DATE: July 3, 2014
TO: Greg Gehlen, Alexandria Real Estate
FROM: Julian J. Bañales, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2014.0679U
510 and 520 Townsend Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Robin Abad, at (415) 575-9123 or Robin.Abad@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

[Signature]
Adam Varat, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: 3 July 2014
Case No.: 2014.0679U
Project Address: 510-520 Townsend Street
Block/Lot: 3784/007, 3784/080
Zoning: WMUO – West Soma Mixed Use-Office
Western SoMa Special Use District
85-X along Townsend Frontage; 65-X along Harriet Frontage / Rear of Lot
Area Plan: Western SoMa
Project Sponsor: Greg Gehlen, Alexandria Real Estate
415-554-8844
Staff Contact: Robin Abad – 415-575-9123
Robin.Abad@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 existing buildings on two adjoining lots (30,168 GSF of office and 20,455 GSF of warehouse in total) and construct a mixed-use building on the merged lot. The Townsend Street frontage is proposed at seven stories at 85 feet tall; the rear elevation which opens partly onto Harriet Street is proposed at five stories at 65 feet tall. The proposed new building would include approximately 258,000 GSF of office space, with the potential for ground-floor portions of that space for commercial uses along street and alley frontages. Approximately 18,000 GSF is proposed for onsite parking, or 7% of the proposed project’s GFA.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

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

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (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. The proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan, which was evaluated in the Western SoMa Community Plan Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR, which was certified in 2012. Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it is eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE). Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

1. **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the Western SoMa Community Plan Final EIR, and there would be no new project-specific significant impacts. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee; (b) the CPE certificate fee; and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR.

2. **CPE + Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee; (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR.

---

1 Documents in italics in this PPA are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center (PIC) at 1660 Mission Street, and online on the Planning Department’s website at: http://www.sfplanning.org.

3. **CPE + Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee; (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value); and (d) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR.

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. See page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees. **Note that until an approval application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.** Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated May 5, 2014.

1. **Historic Resources.** The project site—consisting of an industrial building with associated parking lot at 510 Townsend Street and an office building at 520 Townsend Street—was evaluated as part of the South of Market Historic Resource Survey, which was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission in July 2010. Based upon this survey, the existing corrugated metal industrial building and concrete office building, at 510 Townsend Street and 520 Townsend Street respectively, were assigned a California Historic Resource Status Code (CHRSC) of “6Z,” which defines the properties as “found ineligible for NR, CR or local designation through survey evaluation.” Furthermore, the project site is not located in or near any historic districts. Therefore, the site is not considered to be a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA. No additional historic resource studies would be required.

2. **Archaeological Resources.** The project involves approximately 17 feet of excavation below grade. The proposed project would require a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR), which would be conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist. The PAR will determine what type of soils disturbance/modification will result from the project, such as excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, site remediation, etc. Any available geotechnical/soils or Phase II hazardous materials report prepared for the project site will be reviewed at this time. In addition, staff will determine if the project site is in an area that is archeologically sensitive. If staff finds that the project has the potential to effect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum will identify appropriate additional actions to be taken including the appropriate archeological measure and/or if additional archeological studies will be required as part of the review.

3. **Geology.** The project site is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone, specifically a liquefaction hazard zone, as identified in the San Francisco General Plan. Any new construction on the project site is subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review because it is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone.³ A

³ San Francisco Planning Department. Interdepartmental Project Review. Available online at:
geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EE Application. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

**Noise.** Based on the Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR, the project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Western SoMa Community Plan FEIR Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a, Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-1d are related to projects siting noise-sensitive uses and/or residential uses in these noisy areas. As the proposed project consists of office use, the aforementioned Mitigation Measures would not apply to the proposed project.

Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures would apply to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a requires that development projects in the Western SoMa Community Plan area undertake noise attenuation measures to ensure that project noise from construction activities is minimized to the maximum extent feasible. If the project were to require pile driving, Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving would apply to the project. Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b would require that a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures be completed under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant for projects that require pile driving.

Project-related construction noise would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. Detailed information on project-related construction equipment, phasing, and duration of each construction phase may be required as part of environmental evaluation to assess the project’s construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible.

