DATE: August 15, 2013
TO: Jack Sylvan, Forest City Development California
FROM: Joshua Switzky, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2013.0970 for Pier 70 – Waterfront Site

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Rich Sucre, at (415) 575-9108 or richard.sucre@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

[Signature]

Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 14, 2013
Case No.: 2013.0970U
Project Address: Pier 70 Waterfront Site
Block/Lot: 4052/001
Zoning: M-2 (Heavy Industrial) Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Central Waterfront Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Jack Sylvan, Forest City Development CA
(415) 593-4249
Staff Contact: Rich Sucre – (415) 575-9108
richard.sucre@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 and state agencies such as the Port of San Francisco, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the State Lands Commission, 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.

This Preliminary Project Assessment Letter covers the area known as the “Waterfront Site,” which is part of the larger redevelopment of Pier 70, which is located along the San Francisco’s Central Waterfront on property owned and managed by the Port of San Francisco. Other areas, including the “Historic Core” “Crane Cove Park” and “BAE Systems,” are not subject to this letter, though may be referenced as related to the proposed project.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project consists of the redevelopment of approximately twenty-eight acres (identified as the “Waterfront Site”) of the former industrial shipyard, Pier 70. The Waterfront Site would be developed into a new mixed-use community with new commercial office, new residential development, and a new retail, and arts component, along with new above-grade and below-grade parking, approximately seven acres of a new and expanded public parks and shoreline access, and new public roads and circulation improvements. The proposed project also includes the rehabilitation and adaptive
reuse of Buildings 2, 12 and 21, which contribute to the eligible Pier 70 National Register Historic District. Overall, the proposed project would construct a maximum of 3.25 million gross square feet (gsf) in four phases over a ten-to-fifteen year period. Currently, the proposed project is within the conceptual design phase, and is subject to change as based upon further review and refinement with the Planning Department and other public agencies, community outreach, market conditions and the environmental review process. The program for specific areas may shift between commercial or residential, as detailed within the “flexible zoning scheme.”

As detailed by the project sponsor, Forest City Development, in conjunction with the Port of San Francisco, the proposed project currently anticipates:

- **Residential** – Development of approximately 950 new dwelling units consisting of approximately 800,000 gsf, with a proposed project variant of up to 2000 units. As part of this residential program, Building 2 would be rehabilitated into approximately 120 dwelling units (consisting of approximately 110,000 gsf).\(^1\)

- **Commercial Office** – Construction of up to 2.25 million gsf of Class A Office and Research/Development space. As part of the commercial development, a portion of Building 12 would be rehabilitated into commercial office space (consisting of approximately 60,000 gsf).

- **Retail and Arts** – Construction of up to 400,000 gsf of new ground floor commercial retail and arts activity space, including small scale local production and small business incubator uses. Approximately 120,000 gsf of the retail and arts space would result from the construction of Buildings E-1A and E-1B, and approximately 115,000 gsf would result from the rehabilitation of Buildings 12 and 21.

- **Parking** – The proposal would provide parking within up to three newly-constructed district parking facilities and/or dispersed within buildings housing other uses, based upon the following maximum rates:
  - Residential Condominium Units: 1.0 space per dwelling unit;
  - Residential Rental Unit: 0.5 space per dwelling unit;
  - Commercial (includes office, restaurant, retail and arts, and all other uses): .9 spaces per 1,000 gsf of floor area

- **Open Space and Recreation** – The project includes construction of approximately seven acres of new public open space and recreational areas consisting of: approximately 3.9 acres for the Slipway Commons Waterfront Park; 0.6 acres for Market Square, located between Building 2 and 12; and, approximately 1.7 acres of useable rooftop open space on the district parking facilities.

- **Infrastructure Development** – The infrastructure development would include a) site preparation, including remediation of contaminated soils, grading, soil compaction and stabilization,

---
\(^1\) The Master Developer and the Port propose to examine different flexible zoning arrangements during the Project Entitlement phase, including Project variants with up to 2,000 residential units and corresponding reductions in commercial space within the sitewide maximum development envelope of 3.25 million gsf of space. These Project variants will be subject to environmental and public review during the Entitlement process.
construction and installation of water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and utility infrastructure, and subsurface improvements to improve seismic conditions; and b) construction of streets and walkways, shoreline improvements, public access, and parks.

Currently, the Waterfront Site uses include vehicular storage, arts and industrial uses, as well as a number of vacant areas.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project will require the following documentation as part of the environmental review process, which must be completed before any project approval may be granted.

Environmental Evaluation Application: In order to facilitate environmental review and comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the project sponsor will be required to submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). The EEA should include a detailed project description that includes information such as project phasing, and off-site improvements. If a Special Use District (SUD) is proposed, as discussed below under “Planning Code Text and Zoning Map Amendments,” then the project description would need to be revised to include the SUD, and the potential physical environmental effects of the SUD would need to be evaluated. The CEQA document, most likely an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), will examine the SUD as a whole. A cumulative analysis that includes reasonably foreseeable projects in the Pier 70 project area and project vicinity will also be required. The following PPA does not address portions of Pier 70 outside of the Waterfront Site, although much of what follows may likely be required for those other areas.

The information in the EEA shall be supplemented with the following background studies:

- **Aesthetics.** The proposed project consists of construction of a new mixed-use multi-phase development and the rehabilitation of the Waterfront Site portion of Pier 70, located along the Central Waterfront. 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 Planning Department will require photomontages of the proposed project buildings from to-be-determined public viewpoints within its surroundings. At minimum, the Department/Environmental Planning 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 the quality of street view corridors identified in the General Plan. Specific viewpoints will be selected based on a level of visual sensitivity, as well as to evaluate the project’s potential implications on the skyline and to urban form. Whether night time photomontages are needed or not will be determined as part of the scoping process. An assessment of cumulative conditions will also be required.

- **Transportation Study.** Based on a review of the plans submitted as part of Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA), the Planning Department has determined that a Transportation Study is required. As part of any future analysis, the Department will focus on trip generation, intersection level of service, transit capacity, pedestrian and bicycle access and facilities, emergency access, loading and parking. Impacts of construction will also have to be assessed.
The Department/Environmental Planning will require information on the circulation plan for all travel modes. Any proposed changes to roadway and intersection configuration, transit routes and service, and pedestrian and bicycle circulation will be included in the analysis and will require close coordination with SFMTA, DPW, the Port and Planning Department. An assessment of cumulative conditions will also be required. Upon submittal of an EEA, the Planning Department will provide additional guidance related to the process for selecting a transportation consultant and direct the development of the scope of work for the analysis with the transportation consultant.

