Attached below is an addendum/errata to the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) originally issued June 22, 2015 pertaining to a proposal for an 8-story, 85-foot-tall, 96,000-gross-square-foot mixed-use building that would contain 89 residential units at 365-399 Fifth Street (APN 375023, 3752024 and 3755090). As stated in the June 22, 2015 PPA, the above-referenced proposal would not conform to current zoning requirements (Western Soma Mixed-use-General zoning [WSMUG]; 55-X Height and Bulk) and has been designed to conform to a future land use controls that are anticipated to be adopted as part of the Central Soma planning effort currently underway.

Based on recent conversations with you, we understand that RealTex intends to submit a revised Environmental Evaluation application for a proposal that would conform to the use, height and density requirements of the current (WSMUG) zoning and (55-X) height district. If such a revision were received, the Planning Department would review the proposal and consider issuing a community plan exemption under CEQA.

The PPA issued June 22, 2015 incorrectly references the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project as the Program Environmental Impact Report (EN PEIR) that could potentially provide environmental clearance for the proposal. The applicable Program EIR should be the Western Soma Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project PEIR (certified December 6, 2010). As such, the following references to applicable mitigation measures cited in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project are hereby updated to correctly refer to the Western Soma Community Plan PEIR:

Archeological Resources
Cited: EN PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies
Corrected: Western Soma M-CP-4 Project-specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment

Noise
Cited: EN PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise
Corrected: Western Soma M-NO-2a General Construction Noise Measures

Cited: EN PEIR Noise Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses
Corrected: Western Soma M-NO-1a Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses
Western Soma M-NO-1b Siting of Noise Sensitive Uses

Cited: EN PEIR Noise Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisey Environments
Corrected: Western Soma M-NO-1d Open Space in Noisey Environments

Further, the PPA’s 18-month validity period, as noted on pg. 16 of the original PPA is hereby updated to July 12, 2017 to accommodate these corrections. Please feel free to contact the PPA Coordinator, Michael Jacinto, at (415) 575-9033 or michael.jacinto@sfgov.org, should you have any questions.
DATE: June 22, 2015
TO: Jake Shemano, RealTex, Inc.
FROM: Rick Cooper, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015.03239PPA for 365-399 Fifth Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact Michael Jacinto, at (415) 575-9033 or michael.jacinto@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Rick Cooper, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: June 17, 2015
Case No.: 2015.003239PPA
Project Address: 365-399 Fifth Street PPA
Block/Lot: 3752/023, 024, 590
Zoning: Western SoMa Mixed Use-General (WSMUG)
Height: 55-X
Area Plan: Western SoMa Plan
Project Sponsor: Jake Shemano, RealTex Inc.
415-923-8375
Staff Contact: Michael Jacinto – [415.575.9033]
michael.jacinto@sfgov.org

DISCLAIMERS:

This Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) letter provides feedback to the project sponsor from the Planning Department regarding the proposed project described in the PPA application submitted on March 10, 2015, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not 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, Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Health, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on the PPA application and plans, 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 project site comprises three parcels (APN 3752023, 3752024 and 3755090) at 365-399 Fifth Street in the South of Market neighborhood. The approximately 11,413-square-foot site is located on a block bounded by Harrison Street on its south, 4th Street on its east, 5th Street on its west, and Clara Street on its north. The proposal entails demolition of two existing buildings on the site: one that currently accommodates a donut shop (constructed in 1966), and another that is in office use (constructed in 1925). The proposal
entails construction of an 8-story, 85-foot-tall, 96,000-gross-square-foot mixed-use building that would contain 89 residential units (of which 20 percent would be studios, 24 percent one bedrooms and 47 percent two bedroom units). There would be eight residential floors over a ground floor and basement. The ground floor would contain the lobby, a 945 sq. ft. multi-use commercial space on the corner of 5th Street at Harrison Street, bicycle parking, accessory residential amenity space, a refuse room, and (3) residential units fronting Clara Street. The proposed building would contain one subterranean parking level which would be accessible from Clara Street and would provide (22) parking spaces, including (2) handicapped parking spaces, (1) city car share space, individual residential storage areas, and mechanical facilities. Onsite open space would be provided at the building’s second floor (2,165 sq. ft.) as well as within a 4,995-square-foot roof deck. The approximate height of the building will be 85’ as measured from the midpoint of the frontage along 5th Street to the roof of the top floor.