4. **Transportation.** Based on a review of the PPA Application, the Department has determined that a transportation study is likely to be required. However, a formal determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EE Application. In order to facilitate that determination, Planning staff propose the following recommendations:

- Clarify the trash room location on project plans;
- Clearly indicate spatial organization of required bicycle parking spaces on plans;
- Relocate bicycle parking to ground floor for ease of access;
- Show required bicycle showers and lockers on plans;
- Label streets on site plans;
- Show adjacent sidewalks and curb cuts (with dimensions), and Class 2 bicycle parking on plans;
- Include curb cut removal as part of proposed project plans.

5. **Air Quality.** The proposed project’s approximately 290,000 square feet of office space exceeds the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants.\(^4\) Therefore an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is likely to be required. Detailed information related to the project’s construction equipment, phasing and duration of each construction phase, and cubic yards of on-site excavation shall be provided as part of the EEA.

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

In addition, San Francisco has partnered with the BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed the “Air Pollutant Exposure Zone,” were identified. Land use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project’s activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. Although the proposed project is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, improvement measures may be recommended for consideration by City decision makers such as exhaust measures during project construction.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect off-site sensitive receptors. High-rise buildings—defined as structures exceeding 75 feet in height—are required to install a backup diesel generator. The proposed 85-foot tall building would likely require a backup diesel generator and additional measures may be necessary to reduce its emissions. Detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources shall be provided with the EE Application.

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

---


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

7. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** The City and County of San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a GHG Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor would be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the Environmental Case Manager during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the GHG Reduction Strategy.

8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building approximately 85 feet in height. Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow fan analysis be performed to determine whether a project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. The shadow analysis would also address shadow impacts to other public open spaces not owned by the Recreation and Parks Department. An application for a shadow fan analysis should be submitted with the required fee at the time of submittal of the EE application.

9. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of an approximately 85-foot-tall building. 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 wind analysis.

10. **Hydrology and Water Quality.** The project proposes more than 40,000 square feet of new construction in San Francisco’s designated recycled water use area, and is therefore required to install recycled water systems for irrigation, cooling, and/or toilet and urinal flushing in accordance with the Recycled (or Reclaimed) Water Use Ordinance, adopted as Article 22 of the San Francisco Public Works Code. For more information about the recycled water requirements, please visit sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687.

The California Water Code Sections 10910-10915 require that a Water Supply Assessment be prepared for the proposed project as the office space exceeds the 250,000-square-foot threshold, qualifying the project as a “water demand project” under Section 10912(a). The assessment determines whether available water supplies are sufficient to serve the demand generated by projects of a specified size,
as well as the reasonably foreseeable cumulative demand in the service area over the next 20 years under a range of hydrologic conditions. Please coordinate with the assigned Environmental Coordinator at the San Francisco Planning Department or visit sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=75 for more information.

The project would result in a ground surface disturbance of 55,440 square feet, and is therefore subject to San Francisco’s stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare of a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including: (a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR (b) stormwater treatment for areas in separate sewer systems. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the SFPUC, Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. The project’s environmental evaluation should generally assess how and where the implementation of necessary stormwater controls would reduce the potential negative impacts of stormwater runoff. To view the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to http://sfwater.org/sdg.

The project is proposing new construction on a block that has the potential to flood during storms. The SFPUC will review the permit application to comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. Contact the SFPUC at the beginning of the process to determine whether the project would result in ground-level flooding during storms. Requirements may include provision of measures to ensure positive sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, DBI, or the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. For information required for the review of projects in flood-prone areas, the permit applicant shall refer to Bulletin No. 4: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/DB_04_Flood_Zones.pdf.

11. **Tree Planting and Protection Checklist.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any tree identified in the Tree Planting and Protection Checklist must be shown on the site plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy dripline. The project sponsor is required to submit a completed Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the EE Application.

12. **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 environmental review process. Please be prepared to provide these mailing labels upon request of the assigned Environmental Coordinator.

---

PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:

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

1. A Large Project Authorization from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 to allow the construction of a new building greater than 75 feet in height or greater than 25,000 gross square feet.

2. An Office Development Authorization from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 321 to allow new office development exceeding 25,000 gross square feet of new (net) office space.

