DATE: August 9, 2013  
TO: David Silverman, Reuben Junius & Rose  
FROM: Devyani Jain, Planning Department  
RE: PPA Case No. 2013.0784U for 2177 3rd St.

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Elizabeth Purl, at (415) 575-9028 or elizabeth.purl@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Devyani Jain, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 9, 2013
Case No.: 2013.0784U
Project Address: 2177 3rd Street
Block/Lot: 4045/003 and 003B
Zoning: UMU/68-X
Life Science and Medical SUD
Area Plan: Central Waterfront (Eastern Neighborhoods)
Project Sponsor: David Silverman
415-567-9000
Staff Contact: Elizabeth Purl – 415-575-9028
elizabeth.purl@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 proposal is to demolish the two existing industrial/office buildings on the 29,438-square-foot subject lot and construct two 7-story, 68-foot tall residential buildings. The proposed new buildings would have approximately 154,509 gross square feet of space and would include 109 dwelling units, 3,143 square feet of ground-floor retail space, and 72 parking spaces. Parking would be provided at the basement level with access from 19th Street. The project would include common open space on a podium level above the parking level and on the roof, with pedestrian bridges connecting the two buildings at each level including the roof.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires the following environmental review. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted:
An **Environmental Evaluation Application** is required for the full scope of the project. Environmental Evaluation 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](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Permits & Zoning” tab.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project may qualify for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan. Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an environmental impact report (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.

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 Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR), 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 Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR 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, are as follows: (a) $13,004 Environmental Document Determination fee; (b) $7,216 CPE certificate fee; and (c) $10,000 proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

2. **CPE and Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.** In this case, 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 Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. If any new significant impacts of the proposed project can be mitigated, then a focused Mitigated Negative Declaration to address these impacts is prepared and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, are as follows: (a) $13,004 Environmental Document Determination fee; (b) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (c) $10,000 proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

3. **CPE and Focused Environmental Impact Report (EIR).** In this case, one or more new significant impacts of the proposed project specific to the site or the project proposal are identified that was not

---

3 See page 10 of the current fee schedule.
identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. If any new significant impacts of the proposed project cannot be mitigated, then a focused EIR to address these impacts is prepared and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, are as follows: (a) $13,004 Environmental Document Determination fee; (b) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee; and (d) $10,000 proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

Based on the Department’s preliminary review, the following topics would be analyzed during the environmental review process and any associated mitigation measures that were identified in the area plan EIR would apply to the proposed project.

1. **Archeological Resources.** The proposed project consists of demolition, excavation to a depth of approximately 14 feet below grade, construction of new foundations, and installation of elevator pits and car stacker pits. The project site lies within Archeological Mitigation Zone J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans FEIR. Proposed project sites within this area are required to undergo either Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist or the preparation of a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. In most cases, the project sponsor would likely choose the PAR process. The PAR will first determine what type of soils disturbance/modifications would result from the proposed project, such as excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvements, site remediation, etc., second, whether or not the project site is located in an area of archeological sensitivity and, third, what additional steps are necessary to identify and evaluate any potential archeological resources that may be affected by the project. Helpful to the PAR process is the availability of geotechnical or soils characterization studies prepared for the project. The results of this review will be provided in a memorandum to the Environmental Planner assigned to the project.

Alternatively, preparation of a PASS would require the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant from the Planning Department’s rotational Qualified Archeological Consultants List (QACL). The project sponsor must contact the Department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The whole QACL is available at [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological_Review_consultant_pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological_Review_consultant_pool.pdf).

The Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) should contain the following:

a. The historical uses of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps;

---

4 See page 10 of the current fee schedule.
5 See page 11 of the current fee schedule.
b. Determine types of archeological resources/properties that may have been located within the project site and whether the archeological resources/property types would potentially be eligible for listing in the CRHR;

c. Determine if the 19th or 20th century soils-disturbing activities may have adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources;

d. Assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resources;

e. Conclusion: assessment of whether any CRHP-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommendation as to appropriate further action.