BACKGROUND:

The project site is within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans. The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans cover the Mission (location of project site), East South of Market (SoMa), Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and Central Waterfront neighborhoods. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR) by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.1,2 The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and its associated rezoning became effective December 19, 2008.

The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR), certified in 2008.3 The project site also lies within the proposed Central SoMa Plan area, a community planning process initiated in 2011. The Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public Review4 (Draft Plan) was released in April 2013, with proposed changes to the allowed land uses and building heights in the Plan area, including a strategy for improving the public realm within the Plan area and vicinity. The Draft Plan is available for download at http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org. The Central SoMa Plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which is currently underway. The Draft Plan and its proposed rezoning are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in 2016.

The existing zoning for the project site is WMUG (Western SoMa Mixed Use-General), which permits residential uses and encourages them in mixed-use buildings. The proposed use district for the project site in the Draft Plan is Mixed-Use Office (MUO), which would allow residential uses, as proposed under the project. The site’s existing height district is 55-X (the –X indicates that there are no specific bulk controls prescribed at this height within this district) and could be increased to 85-X under Draft Plan

---

4 Please note that the Central SoMa Plan was formerly called the Central Corridor Plan. To avoid ambiguity, this letter uses the current “Central SoMa Plan” when referring to the ongoing planning process, while “Draft Plan” refers to the document published in April 2013 under the name “Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public Review.”
conditions. The Draft Plan presents three alternatives, all of which propose an 85-foot height district at the project site. At this point, it is unknown whether the amended height affecting this and surrounding parcels would ultimately be approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Further comments in this Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) are based on the Draft Plan concepts published to date, which are contingent on the approval of the proposed Central SoMa Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The proposed project requires environmental review either individually, with a project-specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or in a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) if the project is consistent with an adopted community plan. The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. However, the proposed project is not consistent with the land use or development density (zoning, specifically height limit) identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, and it is therefore not eligible for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

The Project’s proposed 85-foot building height would be consistent with all three height limit alternatives currently being studied in the Central SoMa Plan EIR. Thus, it is possible that the proposal, as currently presented, would qualify for a CPE under the proposed Central SoMa Plan EIR once that EIR is certified and the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have adopted new zoning controls. However, the proposed project would be assessed based on the height limits for the project site in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlements for the proposed project are sought.

Due to the project’s location within the geographic area evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, any development on the project site would potentially be subject to the mitigation measures identified in that document. Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR that may be applicable to the proposed project are discussed below, under the applicable environmental topic. However, mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR that are applicable to the proposed project area could be refined, augmented, or superseded under the future Central SoMa Plan EIR, which would become applicable to the proposed project if the Draft Plan is approved.

If the proposed project is not consistent with the height and density identified for the project site in the adopted Central SoMa Plan, the proposed project would be precluded from qualifying for a CPE under the Central SoMa Plan. The proposed project would be analyzed in a separate environmental document that would not rely on the environmental analysis undertaken for the Central SoMa Plan. In this case, the applicable fees would be (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) the standard EIR fee, if an EIR is required.

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA Application. The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned...
Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) application.

1. **Historic Resources.** At the time of this review, the existing buildings on the project site range between 49 and 90 years of age. The California Environmental Quality Act requires that lead agencies evaluate buildings of 45 years of age or older for their potential to be considered historical resources. The two buildings on the site were evaluated as part of the South of Market Area Historic Resource Survey and were rated 6Z, meaning both buildings have been found ineligible for national, state, or local listing. Further, the project site is not located in an existing or proposed historic district. Thus, the proposed project would likely not be subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff; no additional analysis of historic architectural resources is likely required.