3. A Lot Merger approval from the Department of Public Works is required in order to tie the subject two lots together (3784/080 and 3784/007) for a single development project. This entails a referral from the Department of Public Works to the Planning Department; review by the Planning Department ensures that the proposed lot satisfies the minimum lot size and lot area requirements.

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

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

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

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

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

   1. Large Project Authorization
   2. Office Allocation
   3. Building Permit (Section 312) – [Conducted in conjunction with entitlements]

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](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Permits & Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://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. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. An application is enclosed.

2. **Large Project Authorization.** Planning Code Section 329 outlines the requirements for Large Project Authorization in Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts. A Large Project Authorization is required for the construction of a new building greater than 75 feet in height or greater than 25,000 gross square feet. The project proposes the construction of a new 7-story, 85-foot tall, 278,808 sf (approx.) office building whose height exceeds the 75-foot height and 25,000 sf area applicability threshold established by Section 329(b)(1)(2); therefore, a Large Project Authorization is required. As a component of the review process under this Section 329, the project may seek specific exceptions to the provisions of this Code as itemized in Planning Code Section 329(d)(1-11).

3. **Office Development Authorization (or Office Allocation).** Planning Code Section 321 outlines the requirements for annual office development. In accordance with Section 321, an Office Development Authorization (or Office Allocation) is required when a project proposes to add more than 25,000 gross square feet of new (net) office space, regardless of the project site’s zoning classification. An Office Allocation is required even if other entitlements are also required, such as a Large Project Authorization. The project proposes the construction of a new 7-story, 85-foot tall, 278,808 sf (approx.) office building which exceeds the 25,000 sf of office applicability threshold; therefore, an Office Allocation is required.

4. **Floor Area Ratio (FAR).** Planning Code Section 124 establishes a maximum 6:1 FAR for that portion of the project within the 85-X height district and a maximum 5:1 FAR for that portion of the project within the 65-X height district. Therefore, the maximum gross floor area permitted within the 85-X height district portion of the property is 159,372 sf (6 x 26,562 sf= 159,372 sf, assuming the 26,562 sf area for that portion within the 85-X height district cited on the plans is accurate). The maximum gross floor area permitted within the 65-X height district portion of the property is 134,260 sf (5 x 26,852 sf = 134,260 sf assuming the 26,852 sf area for that portion within the 85-X height district cited on the plans is accurate). A scaled measurement of the plans indicates that the proposed FAR is approximately 6.2 FAR, within the 85-X height district and approximately 4.2 FAR within the 65-X height district. Therefore, while the portion of the project within the 65-X height district appears to comply, it appears the portion of the project within the 85-X height district exceeds the maximum 6.0 FAR by .2 FAR and therefore does not meet Code. Since the maximum allowable FAR provision is not variable, the project must comply. More accurately scaled plans that diagrammatically hatch areas of the floor plans included in the FAR calculation will be useful to confirm the FAR assessment.
Please note that the definition of gross floor area pursuant to Planning Code Section 102.9 used in the FAR calculation is very specific in terms of areas that are included vs. excluded in the gross floor area calculation.

5. **Obstructions.** Planning Code Section 136 establishes the maximum permitted projections of various architectural features and elements of a building into the required yards, open space and public right-of-way. Due to the schematic nature of the proposed plans, there is not enough architectural detail to determine compliance, however please refer to Planning Code Section 136 for detail to ensure compliance.

6. **Street Trees/Streetscape Plan.** Section 138.1 requires one 24-inch box street tree for every 20 feet of property frontage for new construction. With a property frontage of 191.9 feet, the project is required to provide 10 (191.9 feet x 1 tree/20 feet = 9.5 trees which rounds up to 10 trees) street trees. The project plans do not provide any street trees, and therefore the project does not comply with this provision. The applicant may seek a waiver from the street tree requirement subject to Zoning Administrator approval. To receive a preliminary street tree waiver assessment, the applicant must submit a Tree Referral Form (see attached) to the Department of Public Works (DPW).