Based on the PAR or the PASS, the Department archeologist will determine if and what additional mitigation measures are necessary to address potential effects of the project to archeological resources. These measures may include implementation of various archeological mitigations such as accidental discovery, archeological monitoring, and/or archeological field investigations. In cases of potential higher archeological sensitivity, preparation of an Archeological Research Design/Treatment Plan (ARD/TP) by an archeological consultant from the QACL may be required.

2. **Historic Resources.** Constructed in 1987, the existing buildings on site are less than 50 years old and are not a historic architectural resource for purposes of CEQA. Furthermore, the project site is not within or directly adjacent to a historic district; thus, no additional analysis of historical resources would be required.

3. **Noise.** The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR identified a number of noise mitigation measures applicable to construction, as well as siting of noise-sensitive land uses (such as residential uses) in areas that are substantially affected by existing noise levels. The project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). In addition, the proposed project would include the demolition of two existing commercial warehouse buildings and the construction of two new 7-story mixed-use buildings that would add new noise-sensitive uses within the project area. With the implementation of Noise Mitigation Measures F-2, F-3, F-4, and F-6, the project is not expected to result in any peculiar impacts not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR with respect to noise.

Application of **Noise Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 (Construction Noise)** is intended to reduce construction-related noise impacts. **Mitigation Measure F-1** applies to pile-driving activities and would require that piles be pre-drilled. Since the project does not require foundation piles for construction of the new buildings, **Mitigation Measure F-1** may not apply to the project. **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 that outlines the noise attenuation measures to be implemented during the construction phase. The plan must be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), for review and approval, prior to the issuance of any construction or demolition permit.
Mitigation Measure F-3: Interior Noise Levels would apply, as the project sponsor is proposing to site residential uses located along a street with a noise level above 60 dBA (Ldn), as identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR (Figure 18). Noise levels at the project site are estimated to be in the range of 65 to 70 dBA (Ldn). Title 24 requires an interior noise standard of 45 dBA. To ensure that the project meets this standard, the Planning Department would require preparation of an analysis that includes a site survey and at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to issuance of an environmental review document. The analysis must be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis or engineering and must demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the Planning Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis or engineering prior to the first approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels, consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum certificate of extent feasible.

Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses would apply, as the project sponsor is proposing to site residential uses within the NCT Use District in an area that exceeds 60 Ldn. Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses would require the sponsor to prepare an acoustical study that identifies potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and have 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. The study should include any recommendations regarding building design to ensure that the interior noise environment meets Title 24 Building Code acoustical requirements.

Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments would also apply in order to protect the project’s proposed 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 and/or construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space.

4. Air Quality (AQ) Analysis. The proposed project, which includes the construction of new buildings with a total of 154,509 square feet and 109 dwelling units, does not exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would not be required.

The project proposes demolition of two existing commercial buildings, as well as grading and construction of two new 7-story buildings across a 29,438-square-foot (0.68-acre) project site. 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 a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred hereto 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). The requirements of this ordinance supersede Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure G-2: Construction Air Quality. Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) or comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In addition to construction dust, demolition and construction activities would require the use of heavy duty diesel equipment that emits diesel particulate matter (DPM). DPM is a designated toxic air contaminant that may affect sensitive receptors located up to and perhaps beyond 300 feet from the project site. Additional measures may be required to reduce DPM emissions from project-related construction vehicles and equipment.

The proposed project includes sensitive land uses (109 dwelling units) that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that may emit toxic air contaminants. Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses requires new residential development near high-volume roadways and/or warehousing and distribution centers to include an analysis of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and/or toxic air contaminants (TAC), and, if warranted, to incorporate upgraded ventilation systems to minimize exposure of future residents to DPM and other pollutant emissions, as well as odors. In addition, Health Code Article 38 applies to the proposed project. Health Code Article 38 requires that new residential development greater than 10 units located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone perform an Air Quality Assessment to determine whether PM2.5 concentrations from roadway sources exceed 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter (0.2 μg/m³). Sponsors of projects on sites exceeding this level are required to install ventilation systems or otherwise redesign the project to reduce the outdoor PM2.5 exposure indoors. The proposed project is located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone; therefore, an analysis of annual exposure of project occupants to roadway related particulate matter would be required. You may choose to have the air quality assessment prepared by a qualified firm and forwarded to DPH for review, or you may request that DPH conduct the assessment. For more information on Health Code Article 38 see: [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Air/default.asp](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Air/default.asp).