2. **Archaeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities to a depth of approximately 16 feet associated with excavation, grading, building construction as well as other types of soils movement. The project site lies within Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Archeological Mitigation Zone J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies. Therefore, the proposed project would require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of project mitigation measures (such as archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

3. **Transportation.** Based on the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, the project would require additional transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant impact. Therefore, the Planning Department requires that a consultant listed in the Planning Department’s Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a...
Transportation Technical Memorandum. You may be required to pay additional fees for the Memorandum; please contact Virnaliza Byrd at (415) 575-9025 to arrange payment. Once you pay the fees, please contact Manoj Madhavan at (415) 575-9095 or manoj.madhavan@sfgov.org so that he can provide you with a list of three consultants from the pre-qualified Transportation Consultant Pool. Upon selection of a transportation consultant, the Department will assign a transportation planner who will direct the scope of the consultant-prepared memorandum.

Additionally, the proposed project is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero. Planning staff have reviewed the proposed site plans and offer the following recommendations, some of which address the safety of persons walking and bicycling to and from the project site and vicinity:

- Transportation planner should conduct a site visit to assess pedestrian safety and to address other potential transportation and circulation concerns.

4. **Noise.** 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. If pile driving is to be used during the construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project. The EEA application should indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required. Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise requires that the project sponsor develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant when the environmental review of a development project determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and sensitivity of proximate uses. This mitigation measure requires that a plan for such measures be submitted to DBI prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

Based on the General Plan’s Background Noise Levels map, the project site is located along a segment of Fifth Street with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Therefore, an acoustical analysis is required for the proposed new residential/mixed-use development. **Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses** is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors. This measure would apply to the proposed project because the project includes a noise-sensitive use. Noise Mitigation Measure F-4 requires that the project sponsor conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements for new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn). The analysis must demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations can be met.

**Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses** would not apply to the proposed project because the project would not include commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the project site vicinity.

---

Finally, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments would apply to the proposed project because it includes new development of a noise-sensitive use. This mitigation measure requires that open space required under the Planning Code be protected from existing ambient noise levels and would apply to the outdoor open space on the proposed building’s second level fronting Hulbert Alley, as well as to the open space proposed on the building’s rooftop level. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles or urban design.

5. Air Quality. The proposed project’s 89 dwelling units fall below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is likely not required. Furthermore, 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 proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6. The proposed project is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by DPH.

The project site is also located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code, Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The project proposes to construct new sensitive land uses (i.e., residential), which are subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. The project sponsor will be required to submit an Article 38 application to DPH prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the Article 38 application with the EEA.

In addition, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Air Quality Mitigation Measure M-AQ-G1, Construction Air Quality will likely be required.

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 85 feet, the proposed project may require a backup diesel generator and additional measures would likely be necessary to reduce its emissions. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

6. Greenhouse Gases. 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. Projects that are consistent

---

8 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
9 Refer to [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp) for more information.
with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.\(^\text{10}\) The project sponsor is required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

7. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. The project will therefore require a consultant-prepared wind analysis, which may include wind tunnel analysis if needed. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning coordinator prior to proceeding with the analysis.

8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department\(^\text{11}\) staff indicates that the proposed project could cast shadows on surrounding public streets and sidewalks but would not impact an open space under jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. Therefore, no further review of the project’s Proposition K conformity would be required.

9. **Geology.** The project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill). Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.\(^\text{12}\) A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. 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. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would disturb over 50 cubic yards of soil as part of its construction in an area of known ground contamination. 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 the Department of Public Health (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 ESA would determine

---


\(^{11}\) Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis – 365-399 Fifth Street (aka 399 Fifth Street), prepared by Christopher Townes, June 8, 2015. This document is available for review at the Planning Department in Case File No. 2015.003239PPA.

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.

DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp. Fees for DPH review and oversight of projects subject to the ordinance would apply. Please refer to DPH’s fee schedule, available at: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz. Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EEA.

Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials would be applicable to the demolition of the site’s two existing buildings. The mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, and any fluorescent light tubes containing mercury be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. In addition, any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, must be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Also, given that the site’s existing buildings were constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the building. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for the requirements related to demolition of buildings with asbestos-containing materials. In addition, because of its age (constructed prior to 1978), lead paint may be found in the existing building. Please contact the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for requirements related to the demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

11. Tree Planting and Protection. 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 such trees must be shown on the site plans with the size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit the Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the EEA and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans. Also see the comments below under “Street Trees.”

12. Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects. The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any “major project.” A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding $1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a Community Plan Exemption (CPE); certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a
project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations occur, the filing requirement shall be triggered by the earliest such determination.) A major project does not include a residential development project with four or fewer dwelling units. The first (or initial) report must be filed within 30 days of the date the Planning Commission (or any other local lead agency) certifies the EIR for that project or, for a major project relying on a program EIR, within 30 days of the date that the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts a final environmental determination under CEQA. Please submit a Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. This form can be found at the Planning Department or online at http://www.sfethics.org.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:

The project requires the following Planning Department approvals. These approvals may be reviewed in conjunction with the required environmental review, but may not be granted until after the required environmental review is completed. Note that the subject parcels are within the Central SoMa Plan area. The draft Plan was published in April 2013. The Central SoMa Plan process is anticipated to be completed by mid-2016. The proposals in the draft Plan are subject to change and are contingent upon the eventual approval by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

1. **Rezoning.** The project site is located within the Western SoMa Mixed-Use General (WMUG) District. The proposed residential and commercial components of the proposed mixed-use project are permitted land uses under both the existing WMUG zoning and the Draft Central SoMa zoning controls being considered for the subject site, Mixed-Use Office (MUO). There is no maximum residential Floor Area Ratio (FAR) within either the WMUG or MUO zoning districts; rather, the maximum building envelope and associated floor area is governed by the maximum height limit and setback requirements. The zoning concepts included in the Central Corridor Draft Plan indicate that a zoning reclassification from Western SoMa Mixed-Use General WMUG to MUO is being considered for the site.

2. **Height District Reclassification.** The project site is located within the 55-X Height and Bulk District. The height of the proposed project would exceed the existing height limit. In order for the project to proceed, the Board of Supervisors would need to approve a Height District Reclassification for the subject parcel. As noted above, the zoning concepts published in the Draft Plan indicate that a height limit of 85 feet is being considered for this site.

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

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

5. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.
Applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org. Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

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

This project is required to conduct a Pre-application meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the “Permits & Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Resource Center” tab.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. Central SoMa Plan. The subject property falls within the ongoing Central SoMa Plan study area generally bounded by 2nd, 6th, Townsend and Market Streets. The Draft Plan, published in April 2013, will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Draft Plan will propose changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and will include a strategy for improving the public realm in this area. The EIR, the Draft Plan, and the proposed rezoning and affiliated Code changes are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in mid-2016.

The Draft Plan includes recommendations for new land use controls as well as new height and bulk controls for the subject property. The Draft Plan is available for download at http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org. Further comments in this section of the PPA are based on the Draft Plan concepts published to date.

2. Land Use. The Draft Plan recommends rezoning the subject property to the Mixed-Use Office (MUO) zoning district, in which the proposed retail and residential uses would be allowed. These uses are generally consistent with key objectives of the Draft Plan, which include providing support for substantial development in a transit-rich area and favoring office development over other kinds of growth, particularly on large parcels.

In order to create a diverse and dynamic 24-hour neighborhood characteristic of SoMa, the Draft Plan’s preliminary land use principles envision a mixed-use neighborhood in which substantial office development is balanced with retail, arts, entertainment, industrial, and residential uses. The proposed ground floor retail with upper floors devoted to office and residential uses support this vision of a mixed-use neighborhood and are strongly encouraged.
3. **Existing Height and Bulk.** The subject property is located within a 55-X Height and Bulk District, which does not permit the project’s proposed height and bulk. *The project could not be approved under existing zoning.*

4. **Urban Form: Height and Bulk.** In recognition of the desire to accommodate more growth in the area, the Draft Plan recommends two height scenarios referred to as the Mid-Rise Alternative and the High Rise Alternative. With regard to the subject site, both the Mid-Rise and High-Rise Alternatives propose an 85 foot height limit. The proposed building height of 85 feet conforms to both height alternatives being considered with no further applicable bulk restrictions.

5. **Additional Height Limits for Narrow Streets in the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts.** The street along the property’s northern boundary, Clara Street, is 35 feet wide and therefore considered a “narrow street” per Planning Code Section 261.1. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 261.1, a building (for only that portion more than 60 feet from the corner) on the southern side of an east-west narrow street within an Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use District must not encroach into a 45 degree sun access plane extending from the most directly opposite northerly property line. As proposed, no portion of the building encroaches into the required 45 degree sun access plane; therefore, the project complies.