- **Archeological Study.** According to the PPA application, project implementation would entail soil disturbing activities. It appears that construction would result in extensive excavation. Therefore, the project is subject to preliminary archeological review by Department staff. This review will commence after submittal of an EEA and geotechnical study/studies. The Department/Environmental Planning will need information regarding excavation depths and locations. At that juncture, Environmental Planning staff will evaluate whether additional reporting, research and possibly a testing plan would be required to avoid potentially adverse effects to known or potential archeological resources.

- **Historic Architectural Resources.** The Waterfront Site has been identified as part of the Pier 70 Historic District, which has been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Currently, the proposal calls for the rehabilitation of Buildings 2, 12 and 21, and the demolition of contributing and non-contributing resources of the Pier 70 National Register Historic District.

To assist in analysis of the proposed project, the Department will require submittal of a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) to be prepared by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in Historic Architecture or Architectural History. In evaluating the proposed project, the architecture, massing, height, materials, and articulation of the proposed new construction should be analyzed according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. In addition, the project analysis should also examine the demolition of existing contributing and non-contributing resources and the impact upon the district, as a whole. Given the context of the new proposal within the historic district, the new construction should be designed to compatible with the contributing resources, and have minimal impact upon district’s historic fabric and character-defining features. In addition, the proposal will need to examine other nearby projects, including the proposed development at the “Historic Core” and “Crane Cove Park,” for cumulative effects upon the historic district. Additional comments will be provided upon submittal of the EEA and HRE.

Prior to engaging a historic resource consultant, please ensure that the scope of all required documents are reviewed and approved by the Department’s preservation staff, in consultation with the assigned environmental planner.

- **Hazardous Materials.** The project sponsor shall submit the Regional Water Quality Control Boards Approved Remedial Action Plan approved in 2012 and Draft Risk Management Plan as well as background documents regarding hazardous materials on the site.
• **Air Quality.** The proposed project would likely exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is likely to be required.

Project-related excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blow 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). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In addition to construction dust, demolition and construction activities would require the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment, which emit diesel particulate matter (DPM). DPM is a designated toxic air contaminant, which 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 construction vehicles and equipment.

Lastly, the proposed project is likely to require at least one diesel back-up generator which would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. During the environmental review process the proposed project will be reviewed to determine whether mitigation measures in the form of either construction emissions minimization measures or air filtration and ventilation mitigation measures 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.

• **Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** The project sponsor and its consultant will be required to complete the Planning Department’s Greenhouse Gas Emissions Checklist, which will be provided after submittal of the EEA. The checklist includes a list of pertinent City regulations, ordinances and other requirements that reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions consistent with the City’s Greenhouse Gas reduction strategy. Projects that do not comply with an element of the checklist may be determined inconsistent with San Francisco’s qualified GHG reduction strategy and may require the development of specific mitigation as part of an EIR to achieve compliance.

• **Geotechnical Study.** The project sponsor will be required to submit a geotechnical study that investigates the soils underlying the site, possible foundation types and any geotechnical concerns related to the type(s) of foundation system(s) contemplated. The geotechnical study should determine whether the site is subject to liquefaction and should highlight any recommendations for mitigating potential impacts, as applicable, associated with any of the
geotechnical concerns identified in the study. This is especially applicable to the areas with historic fill and the historic slipways proposed for change of use.

- **Noise Measurements.** The project site is located in an area bounded by Illinois Street and the “Hill” subdistrict, the “Historic Core” subdistrict, “BAE Systems” ship repair, the former Potrero Power Plant, and the San Francisco Bay. The project involves siting new noise-sensitive uses (e.g., residential uses) and other non-residential uses on the Waterfront Site. Given the mixed use nature of the project proposal, the Planning Department will require preparation of a noise technical memorandum that describes the noise potential of proposed project operations, as well as the effects of existing adjacent industrial operations on proposed noise-sensitive uses. The noise memorandum should include discussion related to loading and deliveries, and operation of industrial uses in close proximity to residences and other noise-sensitive uses. Any increases in traffic levels that affect ambient noise levels should also be discussed. In addition, detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase shall be provided to assess construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible. The project, therefore, would require a robust noise study by a noise consultant. The consultant will be required to prepare a scope of work in consultation with the Environmental Planning case manager prior to performing the analysis.

- **Stormwater Management Ordinance.** The City and County of San Francisco (and the Port of San Francisco’s) Stormwater Management Ordinance (SMO) became effective on May 22, 2010. This ordinance requires that any project, such as this one, resulting in a ground disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP), consistent with the November 2009 Stormwater Design Guidelines (SDG). Responsibility for review and approval of the SCP is with the Port of San Francisco. The initial CEQA evaluation of a project will broadly discuss how the SMO will be implemented. The project’s environmental evaluation would generally evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and Low Impact Design (LID) 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.

- **Sea Level Rise.** The Port of San Francisco has prepared maps showing the areas along the San Francisco waterfront that are within the Port jurisdiction and would be subject to inundation during a 100-year flood taking into account a sea level rise of 15 inches by 2050 and 55 inches by 2100. The Department is aware that the Waterfront Site project is being designed to address sea level rise and this information should be included as part of the EEA. The EIR will address sea level rise in relation to the proposed project.

- **SFPUC Water Assessment.** A Water Assessment (WA) will likely be required for the proposed project. The SFPUC is in need of specific project information in order to prepare the WA for the proposed project. The SFPUC will prepare the project WA with project description details provided by the project sponsor to the SFPUC in the form of a Project Demand Memo (memo) to support preparation of the WA. As part of the memo, the project sponsor shall provide 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.
Once the project sponsor provides the memo, the SFPUC will complete the WA within 90 days. The SFPUC will submit the WA to its Commission for adoption. 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 WA.

The EIR will also discuss wastewater treatment capacity. The SFPUC will review the project’s wastewater generation rates to determine if there is adequate wastewater treatment capacity. The project sponsor will be required to submit wastewater generation rates as part of this review. Environmental Planning staff will consult with the SFPUC during environmental review.

- **Shadow.** Planning Code Section 295 (“Proposition K”) restricts new shadow upon public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department (RPD) by any structure exceeding 40 feet, unless the Planning Commission finds the impact to be less than significant. In addition to studying affected open spaces owned by RPD for Proposition K purposes, the environmental analysis will need to study the impact of the development on other public open spaces as well. As such, a detailed shadow study of the proposed project will be required so as to respond to the broader significance criterion on the CEQA Checklist which requires analysis of whether the project would, “Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?” The EIR would identify any proposed parks on the project site that are proposed for transfer to RPD, if any.

- **Wind Analysis.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building(s) over 80 feet in height. The project therefore would require an initial review by a wind consultant, including a recommendation as to whether a wind tunnel analysis is needed. The consultant 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.

