DATE: August 8, 2014

TO: AGI Avant, Inc.

FROM: Joshua Switzky, Planning Department

RE: PPA Case No. 2014.0926U for 1270 Mission Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Lisa Chen, at (415) 575-9124 or Lisa.Chen@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Joshua Switzky, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 12, 2014
Case No.: 2014.0926U
Project Address: 1270 Mission Street
Block/Lot: 3701/021
Zoning: C-3-G (Downtown General)
120-X
Fringe Financial Service Restricted Use District
Project Sponsor: AGI Avant, Inc.
415-775-7005
Staff Contact: Lisa Chen, 415-575-9124
lisa.chen@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 includes the demolition of a one story, 1,192 square foot building currently being operated as a pizza shop and surface parking lot on the project site and construction of an approximately 120-foot tall, 13-story mixed-use building containing 199 dwelling units and 3,329 square feet of ground floor retail space. The project includes 101 parking spaces, an 803 square foot bike storage room, and an 11,424 square foot roof deck.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires the following environmental review, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted.

In order to facilitate environmental review and comply with CEQA, the applicant shall submit an Environmental Evaluation (EE) Application. The application is available in the Planning Department
If the additional analysis outlined below indicates that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the project may qualify for a Class 32 categorical exemption, and the Planning Department would issue a Certificate of Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review. Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines, or Class 32, provides a categorical exemption for projects characterized as infill development.

If the additional analysis performed after submittal of the EE Application indicates that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, Planning Department staff would prepare an Initial Study to determine whether a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is needed.

If the Department finds that the project would have significant impacts that can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration. If the Initial Study process indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR will be required to be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool.1 The Planning Department would provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study based on our preliminary review of the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) Application.

1. **Historic Architectural Resources.** The project site consists primarily of a surface parking lot with a small, reinforced concrete commercial building constructed in 1975 at the corner of Laskie and Mission Streets. The building is less than 45 years old and the project site is neither located in or near any historic districts nor adjacent to any historic resources. Thus the property is designated as Category C and is not considered a historic resource for purposes of CEQA. No additional historic resource studies would be required.

2. **Archeological Resources.** The project involves approximately 18 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 affect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum will identify appropriate additional actions to be taken, including the appropriate archeological mitigation 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. A 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.

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 proposes the following recommendations:
   - Substantially reduce number of on-site parking spaces;
   - Combine the garage entry and driveways into a single egress of less than 22 feet in width;
   - Plans should include driveway dimensions, Class 1 bicycle parking configuration, Class 2 bicycle parking location, trash location

5. Air Quality. The proposed project’s 199 residential dwelling units and 3,329 square feet of retail space are below 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 not likely to be required.

Project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred hereto as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Control 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. 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 project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, improvement measures may be recommended for consideration by City decision makers such as exhaust measures during construction and enhanced ventilation measures as

---

2 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
part of building design. Enhanced ventilation measures will be the same as those required for projects, such as this project, subject to Article 38 of the Health Code.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Given the proposed project’s height of approximately 120 feet, the proposed project would likely require a backup diesel generator and additional measures may be necessary to reduce its emissions. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EE Application.

6. **Noise.** 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.

7. **Hazardous Materials.** The project site is likely to result in the excavation of greater than 50 cubic yards of soil. Therefore, the project is likely 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.

8. **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 coordinator 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.

9. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building approximately 120 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. A preliminary shadow fan analysis has been prepared by Planning Department staff, and indicates that the proposed project would not cast shadows on nearby parks and/or recreational resources (see attachments). No further analysis of shadow-related impacts would be required. However, should changes in the form, scale, or mass of the proposed building be required, the proposed project may require additional analysis of potential shadow impacts.

10. Wind. The proposed project would involve construction of a building reaching approximately 120 feet in height. The project therefore may require a wind technical memo from a wind consultant, including a recommendation as to whether a wind tunnel analysis is needed in order to determine whether the project would alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.

11. Utilities, 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 http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687.

The project is proposing new construction on a block that has the potential to flood during storms. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (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 permit for the proposed project needs to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department and DBI. 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.

12. 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 Checklist³ 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.