If the project would generate sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, diesel generators or boilers, or includes 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 FEIR identified a significant impact related to uses that emit DPM and included Mitigation Measure G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM and Mitigation Measure G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC).

During the environmental review process the proposed project will be reviewed to determine whether mitigation measures in the form of either construction emissions minimization or air filtration and ventilation mitigation measures will be required and whether any additional mitigation measures identified in the underlying Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR, including Mitigation Measures G-2, G-3, or G-4, will be required. Should the project include stationary sources of air pollutants including, but not limited to, diesel boilers or back-up generators, an Air Quality Technical
Report may be required for additional air pollutant modeling. If an Air Quality Technical Report is required, the project sponsor must retain a consultant with experience in air quality modeling to prepare a scope of work that must be approved by Environmental Planning prior to the commencement of any required analysis and/or modeling determined necessary.

5. **Naturally Occurring Asbestos.** Based upon mapping conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), the project site may be underlain by serpentine rock. Project construction activities could release serpentinite into the atmosphere. Serpentinite commonly contains naturally occurring chrysotile asbestos (NOA) or tremolite-actinolite, a fibrous mineral that can be hazardous to human health if airborne emissions are inhaled. In the absence of proper controls, NOA could become airborne during excavation and handling of excavated materials. On-site workers and the public could be exposed to airborne asbestos unless appropriate control measures are implemented. To address health concerns from exposure to NOA, ARB enacted an Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations in July 2001. The requirements established by the Asbestos ATCM are contained in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 17, Section 93105, and are enforced by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Asbestos ATCM, which include measures to control fugitive dust from construction activities, in addition to the requirements of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance discussed above.

6. **Greenhouse Gases.** The 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provide CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR did not address GHG emissions, as it was prepared and certified prior to inclusion of GHG emissions as an environmental topic in the CEQA Guidelines. On August 12, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department submitted to the BAAQMD a draft of the City and County of San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This document presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines (2010). Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy would result in less-than-significant GHG emissions.

In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor will be required to submit a completed checklist as part of the environmental review process.

---


7. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would include the construction of two new 7-story buildings on a lot previously used for industrial purposes. The existing two-story warehouse/commercial buildings on the project site would be demolished as part of the project. Given the proposed scope of work, including excavation for a basement level with elevator pits and car stacker pits, the proposed project is not expected to result in any peculiar impacts not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, provided that **Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials** is implemented. Application of this mitigation measure would reduce any impacts related to hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.

The site is in an area of artificial fill known as the Maher area. Additionally, based on the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and other preliminary information provided by the project sponsor, the site was formerly occupied by industrial uses that may have contaminated the soil on the project site. Although the Phase 1 ESA did not specifically identify potential soil contamination, the Planning Department recommends that a Phase 2 ESA (e.g., soil sampling) be prepared. Any Phase 2 reports already prepared should be submitted with the EE application. Review of the Phase 1, Phase 2, and any additional studies recommended by the Phase 1 may require remediation with oversight from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) and participation in its Voluntary Remedial Action Program (VRAP). Review of these documents during the environmental review process will determine whether any necessary action could be administered by DPH through the recently-amended Maher Ordinance. More information on DPH’s Voluntary Remedial Action Program may be found at [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteVoluntaryRemedial.asp](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteVoluntaryRemedial.asp).

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials would apply to the proposed project. Existing environmental hazards in the vicinity of the project site and the potential for hazards and hazardous materials contamination from past historic uses on the site need to be reviewed. The existing buildings on the project site were constructed in 1987. Pursuant to this mitigation measure, development proposals within the Eastern Neighborhoods require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Prior to development of the existing buildings, the project site was developed with an industrial use that included several underground fuel storage tanks and vehicle service areas. A tank closure report submitted by the project sponsor shows that eight tanks were removed in 1986 and a Remedial Action Completion Certification was issued by DPH in 1996. However, existing environmental hazards in the vicinity of the project site and the potential for hazards and hazardous materials contamination from past industrial uses on the site would need to be reviewed. The project includes some ground disturbance for a new foundation, elevator pit and car stacker pit. As discussed above, a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment has been prepared and a Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment is recommended; the latter may be determined necessary by the San Francisco
Department of Public Health (DPH). A copy of the any subsequent site assessments or other studies should be included with the project’s Environmental Evaluation Application package, if available at the time of submittal. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be forwarded to DPH for their review and the project sponsor would be required to submit a fee to DPH for their review. If site remediation is required, the project sponsor would be required to implement site specific mitigation measures. DPH would provide oversight of remediation activities through their Voluntary Remediation Action Program. For more information regarding the Voluntary Remediation Action Plan Program and fees related to DPH review and oversight, please see: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteVoluntaryRemedial.asp.

