the draft Central Corridor Plan are for a predominant mid-rise district (85 feet to 130/160 feet) with large floor plate character combined with strategically located and widely-spaced slender towers near key transit stops. Towers of the heights and the spacing proposed will require extensive shadow, view, skyline, and immediate context analysis to assess the appropriateness of their heights, bulk, and spacing.

   The Department recommends the height of the eastern most building not exceed 85 feet as per the Central Corridor Plan area proposed height limits. The building to the west should be sculpted to...
step up to the tower and should not exceed 160 feet. The massing envisioned is an 85 foot podium height with 15 foot step backs on all sides.

For large sites, massing breaks and mid-block alleys are envisioned, similar to the controls in the Eastern Neighborhoods mixed-use districts. The Department recommends providing two publicly accessible mid-block alleys with a minimum 20-foot width: one that aligns with Lapu Lapu Street across Harrison Street and another that separates the tower and the lower buildings.

The Department discourages the location of the covered porte-cochere under the corner tower for passenger drop-off. The Department recommends eliminating the drive though porte-cochere and incorporating that function into one of the mid-block alleys. A shared space alley that could accommodate limited vehicular access combined with public space would be an acceptable alternative.

In general, the building should be built to the street wall and create a consistent frontage. Recessed areas may be incorporated into mid-block alley entrances. The triangular open spaces at the side property lines look like remnants and the Department questions their usefulness and potential quality, recommending the building be squared off along the eastern property lines. The Department recommends locating retail along the corners of the mid-block alleys on both Harrison and Perry streets.

2. **Parking, Loading, and Garage Access.** The Department recommends: (1) abandoning unused curb cuts or driveways, (2) reducing vehicular access points for the site to two, and (3) limiting the size of loading and garage access openings. Consider combining any loading access with the garage entrances. Bicycle parking should be as close as possible to lobbies or garage entrances to minimize the travel distance through the garages and potential conflicts with automobiles.

3. **Architecture.** The application is diagrammatic and is assumed to be preliminary. The Department will provide additional architectural review and comments at subsequent design stages.

4. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor would be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishings, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval.

The Central Corridor Plan calls for sidewalk widening along both Fourth and Harrison streets. Perry Street is identified as an alley, and may be an ideal candidate for a shared public way. See
http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/ to identify relevant street types and for a list of possible improvements that could be applied to project frontages.

The Department recommends that the sponsor consider public realm features, such as mid-block and corner bulb-outs, and living alleys. The Department also recommends the sponsor consider improvements along the length of Perry Street. Department staff is available to review proposals or meet with the project sponsor to explore ideas. For more information on process, guidelines, and requirements for street improvements, refer to www.sfbetterstreets.org. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is being provided at the request of the project sponsor for a project in which a current environmental evaluation application is on file. This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months.

Enclosure(s): Neighborhood Group Mailing List
Interdepartmental Project Review Application
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet

cc: John Barrett Jr., Property Owner
    Ben Fu, Current Planning
    Debra Dwyer, Environmental Planning
    Josh Switzky, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Nicholas Perry, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Tina Tam, Historic Preservation
    Jerry Robbins, MTA
    Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW
Effective: August 31, 2012

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. 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 Planning Department approval of the first construction building permit.

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. $1,157 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. $1,682 for all other projects.

Please note that $384 of these fees is non-refundable. If your project falls under the first type of fee, and you cancel your meeting, $773 will be refunded to you. If your project falls under the second type of fee, and you cancel your meeting, $1,298 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, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2414. Those wishing more specific or more detailed information may contact the Project Review Meeting Coordinator at (415) 575-9091.

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:

Please submit four (4) copies/sets of all information for distribution to each department/agency.

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)
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Land Use Type | Existing | Proposed | Net Change
---|---|---|---
Number of Dwelling Units
Commercial Square Footage:
Retail
Office
Number of Hotel Rooms
Industrial Square Footage
Other Uses: _________________
Number of Parking Spaces
Number of Stories

Previously contacted staff________________________________________________

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) __________________________________

(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)
DATE: April 1, 2007  (V1.3)

TITLE: Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding

PURPOSE: This bulletin alerts project sponsors to City and County review procedures and requirements for certain properties where flooding may occur.

BACKGROUND:
Development in the City and County of San Francisco must account for flooding potential. Areas located on fill or bay mud can subside to a point at which the sewers do not drain freely during a storm (and sometimes during dry weather) and there can be backups or flooding near these streets and sewers. The attached graphic illustrates areas in the City prone to flooding, especially where ground stories are located below an elevation of 0.0 City Datum or, more importantly, below the hydraulic grade line or water level of the sewer. The City is implementing a review process to avoid flooding problems caused by the relative elevation of the structure to the hydraulic grade line in the sewers.

PERMIT APPLICATION PROCESS:
Applicants for building permits for either new construction, change of use (Planning) or change of occupancy (Building Inspection), or for major alterations or enlargements shall be referred to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) at the beginning of the process, for a review to determine whether the project would result in ground level flooding during storms. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the PUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, the Department of Building Inspection, or the Redevelopment Agency.

The SFPUC and/or its delegate (SFDPW, Hydraulics Section) will review the permit application and comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. The SFPUC will receive and return the application within a two-week period from date of receipt.

The permit applicant shall refer to PUC requirements for information required for the review of projects in flood prone areas. Requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters.
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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 and Technical Assistance**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Resources Planning
(415) 554-3271

**Recycled Water Plumbing Codes**
Department of Building Inspection Plumbing Inspection Services
(415) 558-5654

**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
NOTE:

1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST BE 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.
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