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2)(i)(A), a Streetscape Plan in conformance with the Better Streets Plan of the General Plan is required on a lot size greater than ½ an acre (43,560 sf/2 = 21,780 sf) in total area involving new construction. Since these criteria are satisfied by the proposed development, a Streetscape Plan is required in accordance with the provisions of Planning Code Section 138.1.

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

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

8. **Screening of Rooftop Features.** Planning Code Section 141 requires that rooftop mechanical equipment and appurtenances to be used in the operation or maintenance of a building to be arranged so as not to be visible from any point at or below the roof level of the subject building. 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. In the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use
Districts (which includes WMUO), mechanical equipment and appurtenances shall be enclosed in such a manner that:

1. The enclosure is designed as a logical extension of the building form and an integral part of the overall building design;

2. Its cladding and detailing is comparable in quality to that of the rest of the building;

3. If screened by additional volume, as authorized by Section 260(b), the rooftop form is appropriate to the nature and proportions of the building, and is designed to obscure the rooftop equipment and appurtenances and to provide a more balanced and graceful silhouette for the top of the building or structure; and

4. The additional building volume is not distributed in a manner which simply extends vertically the walls of the building.

Detailed architectural plans that specify the materials, colors and finishes of the project have not yet been provided in order to determine whether the project satisfies this Code section.

9. **Parking Screening.** Planning Code Section 142 requires off-street parking and "vehicle use areas" adjacent to the public right-of-way to be screened. The screening requirements vary based on the linear length that the off-street parking and vehicle use area has adjacent to the public right-of-way. Please refer to Planning Code Section 142 for detail to ensure compliance.

10. **Street Frontage.** Planning Code Section 145.1 requires that at least 60% of the ground floor street frontage which contains active uses [as defined in Planning Code Section 145.1(b)(2)] be visually transparent into the building. Detailed architectural plans that specify the materials, colors and finishes of the project have not yet been provided in order to determine whether the project satisfies this Code section. Please refer to Planning Code Section 145.1(c) for specificity regarding additional street frontage controls.

11. **Off-Street Parking.** Planning Code Section 151.1 establishes no minimum parking requirement but establishes an off-street parking maximum area as 7% of the gross floor area. A scaled measurement of the plans indicates that the proposed gross floor area is approximately 278,808 sf; therefore, the maximum allowable off-street parking area is 19,517 sf (278,808 sf x .07 = 19,517 sf). The proposed off-street parking area of 33,993 sf exceeds the maximum 19,517 sf allowed by approximately 14,476 sf and therefore does not comply. Since the maximum allowable off-street parking area provision is not variable, the project plans must be modified to demonstrate compliance.

12. **Loading.** Planning Code Section 152.1 establishes the minimum number and dimension (width x length x height) of loading spaces. Although the proposed plans demonstrate compliance with the minimum number of loading spaces (3 spaces), the plans do not provide sufficient detail to determine whether the vertical clearance provisions are satisfied. Please refer to Planning Code Section 152.1 for detail to ensure compliance, otherwise an exception from satisfaction of the loading requirements may be sought pursuant to Planning Code Section 329(d)(4).

13. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155 requires this project to provide at least 56 Class I bicycle parking spaces (278,808 sf x 1 space/5,000 sf = 55.7 which rounds up to 56 spaces) and at least 5 Class
12

II bicycle parking spaces \((278,808 \text{ sf} - 5,000 \text{ sf} = 273,808 \text{ sf} \times 1 \text{ space/50,000 sf} = 5.4 \text{ which rounds down to 5 spaces})\) for the proposed office development. Detailed architectural plans that specify the number and class type of bicycle parking included in the project have not yet been provided in order to determine whether the project satisfies this Code section. Please see Zoning Administrator Bulletin #9 attached for further detail regarding bicycle parking design standards.

14. **Transportation Management Programs and Transportation Brokerage Services in Eastern Neighborhoods.** Planning Code Section 163 requires that adequate measures are undertaken and maintained to minimize the transportation impacts of added office employment in the downtown and South of Market area, in a manner consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan, by facilitating the effective use of transit, encouraging ridesharing, and employing other practical means to reduce commute travel by single-occupant vehicles. Please refer to Planning Code Section 163 for detail to ensure compliance.