8. Geotechnical Investigation. The project site is located near or within an area subject to liquefaction potential, a Seismic Hazards Study Zone designated by the California Division of Mines and Geology. A geotechnical report prepared in 1986 for the existing development indicates that the site is underlain by 27 to 29 feet of fill over shoreline marsh deposits and serpentine bedrock, with relatively shallow (12 to 21 feet) groundwater. These conditions indicate a risk of liquefaction as well as seismic risks associated with any development in the Bay Area. Investigation of geotechnical and soil conditions and application of the building codes for new development based on these conditions could reduce the potential for impacts related to structural damage and surface settlement to a less-than-significant level. To assist Department staff in their determination, it is recommended that the project sponsor provide a preliminary geotechnical investigation with boring logs and foundation recommendations specific to the proposed project.

9. Transportation. The Department has made a preliminary determination that a transportation study would be required for the proposed project. The project includes the construction of 98,166 square feet of residential space and 3,143 square feet of retail space that would generate approximately 1,406 new daily person trips of which approximately 204 would be in the PM Peak Hour. About 124 of the PM peak hour person trips would be automobile trips. The additional peak hour trip potential would require additional transportation analysis. Please request a formal determination from the Environmental Case Planner, once assigned. Please provide information on current use of the property for further consideration of the need for a transportation study (i.e., trip credit).

Transportation planning staff notes that the proposed parking garage curb cut should be limited to 10 feet wide rather than the 20 feet shown on the project plans that accompanied the PPA application. Please provide information on existing on-site curb cuts as part of the EE application. Because the proposed residential area is less than 100,000 square feet, off-street loading is not required as part of the project under the Planning Code. However, the project sponsor should consider placing the loading area within the garage. Please provide dimensions of the garage, including ADA and carshare spaces, and parking stacker specifications in the EE application. Additional bike parking above the proposed 40 spaces should be considered.

The transportation report must be prepared by a qualified consultant working at the direction of the Planning Department staff. This process would be initiated after the Environmental Evaluation Application has been filed. 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 to SFMTA for review of the transportation report. The qualified professional must be selected from one of three transportation consultants assigned by the Planning Department during the submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application. Prior to initiating this report, please consult with the assigned Transportation Planner and obtain sign off on the scope of work.

10. **Shadow Study.** Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new buildings 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. Staff has prepared a preliminary shadow fan that indicates that there would be no potential shadow impacts on any nearby parks, including those managed by the Recreation and Parks Department. No further analysis of shadow impacts would be required.

11. **Stormwater Management.** The project site is located on a block that has been identified by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) as having the potential to flood during storms. 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 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 SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, the Department of Building Inspection, or the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Please see the attached information and contact Cliff Wong of the SFPUC at 415-554-8339.

12. **Affidavit for Tree Disclosure.** 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 Disclosure Affidavit prepared for the project and submitted with the EE application for the project must be shown on the site plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit the Affidavit for Tree Disclosure with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure trees are appropriately shown on site plans.

13. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of properties adjacent to the project site and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the Community Plan Exemption process. Please provide these mailing labels at the time of submittal.

If any of the additional analyses determine that mitigation measures not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR are required to address peculiar impacts of the proposed project, 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 EIR. A community plan exemption and a community plan exemption plus a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but a community plan exemption with a focused EIR would need to be
prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool list. If this is necessary, the project sponsor will be provided with three environmental consulting firms from which to choose to have the focused EIR prepared (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.