- **Biological Resources.** Due to its location adjacent to the San Francisco Bay shoreline, the proposed project will be reviewed to determine whether impacts to biological resources would occur. Biological surveys and/or studies of terrestrial, avian, and aquatic species on and near the project site will be required. Any biological surveys must be conducted by a qualified biologist and a scope of work must be approved by Environmental Planning prior to commencement.

- **Alternatives.** In light of the fact that the proposed project will evolve as the sponsor addresses the Department’s List of Post-Term Sheet Design Items (attached), the EIR may need to analyze one or more project variants and/or CEQA Alternatives. Pursuant to CEQA, alternatives will be developed to address identified significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. The preferred project, variants, and CEQA Alternatives will need to be defined before the publication of the Draft EIR.

- **Approvals.** The EIR will need to describe the project approvals anticipated for the proposed project, including approvals by other agencies, as well as oversight by other regulatory agencies.
Based on a preliminary review of the information contained within the PPA application, it appears that the project, given its size, scope and mix of uses, could have a significant effect on the environment, necessitating preparation of an EIR. The first step of the environmental review process is to prepare a Notice of Preparation (NOP). The NOP consists of a project description and indicates to the general public which of the environmental topic areas may be potentially significant and the subject of the EIR. In consultations between Environmental Planning staff and the environmental consultant, the project sponsor may choose to prepare a full-scope EIR that would be preceded by an NOP without an accompanying Initial Study. The Initial Study contains all topics on the City’s standardized CEQA checklist and assists in scoping those environmental topics that require further analysis in the EIR. A public scoping meeting may be required for 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

If there are any questions related to the environmental review comments above, please feel free to contact Andrea Contreras at (415) 575-9044 or Rick Cooper at (415) 575-9027 directly.

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

The proposed 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. For the sake of the directions provided below, “Master Plan Adoption” refers to the initial set of approvals that set forth the overall zoning controls that will entitle the anticipated development. Given the uniqueness of the proposal, the approvals described below are classified into three levels:

(I) **“Master Plan Adoption”** that would entitle the broad land use program and building envelopment allowances at a master plan level;

(II) **“Development Phase”** approval that would enable a given phase to move forward; and

(III) **“Building Construction”** Phase. For this phase, comments assume typical set of requirements as any other project under the land use jurisdiction of the Planning Department.

(I) **ACTIONS REQUIRED AT MASTER PLAN ADOPTION**

1. **Planning Code Text and Zoning Map Amendments.** The Pier 70 Waterfront Site is located within M-2 (Heavy Industrial) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. These zoning, height, and bulk controls were kept in place by the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan (effective January 2009), in anticipation of being rezoned as part of this more localized strategy for Pier 70. Though the proposed land uses could potentially be permitted within the existing zoning, housing would require a Conditional Use Authorization, and both housing and office uses would be generally inconsistent with the intention of the current industrial zoning. Therefore, the Planning Department recommends that the site be rezoned, applying new or existing mixed use district(s) in which the proposed land
uses are principally permitted. Due to the uniqueness of the proposal, it will likely be necessary to establish a Special Use District (SUD) on the site. Note: this SUD may potentially encompass a broader area, including other development sites within Pier 70 that are not part of the Waterfront site (including the “Illinois/20th Street” parcels and the “Hoe-Down Yard” parcels). Additionally, the proposed project is seeking building heights taller than the existing 40-ft height limit on a substantial portion of the site, along with substantial bulk allowances.

The rezoning, including establishment of an SUD and new height and bulk controls, would require Planning Code Text and Zoning Map amendments, which are legislative actions that require Mayoral and Board of Supervisor approval following Planning Commission approval.

Planning Code and Zoning Map Amendments can be initiated either by the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, or by application from the property owner. An application for a Text and Map Amendment (referred to as a Legislation Change Application) is available for download from the Planning Department’s website.

Due to the master-development nature of the proposal, a separate development controls and guideline document should be created specifically for this project; the Planning Code would then reference this document (discussed further below).

2. **General Plan Amendments.** Given the scale and the prominence of the proposal, Department staff would thoroughly review the elements of the General Plan and Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans to verify if any amendments are required to figures, maps, and text from these plans. Due to the project’s scale, an amendment to the General Plan would likely be a necessary action. General Plan Amendments may be initiated by the Planning Commission or by application from the property owner. General Plan Amendments can be applied for using the Legislation Change Amendment Application, as referenced above.

3. **Design Review and Entitlement Requirements.** Given the uniqueness of the proposal and project site, particularly the overall master plan, multi-phase nature, and the requirements for a coordinated construction with the delivery of new infrastructure and community benefits, entitlement provisions in the Planning Code such as Conditional Use and Planned Unit Developments may not be sufficient to deal with the project’s complexity. As a property owned by the Port of San Francisco, entitlement jurisdiction, and roles between the Port, Planning Commission and Department staff, Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) and other bodies have yet to be defined. The Department expects the Development and Disposition Agreement (DDA) between the City, Port and master developer to provide a broad entitlement for the development’s overall program and zoning, but individual phases and vertical development will require further approval at either staff or Commission (Port or Planning) level, depending on the particular uses proposed, whether exceptions are requested, and other factors. The Planning Department will work with the Port and the Project Sponsor in devising an entitlement process that both addresses the Project Sponsor’s need for a degree of certainty and assures quality development in meeting the City and Port’s objectives for the site. Discussions between the Department and the Port are ongoing to identify the best structure for entitlement process and documentation.
4. **Master Development Documents.** Given the scale and scope of the Project, its master plan nature, and the need for Planning Code and General Plan amendments, the Planning Department will require the creation of a set of plans that will both articulate the vision and overall intent of the Project, and that will provide standards, guidelines and instructions on how the site is to be built out. These documents will be companion exhibits to the DDA and will also be embedded or cross-referenced in the Planning Code and other approval framework documents as appropriate. Such documents may include:

   a) **Concept Plan.** The Concept Plan should provide a broad overview of the goals and objectives of the project at a high level. It should set the context for the development and describe the land-use, urban design and other strategies that are to be employed to reach the overall objectives. The Concept Plan should also provide indications of how the project is expected to perform in terms of land use and transportation efficiency, urban design quality and user experience, among other factors.

   b) **Development Controls and Design Guidelines** (including entitlement framework). The Development Controls and Design Guidelines should provide the majority of requirements for building design including, in part, bulk reduction (e.g. major articulation breaks for apparent face requirements), articulation and modulation, frontage activation (by use), open space, building materials and treatment, parking and loading entries, and utilities. This document should specifically address an individual building’s relationship to the public realm, how the individual building fits in with the Waterfront Site’s overall urban design strategy and its relationship to the larger rehabilitation and reuse of Pier 70, adjacent properties (such as the closed Potrero Power Plant), and the rest of the City.