15. **Car Sharing.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 166, the number of car-share parking spaces required is dependent upon the number of parking spaces provided in the proposed office project. For office projects providing 50 or more parking spaces, 1 car share parking space is required, plus one car-share space for each 50 parking spaces over 50. With a total of 73 off-street parking spaces (not including ADA and loading), one car share space is required. Detailed architectural plans that specify the number of car-share spaces have not yet been provided to determine whether the project satisfies this Code section.

16. **Shadow Analysis.** Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a preliminary shadow fan that indicates the project may does not cast shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission.

17. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** This project is subject to the applicable requirements outlined in Section 411 et seq.

18. **Jobs Housing Linkage.** This project is subject to the applicable requirements outlined in Section 413 et seq.

19. **Child Care Requirement.** This project is subject to the applicable requirements outlined in Section 414 et seq.

20. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** This project is subject to the applicable requirements outlined in Section 423 et seq. Please note that the portion of the subject property within the 65-X height district qualifies as “Tier 1” while the portion of the subject property within the 85-X height district qualifies as “Tier 2” for purposes of Planning Code Section 423.
21. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more. For more information, please contact:

Ken Nim, Workforce Compliance Officer  
CityBuild, Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
City and County of San Francisco  
50 Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 581-2303

22. **Public Art.** This project is subject to the applicable requirements outlined in Section 429 et seq.

23. **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.

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

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

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The project is located South of Market Street near the off-ramp for Interstate 280 and the CalTrain Station. The context primarily includes two to four story industrial and commercial buildings. The predominant architectural character is masonry with industrial-sash windows in gravity-framed buildings. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** While the Planning Department supports the mid-block alley proposal, we recommend designing it with more active program, building entries, and landscape elements to facilitate and invite its use. From the Townsend Street frontage, the opportunity for a midblock crossing is not immediately evident to the pedestrian due to the building massing; the project designers are encouraged to explore alternate building massing around the entrance to the arcade to make it more legible and inviting from the street, such as by raising the clear height to two stories at the entrance and notching the building façade to indicate a break. The Planning Department also highly recommends the passage be lined by active programs such as a building lobby, retail, and other uses. Required public art could further enhance and enliven the
midblock pathway, by better announcing its presence at the Townsend façade, enhancing the pedestrian experience through the pathway, or both. Although the plans and renderings show conflicting information about the west end termination of the south elevation colonnade, the Planning Department recommends that the colonnade help define and direct the use of the midblock alley as a public space so that it becomes a vibrant, appealing, and well-used space. Additionally, the Planning Department suggests extending the midblock alley from its currently proposed terminus around the back of the building towards 6th Street so that there is a future potential connection to Bluxome Street.

2. **Parking and Access.** The Planning Department recommends that the vehicular entry be designed to accommodate a gracious pedestrian entrance to the mid-block alley, including when the driveway is not in use. One way to do this would be to reduce the width of the driveway to 20’ and locate it off center from the street axis. As well, it could be designed, detailed, and rendered in materials as a shared space where pedestrians have the dominant use.

3. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends providing retail or other specifically active programming to a 25’ depth with multiple entrances along Townsend and along the mid-block pathway frontage. Office use is not typically a desirable usage on ground floor frontages, unless there is a specific condition—such as a cafeteria or other active amenity—that would take frequent advantage of the access to outdoor space.

4. **Architecture.** The Planning Department recommends increasing the depth, detail, or texture of the larger expanses of glazing on the south-east corner along Townsend. The Planning Department also recommends showing greater architectural or canopy hierarchy at entrance locations as well as significant fenestration depth at the masonry openings to provide for an appropriately varied and articulated façade.