6. **Floor Area Ratio (FAR).** While there is no maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for the residential component of the project under either the existing or contemplated zoning, the MUO zoning district (under current Code) does establish a maximum floor area for retail as 25,000 sf per lot, above which a Conditional Use Authorization would be required. As proposed, the project’s proposed retail area of 945 sf would be permitted as-of-right within the MUO zoning district.

The specific FAR controls of the Central SoMa Plan have not yet been established. Department staff will continue refining the proposal for the Plan and working with project sponsors to develop projects that would be compliant with the proposed FAR controls.

7. **Large Project Authorization.** Planning Code Section 329 outlines the requirements for a Large Project Authorization in Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Zoning Districts. A Large Project Authorization is required of new building construction exceeding 75 feet in height or 25,000 gross square feet. All large projects within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan are subject to review by the Planning Commission in an effort to achieve the objectives and policies of the General Plan, the applicable Design Guidelines and the Planning Code. To the extent possible, the project should be designed to minimize deviations and should strive to comply with all Planning Code requirements. As proposed, the project will be required to seek specific Code modifications from the Planning Commission, for the following provisions:

a. **Rear yard - Planning Code Section 134 requires a minimum rear yard setback of 25% of the lot depth to be provided at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building.** As proposed, all residential floors of the project
encroach into the required rear yard; therefore, the project does not comply. As such, the project would be required to seek an exception from the Planning Commission as a component of the Large Project Authorization review process. The Planning Department recommends the provision of a comparable amount of open space equivalent to what would have been provided in a compliant rear yard.

b. Open space- Open Space (Residential/Non-Residential). Planning Code Section 135 requires the project to provide 80 sf of open space for every dwelling unit (if non publically-accessible) and 54 sf of open space for every dwelling unit (if publically-accessible). Therefore, the total minimum required open space amount for the residential component is either 7,120 sf if not publically accessible or 4,806 sf if publically accessible.

Planning Code Section 135.3 requires this project to provide 1 sf of open space for every 250 sf of retail space. With a total proposed retail floor area of 945 sf, 4 sf of open space is required.

As proposed, the project provides approximately 7,120 sf of non-publically accessible open space which includes 2,165 sf at the 2nd Floor outer court and 4,955 sf at the roof deck. However, pursuant to Planning Code Section 823 (Western SOMA Special Use District), roof decks do not qualify as private or common useable open space. Since, the project only proposes 2,165 sf of qualifying usable open space at the 2nd floor outer court, the project does not comply. As such, the project would be required to seek an exception from the Planning Commission as a component of the Large Project Authorization review process.

Please be aware that while under the current Planning Code, the non-residential, open space is not required to be open to the public, the Central Corridor Plan proposes required publically-accessible open space. As such, required non-residential open space is preferably at-grade, easily accessible and visible to the public, and activated with adjacent uses, and at minimum should meet the design and access requirements of Planning Code Section 138.

8. Permitted Obstructions. Planning Code Section 136 establishes specific dimensional and glazing requirements for bay window projections. As proposed, there is not sufficient detail provided to determine whether the proposed bay windows comply. Please ensure that the project plans provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance.

9. Rooftop Screening. Planning Code Section 141 establishes specific rooftop screening requirements. As proposed, there is not sufficient detail provided to determine whether the project meets the rooftop screening requirements. Please ensure that the project plans submitted with the Large Project Authorization application provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance.

10. Parking Screening. Planning Code Section 142 requires parking areas to be screened from view from the public right-of-way. As proposed, there is not sufficient detail provided to determine whether the project meets the parking screening requirements. Please ensure that the project plans submitted with
the Large Project Authorization application provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance.

11. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** The subject property falls within a seismic hazard zone. An Interdepartmental Project Review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones. An application is available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 or at the Planning Information Center (PIC) at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org).