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

PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:

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

1. **Downtown Project Authorization.** In order for the project to proceed, the Planning Commission would need to determine that the project complies with Planning Code Section (“Section”) 309, through a Downtown Project Authorization. This Section establishes a framework for review of projects within C-3 Districts to ensure conformity with the Planning Code and the General Plan, and modifications may be imposed on various aspects of the project to achieve this conformity. These aspects include overall building form, impacts to public views, shadows and wind levels on sidewalks and open spaces, traffic circulation, relationship of the project to the streetscape, design of open space features, improvements to adjacent sidewalks (including street trees, landscaping, paving material, and street furniture), quality of residential units, preservation of on-site and off-site historic resources, and minimizing significant adverse environmental effects. Through the Downtown Project Authorization process, the project sponsor may also request exceptions from certain requirements of the Planning Code, as described under ‘Preliminary Project Comments’ below.

2. **Conditional Use Authorization.** In order for the project to proceed, the Planning Commission would need to grant Conditional Use authorization, pursuant to Sections 215(b) and 303, to allow a density greater than one dwelling unit for each 125 square feet of lot area.

   In addition, the project sponsor may choose to seek Conditional Use Authorization under Section 124(f). This Conditional Use Authorization would allow additional square footage above that permitted by the base floor area ratio limits for dwellings in the project that are affordable for 20 years to households whose incomes are within 150 percent of the median income. It should be noted that, if the sponsor chooses to comply with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements of Section 415 by providing affordable units on-site, this Authorization would exempt the square footage of these units from the calculation of Gross Floor Area.

3. **Variance.** As currently proposed, and as discussed under ’Preliminary Project Comments’ below, several aspects of the project do not comply with the requirements of the Planning Code. These aspects are not eligible for an exception through a Downtown Project Authorization. Therefore, the project must be revised to comply with the Planning Code, or a Variance must be sought and justified for those aspects of the project.

4. **Building Permit Applications** are required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property, and for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Downtown Project Authorization, Conditional Use Authorization, and Variance applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). 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.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project.

1. **Floor Area Ratio.** Per Planning Code Section (“Section”) 124, buildings within the C-3-G District may reach a Floor Area Ratio of 6.0 to 1, or up to a maximum of 9.0 to 1 with the acquisition of Transferable Development Rights (TDR). Therefore, a maximum of 145,980 gross square feet may be developed on the project site with the acquisition of TDR. No exceptions or variances can be granted to exceed the maximum FAR. Future submittals should provide a detailed calculation of the gross floor area of the project, including floor plans which clearly indicate those areas included within the calculation of “gross floor area” pursuant to the definition in Section 102.9. According to the plans provided in the PPA application, the basic square footage of the project measures 185,789 square feet, exceeding the maximum possible FAR (with the acquisition of TDR). Section 102.9 allows certain features to be excluded from the calculation of Gross Floor Area. Staff would recalculate the precise amount of Gross Floor Area at the time of a formal submittal, taking into account the allowable exclusions. In addition, the sponsor may request a Conditional Use Authorization to exclude the square footage of any on-site affordable housing units from the calculation of Gross Floor Area. See discussion under ‘Planning Department Approvals’ above for more information.

2. **Rear Yard.** Per Section 134, within C-3 Districts, a rear yard must be provided that is equal to 25 percent of the depth of the lot, at the lowest level story containing a dwelling unit and at each succeeding level. Utilizing Mission Street as the frontage of the property, a rear yard measuring 44 feet in depth would need to be located along the northwestern portion of the property. However, the plans show an inner courtyard measuring approximately 25 feet by 111 feet. The project must either be redesigned to provide a compliant rear yard, or will require an exception to these requirements, demonstrating compliance with the criteria specified in Section 134(d). While an exception may be justified to provide appropriately-located mid-block open space, the proposed courtyard does not appear sufficiently sized to justify this exception. See further discussion under ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ below.