5. **6th Street / Highway 280 Frontage.** The project site is adjacent to the elevated I-280 freeway, which is situated directly above the Caltrain rail right-of-way and railyard. As part of the Caltrain electrification and California High-Speed Rail project, the City will be evaluating options for reconfiguring this rail right-of-way and adjacent infrastructure to accommodate enhanced rail service and improve physical conditions in the vicinity to support the development of Mission Bay, Showplace Square, Potrero Hill, South of Market and adjacent neighborhoods. Options which may be considered include removing a portion of the elevated freeway structure, tunneling portions of the rail alignment, and replacing it with a surface boulevard akin to Octavia Boulevard or the Embarcadero, with the transition occurring around Sixteenth Street. In the event that such an option is found feasible and ultimately implemented, the area under the elevated freeway directly northeast of 510 Townsend Street could become new public space or park; street right-of-way; development parcel, or some combination thereof. Thus the project sponsors should treat the 6th Street / Highway 280 façade in such a manner that anticipates the possibility of that frontage becoming a defining...
element of an at-grade public space and/or street. This includes fenestration which provides visual communication out into a potential future public space and vice versa. The project sponsor should also consider flexibility of the ground-floor uses along the northeast frontage of the building, which could in future directly connect with a potential future public space and/or street.

**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 3rd, 2016. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

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

cc:  
X X, Property Owner
X X, Current Planning
X X, Environmental Planning
X X, Citywide Planning and Analysis
Maia Small, Design Review
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
Jerry Robbins, MTA
Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>Cabande</td>
<td>Organizational Director</td>
<td>South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)</td>
<td>1110 Howard Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabande@somcan.org">acabande@somcan.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)</td>
<td>474 Valencia Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td>podersf.org</td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Market Street Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 456</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-362-2500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msaadv@pacbell.net">msaadv@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mission Creek Harbor Association</td>
<td>300 Channel Street, Box 10</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-902-7635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corinnewoods@cs.com">corinnewoods@cs.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Falk</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation</td>
<td>201 Eddy Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-775-2151</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dfalk@tndc.org">dfalk@tndc.org</a>; <a href="mailto:ceddings@tndc.org">ceddings@tndc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Ecker Owners Association</td>
<td>16 Jessie Street Unit 301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ethanhough@gmail.com">ethanhough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hallam Street Homeowners Association</td>
<td>1 Brush Place</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-626-6650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wolfgj@earthlink.net">wolfgj@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 6</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-4689</td>
<td>415-554-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.kim@sfgov.org">jane.kim@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:April.veneracion@sfgov.org">April.veneracion@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:lvy.Loo@afsc.org">lvy.Loo@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Market, Treasure Island/FBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Carpinelli</td>
<td>Board President</td>
<td>Dogpatch Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>934 Minnesota Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Meko</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</td>
<td>366 Tenth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-552-2401</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhmeko@comcast.net">jhmeko@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>Liddell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>South Beach/Rincon/ Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>403 Main Street #813</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kladell2001@yahoo.com">kladell2001@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>LMNOP Neighbors</td>
<td>1047 Minna Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-724-1953</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LMNOP@yak.net">LMNOP@yak.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association</td>
<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@everestsf.com">keith@everestsf.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Citizens for Change</td>
<td>355 11th Street, Suite 200</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-652-9330</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kbaaxter26@gmail.com">kbaaxter26@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Marina, Nob Hill, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, Russian Hill, Seacliff, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Magnani</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>65 Ninth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-865-0201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfoffice@afsc.org">sfoffice@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-6526</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvishillis@gmail.com">marvishillis@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Samoan Development Centre</td>
<td>2055 Sunnyside Avenue #100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134-2611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bayview, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon Hill Residents Association</td>
<td>75 Folsom Street #1800</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbement@sbcglobal.net">rbement@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roddray</td>
<td>Minott</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill Association</td>
<td>1206 Mariposa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-553-5969</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodminott@hotmail.com">rodminott@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>Community Advocate</td>
<td>TODICO Impact Group</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-426-6819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@todico.org">sonja@todico.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:rmike.grisso@sfgov.org">rmike.grisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Bayview, Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market, Visitacion Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-861-0345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Loo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>York Realty</td>
<td>243A Shipley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-1010</td>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td>yorkloogmail.com</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interdepartmental Project Reviews are mandatory for new construction projects that propose buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Projects identified as such, must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit.

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

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

**Interdepartmental Project Review fees:**

1. $1,164 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. $1,702 for all other projects.