   c) **Streetscape and Open Space Plan.** The Streetscape and Open Space Plan should discuss the intent of the parks and public realm network by describing the proposed programming and general design guidelines for main open spaces. This Plan should also lay out the proposed street and pedestrian network describing the network’s hierarchy, the intended function of each street, and include design and functional specifications for each street and intersection. The Plan should also describe how each street and open space will to relate their bordering buildings and the overall development. This plan should also describe how Pier 70 Historic interpretation is programmed into the site.

   d) **Transportation and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan.** The Transportation Plan should describe the overall transportation goals, principles, commitments (infrastructure delivery, financial and programmatic) and strategies for the development emphasizing ways to maximize the ability to travel by bicycling, transit, and by foot. The plan should describe expected transportation improvements that would be incorporated into the project; it should discuss strategies around managing parking and loading particularly to assure they are minimized. Also, the Plan should contain TDM strategies that will encourage people to get around using modes other than private automobiles for most trips.

   e) **Infrastructure Plan.** The Infrastructure Plan should detail the general approach and strategy for the design and construction of the infrastructure necessary to support the proposed project.

   f) **Sustainability Plan.** The Sustainability Plan should provide a comprehensive strategy to achieve the goal of becoming a model of environmental sustainability, providing both
metrics as well as design, infrastructure and managements strategies the project will implement to achieve these metrics. As a large master-planned, mostly newly-built neighborhood, this project has the opportunity to meet and exceed citywide environmental standards by pursuing coordinated district-level strategies.

5. **Shadow Study.** Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis be conducted for any project greater than 40-feet in height relative to any property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Commission. Further shadow analysis will be required as part of the environmental review. (Refer to Shadow in the Environmental Review Section)

**II) ACTION REQUIRED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF A MAJOR PHASE OF CONSTRUCTION**

6. **Development Phase Approval.** As part of the entitlement framework, provisions for development phase approvals will need to be specified. In similar master plan projects, development phase approvals included assurances that sufficient infrastructure and community benefits are delivered proportional with development proposed in the same phase.

7. **Subdivision Map Approvals.** The proposal entails creating new parcels for the project site. All subdivisions will require approval by the Planning Department to assure consistency with the General Plan and previous approvals. Such approvals are most likely to be timed with the Development Phase approvals. Subdivision (Parcel Map / Final Map) applications are handled by the Department of Public Works – Bureau of Street and Mapping. Please refer to the Department of Public Work’s website for the Lot Subdivision Application.

8. **General Plan Referrals.** General Plan Referrals will be required for the Disposition and Development Agreement and other master-level project approvals. Subsequent General Plan Referrals will also be required for any right-of-way dedication, vacation, official curb line change, subdivision and other land-use actions requiring legislation, on an ongoing basis as the project is built out. The Disposition and Development Agreement and other master-level project approvals will need to include a set of master findings that demonstrate how the overall development is in general conformity with the General Plan and Panning Code Section 101.1. In general, subsequent General Plan Referral applications can rely on these “master” general plan findings to the extent feasible. General Plan Referrals are usually applied through the Agency seeking the legislation on the project’s behalf. Please refer to the Department’s website for the General Plan Referral Application.

**III) ACTIONS REQUIRED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS**

9. **Office Allocation.** Planning Code Section 321 outlines the requirements for establishing new office development over 25,000 gross square feet (gsf). The project would require an Office Development Authorization from the Planning Commission for each individual development that establishes more than 25,000 gross square feet of new office space. As of July 2013, the “Small Cap” contains approximately 1.2 million square feet and the “Large Cap” contains approximately 2.2 million square feet. Any office portion of the project would be required to apply for an office allocation. Please refer to the Department’s website for the Office Allocation Application.
10. **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)

11. **Flood Notification.** The project site is located in a flood-prone area. Please see the attached bulletin regarding review of the project by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

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

13. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** Since the project would construct more than 3,000 gsf of office space, the proposed project would be subject to development impact fees per Planning Code Section 411.

Please be aware that an ongoing process, the Transportation Sustainability Program, may eventually replace the Transit Impact Development Fee. Additional information is available on the Department’s website under “Plans & Programs” “Complete List of Plans and Projects” “Transportation Sustainability Program.”
14. **Jobs-Housing Linkage Program.** Since the project would construct more than 25,000 gsf of office space, the proposed project would be subject to a development impact fee per Planning Code Section 413, which also provides alternate options for fee payment.

15. **Childcare Requirement.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 414, any project within the City that includes 50,000 gross square feet of office or hotel use is required to comply with the Childcare requirement, which can be satisfied in several ways including the provision of on-site child care to paying an in-lieu fee.

16. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** As outlined in Planning Code Section 423, the proposed project is subject to Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees for the construction of new residential and non-residential space. However, it should be noted that City approval of a Special Use District and Development Agreement associated with the project will likely alter these requirements, as well as other fees described above in items 13-15, as part of a larger package of public benefits included in site development.

17. **Below Market Rate Housing Requirement.** Pursuant to Planning Code section 415.1-415.9, projects where the City has a proprietary interest that include ten or more units are required to include 15% percent of the on-site units as below market-rate units, construct affordable units off-site equal to 20%, pay an in-lieu fee, or a combination of the three. While these are the minimum rates for typical projects under the recently passed Proposition C in November 2012 (“Housing Trust Fund”), these rates could be adjusted per the DDA.

18. **Building Permit Applications** will be required for the proposed new construction and rehabilitation of existing buildings on the subject lot. Since the property is managed by the Port of San Francisco, the development agreement should clarify the building permit review process between the Port of San Francisco and the Department of Building Inspection.

19. **Mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.** Mandatory interdepartmental project review is required for new construction buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified as Seismic Hazard Zones.

If there are any questions related to the project approvals above, please feel free to contact Rich Sucre at (415) 575-9108 or Joshua Switzky at (415) 575-6815.

**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.
Preliminary Project Assessment
August 14, 2013

Case No. 2013.0970U
Pier 70 Waterfront Site

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

Due to the scope of the project and the requirement for rezoning, the comments below are general in nature. The comments identify issues that the Planning Department expects to be addressed through working with the Port and Project Sponsor in refining the project proposal and developing the development standards and guidelines, regulatory mechanisms (e.g. Code amendments), and other Plan documents as described above.

Note: for convenience, the comments below refer occasionally to the Project Sponsor’s proposed designations for site blocks and buildings as shown on Exhibit B, Conceptual Land Use Plan, submitted with the PPA Application.