12. **Street Trees/Streetscape Plan.** Planning Code Section 138.1 outlines the requirements for streetscape and pedestrian improvements, including the requirement for new street trees and a streetscape plan. The proposed project would be required to provide one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree, as well as the submittal of a streetscape plan. Therefore, the Project would be required to provide a total of 19 street trees, including: 3 street trees along Harrison Street, 8 street trees along 5th Street, 4 street trees along Clara Street, and 4 street trees along Hulbert Alley. The project plans provide only 14 street trees; 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 should submit a Tree Referral Form (see attached) to the Department of Public Works (DPW).

13. **Bird Safety.** Planning Code Section 139 outlines the standards for new construction to reduce bird mortality and bird hazards. Please refer to these standards to ensure compliance with the Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings.

14. **Shadow Analysis.** Based upon the preliminary analysis and submitted materials, the project does not appear to have potential shadow impacts on nearby property owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. Additional analysis will be confirmed during the environmental review.

15. **Street Frontage.** As new construction located within an Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use District, the proposed project would be subject to the requirements for street frontage as outlined in Planning Code Section 145.1, including the requirements for active uses, ground floor ceiling heights, transparency and fenestration, among others. Please refer to Planning Code Section 145.1.

16. **Parking.** Under current zoning (WMUG) and the potential zoning under the Central Corridor planning process (MUO), no parking would be required. However, each of these zoning districts would have parking maximums, which are listed in Planning Code Section 151.1. Within the MUO zoning district, parking is limited to up to one parking space for every four dwelling units, and up to one parking space for every 1,500 sf of retail. Based on the existing and future transit accessibility of the site and the need to limit traffic volumes in the area, parking should be minimized on site.
17. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.1-155.4 provides requirements for bicycle parking and associated facilities (i.e. showers and lockers) in new commercial development. Based on the proposed areas which includes 89 dwelling units and 945 sf of retail, the proposed project is required to provide a minimum of 89 Class I bicycle parking spaces and 4 Class II bicycle parking spaces. The project only provides 89 Class I bicycle parking spaces and zero Class II bicycle parking spaces; therefore, the project does not comply. Please include the required number of Class II bicycle parking spaces on the project plans upon submission of the Large Project Authorization application.

18. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 423, the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee applies to the Project. Impact fees shall be assessed per net new gross square footage on residential and non-residential uses within the Plan Area. Impact fees shall be assessed on mixed-use projects according to the gross square feet of each use in the project. Please note that the Eastern Neighborhoods Fee Tier applicable to this project will be revised upon any rezoning of the property to increase height limits, density allowances, or allowed uses, such as would be necessary for the proposed project to proceed. The Central Corridor Plan as envisioned will maintain the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee structure and add, as necessary, one or more additional higher fee tiers, reflective of the greater heights and densities envisioned in the Central Corridor Plan.

The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document, with an option for the project sponsor to defer payment to prior to issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy upon agreeing to pay a deferral surcharge in accordance with Section 107A.13.3 of the San Francisco Building Code.

**Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits.** Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee from the Planning Commission. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code.

More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website.

19. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 411 et seq., the Transit Impact Development Fee will apply to the retail component of this project. Please be aware that an ongoing process – the Transportation Sustainability Program may eventually replace the Transit Impact Development Fee. You can find more information about this program here: [http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3035](http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3035)

20. **Affordable Housing.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 415, any housing project which consists of ten or more dwelling units shall satisfy the Inclusionary Housing Program requirements outlined in Planning Code Section 415.3(b), Table 415.3. Table 415.3 provides alternatives which include payment...
of a 20% fee, providing 12% (of the total # of units) on-site as affordable, or 20% (of the total # of units) off-site as affordable. Please see Planning Code Section 415 for further Inclusionary Housing Program Code requirements which may also include submission of an Affidavit of Compliance to the Planning Department depending on the alternative sought. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project.

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

a. Direct financial construction from a public entity
b. Development bonus or other form of public assistance

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

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
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

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

The project is located in the Central SoMa Area Plan currently in progress. The area is mixed in use with residential, industrial and commercial uses. The architectural character of the area has a predominance of masonry structures and wood siding. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends that the building massing adjust to provide more massing along Clara and reduce massing towards the interior of the block to help establish a mid-block open space. This could be accomplished by adding mass up to 45’ to the north corner of the site along Clara to better define the streetwall. This could help redistribute units that would be impacted by further opening up the center of the block along the eastern side of the lot.