**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. **Large Project Authorization.** Planning Code Section 329 applies to all new construction and proposed alterations of existing buildings in the Eastern Neighborhoods that meet at least one of the following criteria:

   a. The project includes the construction of a new building greater than 75 feet in height (excluding any exceptions permitted per Section 260(b)), or includes a vertical addition to an existing building resulting in a total building height greater than 75 feet; or

   b. The project involves a net addition or new construction of more than 25,000 gross square feet.

   The project meets Criteria 1b above with a total of approximately 155,000 gross square feet of area. Therefore, a Large Project Authorization, or X case, is required.

2. **Building Permit Applications.** Permit application and notification are required for the proposed demolition and new construction.

Large Project Authorization 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 Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

**NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION 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.

1. **Central Waterfront Area Plan:** As currently proposed, the project’s residential and retail land uses are consistent with the Central Waterfront Area Plan. However, as discussed in the Preliminary Design Comments below, the amount of parking access is excessive and does not conform with Policy 3.2.1: Require high quality design of street-facing building exteriors and Policy 3.2.3: Minimize the visual impact of parking. For more guidance and to ensure general conformity with the policies of the Plan, information on the Central Waterfront Area Plan can be found on the Planning Department’s website at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/Central_Waterfront.htm.

2. **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. This review requirement applies to the proposed project. 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.

3. **Lot Line Adjustments.** The proposed new building crosses two lots (Lots 003 and 003B). Projects that involve Lot Line Adjustments must be reviewed by the Department of Public Works (DPW). Please contact DPW if you have not already done so:

   Department of Public Works
   875 Stevenson Street
   San Francisco, CA 94103
   415.554.5827

4. **Height measurement.** Planning Code Section 102.12(d) allows the owner to choose the street or streets from which the measurement of height is to be taken where the lot has frontage on two or more streets, if the scope of the rules stated in subsections (a) – (c) are followed. Please identify the exact point from which height measurement is proposed to be taken.

5. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth and area. The project does not propose the standard 25 percent rear yard at the rear of the lot. The proposed inner courtyard is approximately 6,000 square feet, or 20 percent of lot area. The proposed courtyard as a substitute for the standard rear yard is not permitted in Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use Districts, except as an approved exception through the Large Project...
Authorization process. A formal submittal should explore providing additional open area that would be comparable to the 25 percent rear yard.

6. **Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires that usable open space be located on the same lot as the dwelling units it serves. At least 80 square feet of usable open space per dwelling unit, or 54 square feet per dwelling unit of publicly accessible open space, is required. Up to 50 percent of the publicly accessible open space may be provided off-site. The Project has a residential open space requirement of approximately 8,720 square feet of usable open space if private, or 5,886 square feet of publically accessible open space. Although the proposed courtyards (approximately 8,000 square feet), roof decks (approximately 2,500 square feet), and balconies combine to exceed the minimum square foot requirement, they do not meet the minimum dimensional requirements for useable open space. Please see inner court requirement under Planning Code Section 135(g)(2). Therefore, exception through the Large Project Authorization process is required. However, for a project on a sizeable lot, sufficient open space should be accommodated. A formal submittal should provide detailed dimensions for confirmation of the open space requirement and should strive to achieve compliance.

7. **The 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 the 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 frontage of the property along each street or alley, with each remaining 10 feet requiring one additional tree. The project is required to provide 12 trees on 3rd Street and five trees on 19th Street. Additionally, this Code Section establishes requirements for the improvement of the public right-of-way associated with development projects, such that the public right-of-way may be safe, accessible, convenient and attractive to pedestrian use and travel by all modes of transportation consistent with the San Francisco General Plan, achieve best practices in ecological storm water management, and provide space for public life and social interaction, in accordance with the City’s "Better Streets Policy” (Administrative Code Section 98.1). The building will be subject to the “Better Streets” streetscape improvements per Planning Code Section 138.1. A streetscape plan will be required to illustrate proposed public realm improvements.

8. **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 mitigated. Any feature-related hazards, such as free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, or balconies must have treatment applied to unbroken glazed segments greater than 24 square feet in size. Please review the standards and indicate the method of window treatments to comply with the requirements where applicable.