LAND USE

The Department appreciates that the proposal for Pier 70 includes an impressive diversity of land uses, which are designed to work in a coordinated way to activate and enliven the entire site, and to connect the site with the surrounding Central Waterfront area. The Department also supports high densities at the site, which will help the City meet its regional targets for both jobs and housing. To best fulfill the land use potential on the site and respond to its specific context, the Department recommends:

- An assessment of a broader range of housing unit count, including a more intensive housing presence on the site (e.g. potential conversion of some of the proposed office space or other uses to residential uses). The Project Sponsor currently proposes from 950 up to 2,000 units). The Department feels that the existing and proposed transportation infrastructure and access to the site is potentially more compatible with a higher proportion of residential uses.

- Study the potential impact of the proposed uses, particularly housing, on the nearby ship repair facilities. These ship repair facilities provide an essential PDR use that could not practically be relocated, and thus insulating them from incompatible uses is a priority. The Department feels that the great size of the Pier 70 area and the Waterfront Site specifically provides opportunity to buffer the ship repair facilities from incompatible uses, including a scenario with a greater proportion of housing.

- Study programming and phasing of interim uses on portions of site not being used for construction.

- Further refine the proposed land uses relative to the existing uses proposed within the Planning Code.

URBAN DESIGN

The Department appreciates the proposed diversity of building heights and sizes on the site and the integration of new buildings with rehabilitated historic structures to remain, as this approach helps create an interesting fabric for a new neighborhood. To inform further analysis and determination of the optimal urban form of the site, the Department recommends further analysis and project refinement of the following topics:
• **Overall Building Heights and Massing.** The notable urban form changes proposed require study from a broad urban form perspective and consideration of what the appropriate heights are in the context of other adopted and proposed development plans, and from the perspective of urban design policies for the eastern side of the City. As with all projects of this scale and visibility, Department staff will expect a wide range of visual, wind, shadow and other pertinent analysis before settling on a final set of development controls for the towers. This further analysis and project refinement should particularly include:
  
  o Development of detailed view analyses from Dogpatch, Potrero Hill and other key locations, from multiple perspectives, to inform final height and massing recommendations.
  
  o Development of design guidelines and development standards for the height zones that address the total number of towers, locations, proximity to one another, and architectural quality.
  
  o Development of bulk standards and design guidelines to modulate the masses of larger floor plate buildings.

• **Active Street Walls and Ground Floor Uses.** Exploration of building design options and establishment of design guidelines to create an attractive, pedestrian-friendly building edges and ground floor uses along all public ways and spaces throughout the site. These factors will be critical to create an active environment, provide a active and inviting open spaces and waterfront environment, and relate to adjacent uses. Particular attention should be paid to buildings along 20th Street in order to draw people to the waterfront and open up to the waterfront park at Building 6.

• **Relationship to Adjacent Sites.** Analysis of the massing, street orientation and ground floor uses of buildings along 22nd Street to ensure a strong relationship between the Waterfront site and the Power Plant site.

• **Relationship to Historic Buildings.** Further study of massing options for new structures near historic buildings (Buildings 2, 12, and 113) to assess impacts, and development of design guidelines that expand on the Port’s Pier 70 Preferred Plan Infill Design Criteria to guide future development near historic buildings. In particular, the project should establish future design controls to address the design of Building A-1 and its relationship to Building 113 based on the following concepts:
  
  o Study views from Potrero Hill to historic buildings (especially Buildings 2 and 12) and how new development may alter those views.
  
  o Study and, as much as possible, reduce shadow impacts of new development (particularly the C-1A and C-1B parking structures) on the “Historic Core.”
  
  o Ensure views of Building 113 from the ground plane around Building A-1;
  
  o Provide light to Building 113;
  
  o Accommodate necessary truck loading into Building 113; and,
Celebrate the corner of Louisiana Street (new street) and 20th Street through thoughtful and distinctive architecture and/or streetscape design. The design should communicate the importance of this intersection and invite people onto the Louisiana Street to travel through the site.

- **Design of Parking Structures.** In general, design controls throughout the City require that parking above grade enfronting active streets be wrapped by other uses to a depth of at least 25-feet. Activation of all streets and public spaces is an important consideration for all structures, as is the opportunity to ensure the structure’s long-term flexibility, adaptability to new uses, and maximal incorporation of other uses in addition to parking in these large structures, close to public transit. The project should explore ways to incorporate active uses into these structures to create interesting and dynamic facades and to mitigate their scale. The Department further supports the project’s proposal for useable open space on the rooftops of the district parking structures.

- **Parcelization / Development Variety.** While the relatively small block sizes are encouraging, further controls will be needed to ensure that the scale of development is further broken down. One of the Department’s key experiences with the build-out of various master planned developments is that, regardless of block size, the granularity and variety in parcel and building footprint on each block significantly affects the look and feel of a district, independent of variations in building height or massing. Maintaining and rehabilitating existing buildings currently on site, as proposed, will assist improving the granularity and diversity of the site, but deliberate attention must be paid to this concern overall throughout the site. The Department encourages further massing division below the block scale to ensure variety within each block and reduce the potential for a monolithic quality of the blocks. Techniques used in other master planned areas of the City have included multiple buildings on each block that share common amenities, such as open space and parking facilities; and use of multiple architects on each block.

**SEA LEVEL RISE**

The project site is identified in the *BCDC Shoreline Areas Potentially Exposed To Sea Level Rise - Central Bay* Map as being potentially exposed to an approximate 55-inch sea level rise before the year 2100. As such, incorporated in the Master Development documents described above will need to be concrete design or infrastructure strategies for how to address projected sea level rise over time.

**SITE ACCESS, CIRCULATION & PARKING**

Currently, site access to Pier 70 is severely constrained by its location: the Bay is located to the north and east, a former power plant with limited to no existing access is located to the south (though note that this is a likely redevelopment site), and the entire site is located at a lower grade than adjacent major north-south street (Illinois Street) bordering the area on the west. In addition, I-280 and Potrero Hill present barriers to significant east-west transportation directly into Pier 70, and the main north-south streets, 3rd Street and Illinois Street, have limited capacity. Given the amount of proposed development, the project will have to develop a robust transportation strategy premised on primary access to the site by non-automotive means, incorporating all transportation modes. As discussed above, the project is expected to create a Tranportation Plan that outlines the full inventory of transportation investments, capital
improvements, and ongoing management commitments. To address site access issues, the Department recommends further analysis and project refinement of the following topics:

- **Street Grid, Connectivity and Complete Streets**
  - Maximize connectivity with street and non-vehicular connections to adjacent areas in all directions, including extensions of existing streets and paths and creation of new ones.
  - The Street Plan will need to ensure complete access to a wide range of travel modes particularly for those travelling by bicycle and by foot. New and improved streets shall be designed to Better Streets Plan standards (per preferred sidewalk widths not just minimums) as appropriate for the differing contexts of the site. Additionally street widths should be appropriately proportional to the scale of adjacent buildings.
  - Explore options for connecting the Waterfront Site to the former power plant site to the south, including extending Maryland Street to provide connectivity for all modes of transport, including autos.
  - Explore connecting Michigan Street at-grade to 21st Street to improve site circulation, as opposed to current scenario of Michigan Street ending at 21st Street due to significant site grade change.
  - Identify design elements (signage, street design, clear view corridors) that will provide clarity to pedestrian, bicycle and automobile routes to the waterfront and the site’s various activity nodes and gathering places.
  - Ensure that the 22nd Street termination at the waterfront is clearly public in nature and publicly inviting. Explore whether there should be an extension of the park westerly at that point or a vehicular drop-off/turnaround.

- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation**
  - Further refine the designs for prioritizing bicycles travel in and through the site and designate primary and lesser routes with the relevant design treatment for each.
  - The project must ensure that the Blue Greenway and Bay Trail are fully accommodated;
  - Ensure that the shoreline park offers a clear and inviting blue greenway connection that mitigates conflicts between pedestrians and recreational cyclists and distinguishes spaces to pause and relax.
  - Explore options for creating multiple pedestrian and recreational bicyclist connections from Crane Cove Park through the site to the former power plant site with connections along the waterfront, through buildings, directly along 20th Street, and along both Louisiana and Maryland Streets.
  - Work with Planning, SFMTA, Port and San Francisco Bicycle Coalition to explore design for enhanced bicycle throughway on Illinois St adjacent to American Industrial Center buildings.
  - Refine the design for pedestrian access on 22nd Street as it slopes down to Building 12, potentially involving a generous landscaped staircase on the south side of building C2.
Explore best means to provide significant on-site bicycle parking (centralized location with amenities versus individual buildings – or both). Note that the Board of Supervisors recently adopted new Planning Code standards for bicycle parking citywide; the project should seek to exceed these new minimum standards.

Work with SFMTA to support expansion the geographic scope of bicycle sharing to include Pier 70 and identify potential locations for bike sharing pods.

**Transit Improvements.** The provision of adequate public transit to the site will be critical to making it a success and managing congestion in the area. The Planning Department is engaged in the ongoing Waterfront Transportation Assessment (WTA) to evaluate future conditions and identify priority effective transportation investments. The project sponsor should engage in the discussions surrounding the WTA with Planning, SFMTA, and other relevant City agencies, in order to review the resulting analysis and strike appropriate agreements as to financial or construction contributions to transportation improvements benefitting the Project site. In addition to funding commitments by the project, these could include capital infrastructure investments on the site that will affect the layout and width of streets, the boundaries of blocks and parcels, and overall circulation within the site. While the site is relatively proximate to the 3rd Street light rail line and the 22nd Street Caltrain Station, the Waterfront site is expansive and parts of the eastern portions of the site, including portions where major new development is planned, is a substantial walk from these facilities. Transit enhancements will be necessary to provide adequate access to the site to support the level of development anticipated.

Explore viability of future transit and shuttle options within the site, including where stops would be located and impacts on street design.

Work with City, Port and SFMTA to identify maximum transit service to Pier 70, including extending the T-Line turnaround loop south, new or expanded Muni bus service into the Site and a shuttle service/system serving the Site provided by the project.

Explore with Caltrain JPB necessary and desirable improvements to the 22nd Street Station to enhance access and capacity of this station to serve Pier 70 development.

Explore with WETA, the Port, and other stakeholders, the provision of water-based transportation to a new ferry terminal more closely serving Pier 70, such as at 16th Street, or Pier 70.

**Transportation Demand Management.** The project will be expected to produce a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, as part of the overall Transportation Plan, that implements proven and effective incentives and programs to reduce auto usage and increase usage of transit, cycling and other modes.

**Auto Parking.** The quantity, management, location and design of parking on the site, including the proposed district parking structures, will affect not just the ways people choose to travel to and from the site, but also the feel and function of the site internally. Regarding parking, the Department recommends and notes the following:
The overall quantity of parking and the ratios for different uses must be further analyzed and considered in the context of the Transit First Policy, transportation objectives and modal share objectives for the project, and the parking controls in the adjacent Dogpatch area. The Department notes that the concept of setting variable standards for residential uses based on tenure (i.e., rental vs condo) is a challenging one given that tenure is not something traditionally regulated by Planning, is not fixed at the time of entitlement, and is somewhat fluid over the life of buildings.

Include language in the DDA to address when, and if, during project build-out, transit infrastructure serving the site improves beyond that anticipated by City and project commitments at the time of DDA approval, that parking demand and transportation objectives will be re-assessed at beginning of each project phase to determine whether total parking program can be reduced.

Careful consideration of how to provide vehicular access to district parking, including minimizing conflicts with other modes of transportation.

Further study of how pedestrians will be guided to move from the parking facilities into the core of the site. Please ensure a safe and attractive pedestrian experience.

The relationship between the non-garage parking spaces and garage spaces should be strategically considered to enable a minimal amount of parking outside of the designated garages. The location of parking and loading entries should also be minimized and strategically placed as to ensure a quality public realm and encourage other modes of travel. As part of the overall parking program, you are strongly encouraged to include on-street parking where it can fit, and place as much parking underground as possible, recognizing that soil conditions may add substantial cost. Explore access points between district parking rooftop open space and the mezzanine level of Building 12.

**Loading and Servicing.** The project will need to address the need for service access and loading at appropriate building locations and given proposed uses (i.e., local production requirements for loading docks), in ways that do not compromise the ground level pedestrian experience throughout the site. Specifically, the project should:

- Explore whether site loading be centralized or in certain locations.
- Work with the Port and Orton Development Inc. team to explore how Louisiana Street can accommodate both Building 113 trucks/loading and inviting and attractive pedestrian access.
OPEN SPACE

The proposed project includes open space which will serve both the new neighborhood and open up the waterfront to the surrounding neighborhood and larger City. The Department looks forward to refining the open space layout, design and programming through the coming process, to be reflected in the Open Space Plan discussed above. To ensure open space on the site is maximized in size, as well as in quality for usage and access, the Department recommends and notes the following:

- Further development of feasible program options for the range of open space zones on the site to further the goal of providing an urban waterfront open space that is unique in San Francisco and serves residents, workers, visitors and other community members. Develop clear plans (and guidelines) for access to the waterfront parks from Pier 70 and to the larger Dogpatch/Potrero community.

- Development of design guidelines for buildings fronting the east-west park so that they are publicly inviting and activate the park spaces. Also, explore the opportunity for an indoor/outdoor cultural/performance venue in a building fronting this park (e.g. E1B).

- Explore design options and develop specific guidelines for the building edge, shoreline edge and park elements fronting buildings for buildings fronting the shoreline park to ensure that the park feels public and accommodates pedestrians, recreational bicyclists and provides places to stop and appreciate the waterfront.