3. **Shadows on Public Sidewalks.** Planning Code Section 146(a) establishes design requirements for buildings on certain specifically-identified streets in order to maintain direct sunlight on public sidewalks in certain downtown areas during critical use periods. Section 146(c) requires that other buildings, not located on the specific streets identified in Section 146(a), shall be shaped to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public sidewalks, if it can be done without unduly creating an unattractive design and without unduly restricting development potential. The Project is not located
on a street specifically identified by Section 146(a), however, the Project will need to be demonstrate how the buildings have been designed to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public sidewalks.

4. **Residential Open Space.** Per Section 135, within C-3 Districts, a minimum of 36 square feet of private open space must be provided per dwelling unit, or 47.88 square feet of common open space must be provided per dwelling unit. Both private and common open space must meet standards for location, dimensions, usability, and access to sunlight. With 199 dwelling units, the project would require 9,528 square feet of common open space. Approximately 9,800 square feet of common open space is proposed on the roof of the building, which would comply with the requirements. However, as the design of the building and rooftop features evolves, staff will continue to evaluate that a sufficient area of open space is provided.

5. **Street Trees / San Francisco Green Landscaping Ordinance:** The proposed project is subject to the San Francisco Green Landscaping Ordinance, which assists in articulating Planning Code Section 138.1.

Planning Code Section 138.1 outlines a provision for adding street trees for projects involving construction of new buildings or adding gross floor area equal to 20 percent or more of the gross floor area of an existing building. A 24-inch box size street tree would be required for each 20 feet of frontage of the property along each street or alley, with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. As the project falls within a C-3-G zoning district, the trees must also have a minimum 2-inch caliper (at breast height), branch a minimum of 80 inches above sidewalk grade, and be planted in a sidewalk opening of at least 16 square feet with a decorative edging treatment and a minimum 3’6” soil depth. Existing trees on the project site, if preserved, would apply towards the street tree requirement.

Based on the street frontage dimensions, it appears that the project requires seven trees on Laskie Street and five trees on Mission Street, which are not reflected in your preliminary plans.

6. **Ground-Level Wind Currents.** As discussed under “Environmental Review” above, the height of the proposed residential building would trigger a wind analysis in order to identify changes in ground-level wind speeds resulting from project. Section 148 of the Planning Code comfort criteria (ground level wind levels not to exceed 11 mph in areas of substantial pedestrian use or 7 mph in public seating areas) specifically outlines these criteria for the Downtown Commercial (C-3) Districts, including the project site. The comfort criteria are based on pedestrian-level wind speeds that include the effects of turbulence; these are referred to as “equivalent wind speeds” (defined in the Planning Code as “an hourly mean wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians”). If existing wind speeds exceed the comfort level, or when a project would result in exceedances of the comfort criteria, an exception may be sought through a Downtown Project Authorization, if the building or addition cannot be designed to meet the criteria “without creating an unattractive and ungainly building form and without unduly restricting the development potential” of the site, and it is concluded that the exceedance(s) of the criteria would be insubstantial “because of the limited amount by which the comfort level is exceeded, the limited location in which the comfort level is exceeded, or the limited time during which the comfort level is exceeded.” Section 148 also establishes a hazard criterion, which is a 26 mph equivalent wind speed for a single full hour. Section 148 includes specific comfort- and hazard-level criteria for ground-level wind
currents. If the project creates new exceedances of the comfort-level criteria, or if the project fails to ameliorate existing exceedances, an exception may be sought through the Section 309 review process. No exception may be sought, however, if the project creates new exceedances of the hazard-level criteria.

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

8. **Exposure.** Per Section 140, at least one room of each dwelling unit must face onto a public street, a rear yard, or other open area that meets minimum requirements for area and horizontal dimensions. Section 140 specifies that an open area (such as the courtyard) must have minimum horizontal dimensions of 25 feet at the lowest floor containing a dwelling unit and floor immediately above, with an increase of five feet in horizontal dimensions for each subsequent floor above. Several units at each floor have exposure only on the open area onto the courtyard at the southwest portion of the site, which does not satisfy these required dimensions. The project must either be redesigned to comply with the exposure requirements, or a Variance would be required. Staff is concerned that the courtyard is not appropriately sized to provide light and air for the abutting dwelling units within the project, as well as dwelling units on adjacent properties. See further discussion under ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ below.