*Please note that $394 of these fees is non-refundable. If your project falls under the second type of fee, and you cancel your meeting, the difference will be refunded to you.*

To avoid delays in scheduling your meeting, provide all information requested on this form and submit your request with a check in the appropriate amount payable to the San Francisco Planning Department. Requests may be mailed or delivered to San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2414. Those wishing more specific or more detailed information may contact the Project Review Meeting Coordinator at (415) 575-9091.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION DATE: ____________________________________________

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name ____________________________________________ Phone No. ( _______ )________________________
Address ___________________________ FAX No. ( _______ )________________________
Owner______________________________________________________________

PROJECT INFORMATION:
Address ___________________________________________________________
How many units does the subject property have? ________________________________
Assessor's Block/Lot(s) __________________________ Zoning District_________________________
Height and Bulk Districts __________________________ Located within Geologic Hazard Zone? Y □  N □

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

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

Previously contacted staff ____________________________________________________________
Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) ____________________________________________
(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)
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 new construction, change of use, change of occupancy, or major alterations or enlargements will be referred to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) at the beginning of the process 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 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 must comply with SFPUC requirements for projects in flood-prone areas. Such requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, special sidewalk construction, and deep gutters.
Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding
Re: SFPUC Urban Watershed Management Program (UWMP) Stormwater Requirements

Dear Project Proponent,

Your project may be subject to meeting requirements of the 2010 San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance and the San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). The project parameter that triggers compliance with the Guidelines is:

- Projects disturbing 5,000 square feet or more of ground surface are subject to the Stormwater Management Ordinance and must therefore meet the performance measures set within the Guidelines.

If your project triggers the Ordinance your project must:

- Determine if your project is located in the area served by the combined sewer or the area served by the separate sewer and meet the applicable performance measure:
  
  o Combined Sewer Areas:
    - For sites with existing imperviousness of less than or equal to 50%, stormwater runoff rate and volume shall not exceed pre-development conditions for the 1- and 2-year 24-hour design storm.
    - For sites with existing imperviousness of greater than 50%, stormwater runoff rate and volume shall be decreased by 25% from the 2-year 24-hour design storm
      (Equivalent to LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.1).
  
  o Separate Sewer Areas:
    - Capture and treat the rainfall from a design storm of 0.75 inches.
      (Equivalent to LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.2).

- Develop a Stormwater Control Plan in accordance with the Guidelines and submit it for review and approval to the UWMP prior to receiving a building permit; and

- Develop an operation and maintenance plan for all proposed stormwater controls and submit it as part of the Stormwater Control Plan.

Stormwater requirements can be met using Low Impact Design (LID) or other green infrastructure approaches. LID approaches use stormwater management solutions that promote the use of ecological and landscape-based systems that mimic pre-development drainage patterns and hydrologic processes by increasing retention, detention, infiltration, and treatment of stormwater at its source.
The necessary documents can be found online at:

- Stormwater Management Ordinance:

- Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines) and Appendixes:
  http://sfwater.org/sdg

- Instructions for completing a Stormwater Control Plan: Refer to Guidelines, Appendix C.

- Municipal separate stormwater sewer system (MS4) and Combined Sewer System Boundary Map: Refer to Guidelines, p.10

Upon receipt of this letter please contact the SFPUC Urban Watershed Management Program (UWMP) to confirm specific Guideline requirements for your project.

Project Reviewer
Urban Watershed Management Program
stormwaterreview@sfrwater.org

The UWMP staff looks forward to helping you achieve stormwater management compliance and moving your project forward.

Sincerely,

UWMP Project Review Team
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Wastewater Enterprise
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) 558-6654

**Backflow Prevention**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Quality Bureau
(650) 952-3100

**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.

PROPERTY LINE OR DEVELOPER COMPLEX

PROPERTY LINE

CURB LINE

DOMESTIC WATER MAIN

STREET - SIDE

RECYCLED WATER IRRIGATION
SEE NOTE 3

RECYCLED WATER DOMESTIC
SEE NOTE 3

DOMESTIC WATER
SEE NOTES 1 & 2

FIRE SPRINKLER
SEE NOTE 1

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.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
SAN FRANCISCO WATER DEPARTMENT

INSTALLATION OF RECYCLED WATER SERVICE LINES

APPROVED BY: Cheryl Munoz
DATE: 05/28/08

DESIGNED BY: W. Villasica
DRAWN: W. Villasica
DRAWING NO.: A-1290.2
CHECKED: M. Gardiner
REV. NO.: 2