- Explore program and design options for how district parking structure rooftops can provide usable open space, including active recreation, not allowed on Public Trust lands. This analysis should explore how to create access along 21st and 22nd Streets to the tops of district parking structures to access these amenities. Develop landscape design guidelines that respect the historic district requirements while also creating flexible, attractive and inviting landscape for the site and acknowledging the community’s desires for green spaces on the waterfront.

- Explore the park sequence/topography along C2 and Building 12 to ensure that the slope and parks can accommodate pedestrian movement and potential programs.

- Refine and possibly reduce the width of the open space setback proposed for the south side of parking garage C-2 to avoid too much unprogrammed, interstitial open spaces on the site and avoid diluting the use of the open space setback abutting Building 12.

- Define location for children’s play area for local residents and visitors.

- Further define the design and uses of the five slipways themselves (that jet into the water) to ensure they are usable and inviting features of the open space network.

- Study the phasing of new open space to ensure that new residents have access to open space in earlier phases of the project.

- Consider design of shoreline open space with Seal Level Rise to insure that open space continues to function.

- Explore how to design/program park area east of H-2 parcel if shoreline access does not continue (or isn’t ready) south along the Power Plant site shoreline.
Further define the access to the open space and specify whether public or private.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The Waterfront Site is part of the eligible Pier 70 National Register Historic District. As we understand, the Port of San Francisco has submitted the nomination forms to list the historic district in the National Register of Historic Places, the federal register of historic properties. The Department appreciates that the proposal has accommodated significant historic properties, which are an essential part of the proposed project. To ensure that these intentions are met, the Department recommends that the project:

- Ensure that all new development and the rehabilitation of Buildings 2, 12 and 21 are completed according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
- Study views to and from Building 12, particularly the amount of reveal of the Building 12 façade from the central open space, specific views from the waterfront, and views south on Maryland Street (and potentially north from south of site).
- Develop design guidelines that recognize the importance of the eastern façade of Building 113, including views of this façade, as well as views north to ship repair and south to Building 2 at the intersection of 20th and Louisiana Streets.
- Develop design guidelines that ensure that Building A-1 is designed so that Building 113 is complemented and views of it can be appreciated from 20th Street.
- Refine the location, orientation and adjacency of new buildings relative to the historic Building 21 as part of the proposed “creative core” portion of the Site.
- Explore a range of movement to, from and through the site to understand how the placements of new development reinforces the overall goal of creating views and unexpected reveals of historic resources on the site and the larger Pier 70.
- Coordinate with the Port and the developer of the Historic Core Subdistrict (Orton Development Inc.) on the development of a Pier 70 district wide historic interpretation program.

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 14, 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:  
Pier 70 Waterfront Site List of Post-Term Sheet Design Items (February 2013)  
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin  
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet  
Pier 70 Proposed Conceptual Land Use Plan
cc:  Jack Sylvan, Forest City (Project Sponsor)  
    Brad Benson, Port of San Francisco  
    David Beaupre, Port of San Francisco  
    Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Mayor’s Office of Economic Dev.  
    Josh Switzky, Citywide Planning Division  
    Steve Wertheim, Citywide Planning Division  
    Richard Sucre, Current Planning Division  
    Rick Cooper, Environmental Planning Division  
    Andrea Contreras, Environmental Planning Division  
    Jerry Robbins, MTA  
    Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
Over the last four months, an interdepartmental team including staff from the Planning Department, OEWD, the Port and SFMTA conducted bi-weekly charettes with Forest City about its preliminary land use plan and urban design framework for the waterfront site portion of Pier 70. City staff also met internally between these charettes to further explore issues and reconcile staff opinions. The charettes were intended to provide general feedback on Forest City’s preliminary plan as the basis for the city and Forest City completing a term sheet for the project and commencing the formal entitlement process.

Forest City revised its plan during the charettes and many of the fundamental ideas informing the plan were vetted and discussed by city staff. At the conclusion of this early process, staff expressed support for Forest City’s general approach to the site.

However, the city team and Forest City identified a number of important issues that were too specific to be addressed prior to the endorsement of a term sheet but that require additional discussion and study during the entitlement process. The issues listed below will be addressed post-term sheet as the CEQA analysis is conducted, specific open space designs and infrastructure plans are developed and a “design for development” type document is prepared for the project.

**Historic Buildings and Views**

1. Study views to and from Building 12, particularly the amount of reveal of the Building 12 façade from the central open space, specific views from the waterfront, and views south on Maryland Street (and potentially north from south of site).
2. Develop design guidelines that recognize the importance of the Building 113 eastern façade and views to that façade, north to ship repair and south to Building 2 at the intersection of 20th and Louisiana streets.
3. Develop design guidelines that ensure that Building A-1 is designed so that Building 113 is complemented and views of it can be appreciated from 20th Street.
4. Refine location, orientation and adjacency of new buildings relative to the historic Building 21 as part of the “creative core” portion of the Site.
5. Study views from Potrero Hill to historic buildings (especially Bldg 12 and Bldg 2) and how new development may alter those views.
6. Study and, as much as possible, mitigate shadow impacts of new development (particularly the C-1A and C-1B parking structures) on the Historic Core courtyard.
7. Explore a range of movement to, from and through the site to understand how the
placements of new development reinforces the overall goal of creating views and unexpected reveals of historic resources on the site and the larger Pier 70.