9. **Active Frontages.** Section 145.1 requires the ground floor frontage along Mission Street to be occupied by active uses within the first 25 feet of building depth. The proposed retail spaces meet this requirement. However, the lobby may only be considered an “active use” if it does not exceed 40 feet in width or 25% of building frontage, whichever is larger. Future submittals should seek to minimize the width of the lobby frontage to the extent feasible, and should verify compliance with this requirement.

Section 145.1 also requires that all ground floor non-residential uses have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet, as measured from grade. However, as discussed under “Preliminary Design Comments” below, future submittals should seek to maximize the ceiling heights of ground-floor retail spaces, with a floor-to-floor height of no less than 15 feet.

10. **Off-Street Parking.** Per Section 151.1, off-street parking within C-3 Districts is principally permitted at a ratio of one space for each four dwelling units. Subject to the criteria of Section 151.1(e), up to 0.75 cars per dwelling unit may be permitted, or up to 1 car per dwelling unit for units with at least two bedrooms and 1,000 square feet of floor area. The project contains 99 off-street parking spaces (excluding the carshare and service spaces) to serve 199 dwelling units, at a ratio of approximately .5 spaces per dwelling. Future submittals should demonstrate how the project complies with the criteria of Section 151.1(f). Given that the project site is situated within a walkable, urban context with abundant transit service, the Department would recommend that the amount of off-street parking be reduced to the greatest extent feasible. Please see discussion under "Preliminary Design Comments"
below, regarding concerns over the overall quantity of parking, as well as the current split level design of the off-street parking.

11. **Off-Street Loading.** Per Section 152.1, one full-sized off-street loading space is required for the project. This loading space must have a minimum width of 10 feet, a minimum length of 25 feet, and a minimum vertical clearance of 12 feet. No off-street loading space is provided. The project must either be redesigned to provide a compliant loading space, or will require an exception to these requirements, demonstrating compliance with the criteria specified in Section 161(i).

12. **Garage Entry Width.** Section 155(s) allows a total of two facade openings of no more than 11 feet wide each or one opening of no more than 22 feet wide for access to off-street parking and one facade opening of no more than 15 feet wide for access to off-street loading. Shared openings for parking and loading are encouraged, with a maximum permitted width of 27 feet. The driveways proposed for the project exceed these maximum widths. The project should be redesigned to comply with these requirements.

13. **Carshare Parking.** Per Section 166, one parking space dedicated to carshare vehicles is required. The project calls out one carshare parking space, and therefore meets the requirement. Access to these vehicles must be provided to carshare service members, including non-residents of the building, at all times. Therefore, the early design of the project should consider access and security issues associated with providing this access.

14. **Bicycle Parking.** Per Sections 155.2, a total of 125 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and 12 Class 2 bicycle would need to be provided for the project. The plans include a secure, Class 1 bicycle parking room at the ground floor. However, this room does not appear sufficiently sized to accommodate 125 bicycles meeting the minimum design and layout standards in the Code. In addition, the plans do not identify any Class 2 bicycle parking. These spaces could be accommodated within the sidewalk fronting the project, with the specific locations identified as streetscape plans are developed for the project at building permit stage.

15. **Shadow Impacts.** Section 295 generally prohibits new buildings that would cast new shadow on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Staff has prepared a preliminary shadow fan (attached) that indicates that the project would not cast shadows on any parks or open spaces subject to Section 295.

16. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** Per Section 411, the retail uses in the project will be subject to the Transit Impact Development Fee. Credit would be given for the existing retail space on the site that would be demolished as part of the project.

17. **Public Art.** Per Section 429, the Project will be required to include works of art costing an amount equal to one percent of the construction cost of the building. The art will need to be installed in a location that is physically and/or visually accessible to the public. In certain circumstances, upon approval from relevant agencies, the art could be installed on public property (such as an adjacent right-of-way). As an alternative, residential projects are eligible to satisfy the requirements of Section
429 through the payment of a fee to the Public Artwork Trust Fund, or through a combination of fee payment and on-site artworks.

18. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Per Section 415, the project must satisfy the requirements of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program through the payment of an Affordable Housing Fee that is equivalent to the applicable percentage of the number of units in the principal project, which is 20 percent of the total number of units proposed. As an alternative, the project may be eligible to satisfy the requirements of Section 415 through the provision of on-site or off-site affordable units. In order to qualify for this alternative, the sponsor must demonstrate that the units would not be subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act.

The sponsor may request a Conditional Use Authorization to exclude the square footage of any on-site affordable housing units from the calculation of Gross Floor Area. See discussion under ‘Planning Department Approvals’ above for more information.

For further information, please refer to the publication "Affidavit for Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program", which is available from 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.

19. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** Interdepartmental Project Reviews are mandatory for new construction projects that propose buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Project sponsors may elect to request an interdepartmental review for any project at any time; however, it is strongly recommended that the request is made prior to Planning Department approval of the first construction building permit. The Planning Department acts as the lead agency in collaboration with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI); the Department of Public Works (DPW); and the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). Department staff from each of these agencies would attend the Interdepartmental Project Review meeting.

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

The ordinance applies to: (1) any permit application for commercial development exceeding 25,000 square feet in floor area involving new construction, an addition or a substantial alteration which results in the addition of entry level positions for a commercial activity; or (2) any application which requires discretionary action by the Planning Commission relating to a commercial activity over 25,000 square feet, but not limited to conditional use; or (3) any permit application for a residential development of ten units or more involving new construction, an addition, a conversion or substantial rehabilitation.
The project proposes more than ten dwelling units and commercial development exceeding 25,000 square feet and is therefore subject to the requirement. For further information or to receive a sample First Source Hiring Agreement, please see contact:

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

21. **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.

22. **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/. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** A required rear yard area that is at minimum 25% of the lot area should be provided, oriented and designed so as to be commonly accessible and usable by building residents. The Planning Department recommends redistributing the studio units along the Laskie facade and extending them over the street as allowable projections as a means of modulating the building.

2. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department expects the project to maximize active ground floor uses in addition to providing a ground floor to floor height of at least 15’. The building should provide a consistent and active relationship with all frontages.

The Planning Department recommends the sponsor explore ground floor residential walk-up units along Laskie. Consider providing continuous retail along Mission street and relocating the lobby to the Laskie frontage.
If ground floor residential use is pursued, they should be designed as individual units directly accessible from the street. Please refer to the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines for design expectations for such units. The units should be designed with raised and setback stoop entries that range from three to five feet above grade. The setbacks should be at least 6 feet from the property line along the majority of the front of the units. The units should be vertically modulated on the façade so that residential units are individually legible. Any setback and raised terrace area at the ground level may count toward required residential open space.

3. **Vehicle Circulation and Parking.** An excessive proportion of the Laskie frontage is occupied by vehicle parking and loading. The proposed design precludes meeting the active uses requirement along the Laskie frontage. The Planning Department strongly recommends a single parking entrance combining loading functions as necessary. The Planning Department recommends that the parking entrance be reduced in width to a single lane width (12'). The limited number of parking combined with the familiarity of use will enable a narrower dimension. If queuing is to be accommodated it may occur inside the building, and assisted with signal devices.

The Planning Department does not support parking over the maximum principally permitted by Code. One of the criteria for granting parking quantity greater than the principally permitted amount is that the additional parking does not compromise the urban design quality of the building or cause the project to seek exceptions or variances from urban design standards in the Code. Consider reducing the overall quantity of parking and the parking footprint (using strategies such as parking lifts or stackers) to accommodate better ground floor uses. The Planning Department recommends locating bike parking as close and conveniently accessible to the residential lobby as possible.

4. **Public Realm Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishings, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate.

The department will work with the project sponsor and other relevant departments to determine an appropriate streetscape design. Standard street improvements would be part of basic project approvals not count for as credit towards in-kind contributions. Refer to the Better Streets Plan for more information. See [http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/) to identify relevant street types for the project frontage.

Specifically, the Planning Department recommends exploring “living alley” street improvements along Laskie, along with other standard streetscape improvements on Mission and will work with the sponsor further as the design evolves.