9. **Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. Approximately 67 of the proposed 109 units do not face onto an open area that meets the dimensional requirements. These units face onto the proposed inner courtyards, or the proposed non-
complying rear yard. An exception for exposure must be sought through the Large Project Authorization process. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception and would generally not support a project in which a large proportion of units do not have adequate exposure. A formal submittal should explore providing Code-complying exposure for all the units.

10. **Rooftop Screening.** Planning Code Section 141 rooftop mechanical equipment and appurtenances to be used in the operation or maintenance of a building shall be arranged so as not to be visible from any point at or below the roof level of the subject building. This requirement shall apply to construction of new buildings and in any alteration of mechanical systems of existing buildings that result in significant changes in such rooftop equipment and appurtenances. The features so regulated shall in all cases be either enclosed by outer building walls or parapets, or grouped and screened in a suitable manner, or designed in themselves so that they are balanced and integrated with respect to the design of the building. Minor features not exceeding one foot in height shall be exempted from this regulation.

11. **Ground Floor Commercial Space and Street Frontage.** Planning Code Section 145.1 requires active uses on the ground floor. Although active uses are proposed on the ground floor, they do not meet the minimum ground floor ceiling height. Ground floor non-residential uses are required to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 17 feet. The proposed ground floor does not appear to meet the required floor-to-floor height. In a project on a sizeable lot, sufficient floor-to-floor height should be accommodated. A formal submittal should provide detailed dimensions for confirmation of compliance with the requirement.

12. **Curb Cuts.** 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. Generally, curb cuts are limited to ten feet in width. The project proposes two curb cuts at 19th Street, both exceeding the ten-foot width.

13. **Car Share Spaces.** Planning Code Section 166 requires (1) one car share space for a project proposing 50 to 200 dwelling units. The project proposes a total of 109 dwelling units. Therefore, one car share space is required. Please illustrate on plans the location of the proposed car share space.

14. **Bicycle Parking.** Section 155.5 of the Planning Code provides requirements for bicycle parking in residential development. The proposed bike parking shown in the PPA application appears to meet the existing requirements in the Code. Please note that currently the bicycle parking requirements in the Code are under review for significant changes that would likely affect the requirements for this project. The Board of Supervisors Land Use committee passed legislation in July and it is expected to become effective in September. For review of potential changes, please see: http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2011.0397M.pdf. These proposals are currently under review and are subject to change.

15. **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 proposed separation at the 3rd Street façade does not appear to meet the required dimensions. Given the size of the lot, the project should provide a break that complies, or an alternative that better meets the intent of the requirement.

16. **Shadow.** Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis be conducted for any project greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow analysis conducted indicated that no public space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department would be shadowed by the proposal, as represented in the plan set submitted with the PPA application.

17. **Inclusionary Housing.** Affordable housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an ‘Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 419,’ to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance: on-site, off-site, or with an in-lieu fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project. The project is within the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program Tier B. As of the date of this letter, Tier B requires 16 percent of the total units constructed to be affordable to and occupied by qualifying persons and families as defined elsewhere in the Code. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a requirement of four units if provided on-site.

For your information, if a project proposes rental units, it may be eligible for an On-site Alternative to the Affordable Housing Fee if it has demonstrated to the Planning Department that the affordable units are either: 1) ownership only or 2) not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act (a Costa Hawkins exception). Affordable units are not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act under the exception provided in Civil Code Sections 1954.50 through one of the following methods:

a. direct financial construction from a public entity

b. development bonus or other form of public assistance

A Costa Hawkins exception agreement is drafted by the City Attorney. You must state in your submittal how the project qualifies for a Costa Hawkins exception. The request should be addressed to the Director of Current Planning. If the project is deemed eligible, we may start working with the City Attorney on the agreement.

18. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** This project is subject to the applicable fees outlined in Section 423 et seq. Impact Fees. The Eastern Neighborhoods Public Benefits Fund is implemented in part through district-specific Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee which applies to the Project Area. Fees shall be assessed on mixed use projects according to the gross square feet of each use in the project. The project is within the Impact Fee Tier 1. As of the date of this letter, Tier 1 requires $8.85 per gross square-foot of residential space and $6.64 per gross square-foot of non-residential space. For the most up-to-date schedule, please refer to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) fee register: [http://sfdbi.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=2570](http://sfdbi.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=2570).
Prior to the issuance by DBI of the first site or building permit for a development project, the sponsor of any project containing space subject to the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee shall pay to the Treasurer according to the schedule in Table 423.3. Planning Code Section 423.3 also provides alternatives satisfying this requirement.