The Planning Department recommends moving the driveway towards 5th Street in order to provide ground floor residential units along the very narrow Hulbert Alley. The project could then take advantage of the alley as a pedestrian space even if the residential units here would be oriented towards Clara and the interior of the block.

The project currently shows nine stories in an 85’ height. The Planning Department strongly recommends reducing by one floor to provide more generous residential heights. The ground floor units should either be buffered by being set back from the public realm or raised with stoops in line with the Planning Department Residential Ground Floor Design Guidelines.

2. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends reducing the driveway entry to a 12-foot-maximum width.

3. **Architecture.** As the architecture is currently shown as diagrammatic, the Planning Department has no comments but encourages the use of high-quality materials, significant depth in the expression of the fenestration and detailing to enhance the pedestrian experience.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. As illustrated on page 10 of this PPA, the list of applications applicable to the project (e.g., Environmental Evaluation, Large Project Authorization, Rezoning, Height Reclassification and Building Permit Application, must be submitted no later than **December 22, 2015**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosure: Neighborhood Group Mailing List  
Interdepartmental Project Review Application  
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin  
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet
cc:  Charles Fetterman, Agent
     Christopher Townes, Current Planning
     Scott Edmonson, Citywide Planning and Analysis
     Maia Small, Design Review
     Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
     Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
     Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
     Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
     June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH
     Planning Department Webmaster (webmaster.planning@sfgov.org)
The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

Title: Preliminary Shadow Analysis - 365-399 5th St (aka 399 5th Street)

Comments: Proposed Bldg. Height: 85 feet
Existing Zoning/Ht. & Bulk District: WMUG/ 55-X
Contemplated Zoning/Ht. & Bulk District (per Draft Central SOMA Plan): MUO/ 85-X
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Michael Nulty
Alliance for a Better District 6
PO Box 420782
San Francisco, CA 94142-0782

Carolyn Diamond
Market Street Association
870 Market St., Suite 456
San Francisco, CA 94102

Reed Bement
Rincon Hill Residents Association
75 Folsom Street #1800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Marvis Phillips
Alliance for a Better District 6
230 Eddy Street #1206
San Francisco, CA 94102-2607

Jason Henderson
Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.
300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503
San Francisco, CA 94102

Jim Meko
SOMA Leadership Council
366 Tenth Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Fernando Marti
Asian Neighborhood Design
1245 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Corrine Woods
Mission Creek Harbor Assoc.
300 Channel Street, Box 10
San Francisco, CA 94107

SOMA Senior Community Action Grp.
360 Fourth Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

Jane Kim
Board of Supervisors Room #244
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett PL
San Francisco, CA 94102

Don Marcos
Mission Hiring Hall
288 7th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103-3419

SOMCAN
1070 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Richard McGeary
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
555 Buena Vista West #601
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dallas Bradley
Natomia Street Neighborhood Watch Group
1065 Natomia Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Marcia Ban
SOMPAC
1035 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Gordon Chin
Chinatown Community Development Center
1525 Grant Ave. (Tower)
San Francisco, CA 94133

David Baker
North of Market Planning Coalition
PO Box 426693
San Francisco, CA 94142-6693

Samoan Development Centre
2055 Sunnydale Avenue #100
San Francisco, CA 94134-2611

Janet Carpinelli
Dogpatch Neighborhood Association
934 Minnesota Street No.227
San Francisco, CA 94107

Antonio Diaz
PODER
474 Valencia Street #125
San Francisco, CA 94103

Mike Grisso
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
1 South Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Ian Lewis
HERE Local 2
209 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

John Clancy
Portside Homeowners Association
115 South Park
San Francisco, CA 94107

Rodney Minott
Save The Hill Neighbors United for Medical
1206 Mariposa Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

Gerald Wolf
Hallan Street Homeowners Association
1 Brush Place
San Francisco, CA 94103

Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Assn.
1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133
San Francisco, CA 94107

Catherine Liddell
South Beach-Rincon
403 Main Street #813
San Francisco, CA 94105

Kaye Griffin
LMNOP Neighbors
1047 Minna Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Keith Goldstein
Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association
800 Kansas Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

York Loo
York Realty
243A Shipley Street
San Francisco, CA 94107-1010
NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP NOTIFICATION FORM

By filling out this form you are registering your neighborhood group to receive notices from the San Francisco Planning Department.