In addition, Mission Street was identified as part of the “rapid network” slated for comprehensive transit and streetscape improvements in the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) adopted by the SFMTA Board of Directors in March 2014. This portion of Mission Street is also being considered for streetscape design improvements as part of the Better Market Street project, which is currently undergoing conceptual design and environmental review. To the extent that timing overlaps, the project may require coordination to ensure street trees and other improvements in the public right of way are consistent with design elements of these larger streetscape planning efforts.
5. **Architecture.** The lobby should be transparent as possible, expressed with a wider and higher recess, and include landscaping.

At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission. Exceptions to the planning code should be responded to by exceptional design.

**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 12, 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  
Preliminary Shadow Fan for 1270 Mission Street

cc:  
Laskie-Mission, LLC, Property Owner  
Kevin Guy, Current Planning  
Eric Jaszewski, Environmental Planning  
Lisa Chen, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
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>415-431-4210</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabande@somcan.org">acabande@somcan.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)</td>
<td>474 Valencia Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-362-2500</td>
<td>podersf.org</td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mission Creek Harbor Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 456</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-902-7635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corinelwoods@cs.com">corinelwoods@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>300 Channel Street, Box 10</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-776-2151</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>Ethan</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Ecker Owners Association</td>
<td>16 Jessie Street Unit 301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td>ethan@<a href="mailto:hough@gmail.com">hough@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:wolfgk@earthlink.net">wolfgk@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</td>
<td>415-554-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jk@sfgov.org">jk@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:lvu.Lee@sfgov.org">lvu.Lee@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Carpinell</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:joc@carpinell.com">joc@carpinell.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>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>President</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</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:kmeko2011@yahoo.com">kmeko2011@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>Liddell</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>South Beach/Rincon Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</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>Karya</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>LMNOP Neighbors</td>
<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmek@comcast.net">kmek@comcast.net</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>415-652-0300</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kbaeter26@gmail.com">kbaeter26@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>415-556-0201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stoffice@afsc.org">stoffice@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvis</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvisphillips@gmail.com">marvisphillips@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>Samson Development Centre</td>
<td>2055 Sunnydale Avenue #100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134</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:rhbement@sbcglobal.net">rhbement@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighborhoods/Save the Hill</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-426-8819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@tpoc.org">sonja@tpoc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TJPAC</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olsson@tpoc.org">olsson@tpoc.org</a></td>
<td>Financial District, 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>415-426-8819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffanybohee@sfgov.org">tiffanybohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grasso@sfgov.org">mike.grasso@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><a href="mailto:tonykelly@gmail.com">tonykelly@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>York Realty</td>
<td>243A Shirley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-1010</td>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td>yorkłożyć@gmail.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). A representative from each of these City Agencies will attend your meeting.

**Interdepartmental Project Review fees:**

1. **$1,308** for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. **$1,859** for all other projects.

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 (2) 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.
APPLICATION DATE: __________________________________________________________

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name ___________________________________________ Phone No. (          )____________________
Address ______________________________________________________________________________________
City ___________________________________________ Zip Code ____________________________________________
FAX No. (          )____________________ E-Mail Address _____________________________________________
Name of Property 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 separate sheet, 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>

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) _____________________________________________
Previously contacted staff (if applicable) ________________________________________________
(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.
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 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 assembly.

**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 is required for each water line.

**Required Backflow Prevention Assembly**

- 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 prevention assemblies must be approved by the SFPUC’s Water Quality Division.

The backflow prevention assembly for domestic water plumbing inside the building and for 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 – described in the City and County of San Francisco Plumbing Codes

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

**Temporary Potable Water Use Until Recycled Water Becomes Available**

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

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

**If you have questions, or would like additional information:**

**Recycled Water Ordinances**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Resources Division
(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
(650) 652-3100

**New Service Line Permits**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Services
(415) 551-3000
NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST BE APPROVED BY SFPUWAC 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.

RESPECTIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

HEAVY LINES:
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION, SFPUWAC RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF NEW SERVICE UP TO THE END OF METLER 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
DESIGNED BY: W. Villasica
DRAWN: W. Villasica
DRAWING NO.: A-1290.2
DATE: 05/28/08
CHECKED: M. Gardiner
REV. NO.: 2