19. **First Source Hiring.** 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 proposes more than ten dwelling units and therefore 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)

20. **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.

21. **The Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF).** TIDF is an impact fee levied on new development citywide to offset new development’s impacts on the transit system. Effective February 1, 2013, it lowers the threshold for triggering the TIDF from 3000 square feet of new development to 800 square feet. The term “new development” for a mixed use proposal refers to the non-residential portion of the project. Please be advised that the proposed project will trigger the payment of TIDF prior to issuance of the first construction document. Please be aware that an ongoing process – the Transportation Sustainability Program – may eventually replace the Transit Impact Development Fee. You can find more information about this program here: [http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3035](http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3035).
PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** In general, the massing is appropriate for this site. The Planning Department appreciates that the project is broken up into distinct masses above the podium level.

   As proposed, the podium-level open space is divided into three small courtyards. The Planning Department recommends aggregating the open space to achieve a single, large space, which will be more usable by occupants.

   - The small open space at the eastern portion of the site is especially narrow and will be of limited use. The Department recommends flipping the ‘C’-shaped building at the eastern portion of the site so that this smaller courtyard becomes contiguous with the central courtyards.

   - In its proposed location, the bridge between the bridge between the eastern and western portions of the building visually divides the open space and will shade large portions of it. If it is to be retained in the design, the Department recommends that the bridge be located so as to provide as much unobstructed open space as possible with minimal shading of the rear yard.

2. **Vehicle Circulation, Access and Parking.** The amount of space devoted to loading and parking access on 19th Street is excessive. Combine the loading and garage access so that only one curb cut is needed and the street frontage devoted to vehicle entry is minimized.

3. **Street Frontage.** The entry to the residential lobby should be a celebrated, prominent part of the façade, distinguished in depth, width, and height. Given its location in the center of the building, the entry could also be an opportunity to break up the larger 3rd street elevation into smaller components.

4. **Architecture.** At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary; the Planning Department will provide further detailed design review upon subsequent submission.

   - The Planning Department appreciates the substantial mass break along the 3rd Street façade. In addition to this larger break, the façade should feature fine-grained articulation to reduce the appearance of mass. The Department recommends an exploration of ways in which portions of the façade can be pushed outward with projecting bays and balconies, or pulled inward with terraces, to give a more varied texture and fine-grained scale appropriate to a residential building. Vertical articulation is recommended.

   - As proposed, the placement and depth of the balconies appears somewhat rigid. When creatively employed, balconies are an opportunity to add variations to the façade plane and visual interest. The Department recommends further exploration of the balcony design and arrangement.
• The building should clearly read as a residential structure. The texture of the proposed skin, with its emphasis on long rows of flat windows, gives the impression of an office or institutional use. The Department recommends enhancing residential features such as balconies or operable windows.

• The break in massing as the building turns the corner of 19th and 3rd Streets provides an opportunity for a distinct expression at the corner; the Department recommends further exploration of this element.

• It is expected that the architecture and quality of execution will be superior. High quality materials combined with exceptional articulation and detailing on all visible facades will be essential to a successful project.

• The Planning Department expects a high quality of design that responds to its context with a consistent composition of building components, materiality, and other architectural features that reference the scale and proportion of the surrounding building forms and components.

5. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor will 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 Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval.

• On the subject block, 3rd Street is identified as a Commercial Throughway, and 19th Street is identified as a Mixed-use Street. See [http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/) to identify relevant street types and improvements for the project frontage.

• If street improvements are being considered, project sponsors should contact 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](http://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 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 **February 9, 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

cc: 2177 3rd Street, LLC, Property Owner
Ben A. Fu, Current Planning
Julian Bañales, Current Planning
Alexis Smith, Citywide Planning and Analysis
Jerry Robbins, MTA
Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
PLANNING BULLETIN

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.
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
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) 558-6054

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
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.