**Circulation Plan and Access (pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular)**

1. Explore vehicular circulation options for connecting the waterfront site to the former Power Plant site to the south, including extending Maryland Street.
2. Explore connecting Michigan Street at-grade to 21st Street to improve site circulation (as opposed to Michigan St dead ending at 21st St. due to significant site grade change)
3. Refine plan for vehicular access to district parking — where from, what route, how not to conflict with bikes?
4. Explore options for creating multiple pedestrian and recreational bicyclist connections from Crane Cove Park through the site to the former Potrero Power Plant site with connections along the waterfront, through buildings, directly along 20th Street, and along both Louisiana and Maryland Streets.
5. Study further how pedestrians will be guided to move from the parking facilities into the core of the site. Ensure a safe and attractive pedestrian experience.
6. Ensure that the shoreline park offers a clear and inviting blue greenway connection that mitigates conflicts between pedestrians and recreational cyclists and distinguishes spaces to pause and relax.
7. Identify design elements (signage, street design, clear view corridors) that will provide clarity to pedestrian, bicycle and automobile routes to the waterfront and the site’s various activity nodes and gathering places.
8. Explore how to provide inviting pedestrian access between larger floorplate buildings (B1-B2 and H1-H2) to offer maximum accessibility and ground plane activation.
9. Explore viability of and design approaches to potential access between district parking rooftop open space and the Building 12 mezzanine level.
10. Ensure that the 22nd Street termination at the waterfront is clearly public in nature and publicly inviting. Should there be an extension of the park westerly at that point or a vehicular drop-off/turnaround?
11. Explore how to design/program park area east of H-2 parcel if shoreline access does not continue (or isn’t ready) south along the Power Plant site shoreline.
12. Further refine the design of the proposed shared/narrow street between parcels E3/5 and E2/4/6, consistent with Better Streets Plan polices. These roadways in particular offer opportunities to explore and implement innovative street designs.
13. Refine the design for pedestrian access on 22nd Street as it slopes down to Building 12, potentially involving a generous landscaped staircase on the south side of the C2 district parking structure.
14. Further refine the designs for prioritizing bicycles travel in and through the Site and designate primary and lesser thoroughfares with the relevant design treatment for each.
15. Explore best means to provide significant on-site bicycle parking (centralized location with amenities versus individual buildings – or both).
16. Work with SFMTA on potential locations for bike sharing pods.
17. Work with City, SFMTA, Port and San Francisco Bicycle Coalition to explore design for enhanced bicycle throughway on Illinois St adjacent to American Industrial Center buildings
18. Address need for service access and loading at appropriate building locations and given proposed uses (i.e., local production requirements for loading docks). Explore whether site loading be centralized or in certain locations.
19. Work with the Port and Orton Development Inc. team to explore how Louisiana Street can accommodate both Building 113 trucks/loading and inviting and attractive pedestrian access.

Transit and Parking
1. Explore viability of future transit and shuttle options within the Site, including where stops would be located and impacts on street design.
2. Work with City, Port and SFMTA to identify maximum transit service to Pier 70, including extending the T-Line turnaround loop south, Muni bus service into the Site and a shuttle service/system serving the Site.
3. Include language in DDA to address when, and if, transit infrastructure serving the site improves in later phases of the project, that actual parking demand will be assessed at beginning of each project phase to determine whether total parking program is needed or can be reduced.
4. Explore appropriate transportation demand management measures to reduce the number of automobile trips to the area and to increase transit usage.

Open Space
1. Further develop and test feasible program options for the range of open space zones on the site to further the goal of providing an urban waterfront open space that is unique in San Francisco and serves residents, workers, visitors and other community members.
2. Develop design guidelines for buildings fronting the east-west park section (E1A, E1B, E3 and E5) so that they are publicly inviting and activate the park spaces. Also, explore the design implications of the opportunity for an indoor/outdoor cultural/performance venue on E1B.
3. Explore design options and develop specific guidelines for the building edge, shoreline edge and park elements fronting buildings E5, E6, and H2 to ensure that the park feels public and accommodates pedestrians, recreational bicyclists and places to stop and appreciate the waterfront.
4. Explore how to create access along 21st and 22nd Streets to the tops of district parking
structures. Further explore program and design options for how district parking structure rooftops can provide useable open space, including active recreation, not allowed on Public Trust lands.

5. Develop clear plans (and guidelines) for access to the waterfront parks from Pier 70 and to the larger Dogpatch/Potrero community.

6. Develop landscape design guidelines that respect the historic district requirements while also creating flexible, attractive and inviting landscape for the site and acknowledging the community’s desires for green spaces on the waterfront.

7. Explore the park sequence/topography along C2 and Building 12 to ensure that the slope and parks can accommodate pedestrian movement and potential programs.

8. Refine and possibly reduce the width of the open space setback proposed for the south side of parking garage C-2 to avoid too much unprogrammed, interstitial open spaces on the site and avoid diluting the use of the open space setback abutting Building 12.

9. Define location for children’s play area for local residents and visitors.

10. Further define the design and uses of the five slipways themselves (that jet into the water) to ensure they are usable and inviting features of the open space network.

11. Study the phasing of new open space to ensure that new residents have access to open space in earlier phases of the project.

12. Consider design of shoreline open space with Seal Level Rise to insure that open space continues to function.

**Land Use, Massing and Height**

1. Further develop detailed view analyses from Dogpatch, Potrero Hill and other key locations, from multiple perspectives, to inform final height and massing recommendations consistent with height zones established during charrette process.

2. Consistent with the height zones established during the charrette process, develop design guidelines and development standards for the height zones that address the total number of towers, locations, proximity to one another, and architectural quality.

3. Explore how to create interesting and dynamic facades on the district parking structures to mitigate their scale and study the potential to incorporate ground floor uses that (i) activate the street/public realm, (ii) are economically feasible and (iii) maintain efficient parking structure design.

4. Explore building design options and establish design guidelines to create an attractive, pedestrian-friendly building edge/streetwall along 20th Street that draws people to the waterfront and opens up to the waterfront park at Building 6.

5. Study the massing, street orientation and ground floor uses of buildings G1, H1, H2
along 22nd Street to ensure a strong relationship between the Waterfront site and the Power Plant site and an active street frontage.

6. Further study massing options near historic buildings (buildings 2, 12, and 113) to assess impacts. Develop design guidelines that expand on the Port’s Pier 70 Preferred Plan infill Design Criteria to guide future development near historic buildings. In particular, establish future design controls to address the design of Building A-1 and its relationship to building 113 based on the following concepts:
   a. Ensure views of Building 113 from the ground plane around Building A-1
   b. Provide light to Building 113
   c. Accommodate necessary truck loading into Building 113
   d. Celebrate the corner of Louisiana Street and 20th Street through thoughtful and distinctive architecture and/or streetscape design. The design should communicate the importance of this intersection and invite people onto the Louisiana Street to travel through the site.

7. Develop design guidelines to modulate the façades and street presence of larger floorplate office buildings.

8. Further explore the use and design of the F-1/G-1 parcels (i.e., merging the parcels, whether appropriate location for portion of district parking, relation to Bldg 12).

9. Work with City and Port to identify use and design for PG&E Hoedown Yard site (Hoedown Site) that maximizes its connectivity to the larger Pier 70 and helps link Pier 70 and the Dogpatch 22nd Street commercial corridor and the site

10. Develop more detailed shadow analyses to assess shadow impacts on proposed public open spaces.

11. Conduct wind analysis as part of CEQA review.

12. If Pier 70 is selected as location of PUC recycled water treatment facility, work with Port, PUC and City to determine specific location and a design that benefits the project.

Other Items
1. Study programming and phasing of interim uses on portions of site not being used for construction.

2. Identify project elements to support an EcoDistrict designation by the Planning Department.
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) 558-6054

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 APPROVED BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.
2. BACKFLOW PREVENTION FOR DOMESTIC WATER PLUMBING INSIDE THE BUILDING MUST MEET UCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.
3. BACKFLOW PREVENTER FOR RECYCLED WATER SYSTEM MUST MEET UCSF 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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