As per the Sunshine Ordinance and Planning Code, your contact information will be subject to public review; it will also be posted on the Department’s website, www.sfplanning.org

If you have any questions, please contact planningnews@sfgov.org or 415-575-9121.

Please provide the following information (* REQUIRED):

Organization Name * ____________________________

Mailing Address * ____________________________________________

Contact Person to be listed in Directory * ____________________________

Title * _________________________________________________________

Phone Number * ________________________________________________

E-Mail Address (generic email suggested) * __________________________

Number of Members: ______  Adopted By-laws: Yes ☐  No ☐

Non-profit: Yes ☐  No ☐  Meeting Schedule (Frequency and Time): ________________
Geographic Area of Interest:
Pick your area of interest as per the Planning Department Neighborhood Map (http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1654) below:

☐ Bayview
☐ Bernal Heights
☐ Castro/Upper Market
☐ Chinatown
☐ Crocker Amazon
☐ Diamond Heights
☐ Downtown Civic Center
☐ Excelsior
☐ Financial District
☐ Glen Park
☐ Golden Gate Park
☐ Haight Ashbury
☐ Inner Richmond
☐ Inner Sunset
☐ Lakeshore
☐ Marina
☐ Mission
☐ Noe Valley
☐ North Beach
☐ Ocean View
☐ Outer Mission
☐ Outer Richmond
☐ Outer Sunset
☐ Pacific Heights
☐ Parkside
☐ Potrero Hill
☐ Presidio
☐ Presidio Heights
☐ Russian Hill
☐ Seacliff
☐ South Bayshore
☐ South of Market
☐ Treasure Island
☐ Twin Peaks
☐ Upper Market
☐ Visitacion Valley
☐ West of Twin Peaks
☐ Western Addition
☐ Citywide

San Francisco Planning Department Neighborhood Map:

Email completed form to planningnews@sfgov.org. Please note that it takes about 2-4 weeks to start receiving notices.

Application Submission Date: ____________
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Recycled Water Installation Procedures for Developers

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas under the following circumstances:

- New or remodeled buildings and all subdivisions (except condominium conversions) with a total cumulative area of 40,000 square feet or more
- New and existing irrigated areas of 10,000 square feet or more

The following are procedures to guide developers and property owners with the installation of recycled water service lines. The diagram on the reverse shows how and where the lines are to be installed, and the required backflow prevention.

Number of Water Lines Coming onto a Property
Three to four lines:
1) Fire
2) Potable water domestic
3) Recycled water domestic
4) Recycled water irrigation (if property has landscaping)

Number of Water Meters
One water meter required for each water line.

Required Backflow Prevention
Fire line – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Potable water domestic – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Recycled water domestic – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Recycled water irrigation line – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer

All backflow preventers must be approved by the SFPUC’s Water Quality Bureau.

The backflow preventer for domestic water plumbing inside the building, and the recycled water system must meet the CCSF’s Plumbing Code and Health Code.

Pipe Separation
California Department of Public Health regulations require new water mains and new supply lines to be installed at least 4-foot horizontally from, and one foot vertically above a parallel pipeline conveying recycled water.

Pipe Type
- Transmission lines and mains – ductile iron
- Distribution and service lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Irrigation lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Dual-plumbing – piping described in Chapter 3, Appendix J of the City and County of San Francisco Plumbing Codes

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

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

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

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

Recycled Water Ordinances and Technical Assistance
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Resources Planning
(415) 554-3271

Recycled Water Plumbing Codes
Department of Building Inspection
Plumbing Inspection Services
(415) 558-6054

Backflow Prevention
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Quality Bureau
(650) 652-3100

New Service Line Permits
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Service Bureau
(415) 551-3000
BUILDING LOT
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RECYCLED WATER
IRRIGATION
SEE NOTE 3
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SEE NOTE 3
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SEE NOTES 1 & 2
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SEE NOTE 1
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NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST APPROVED
BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.

2. BACKFLOW PREVENTION FOR DOMESTIC WATER
PLUMBING INSIDE THE BUILDING MUST MEET
CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH
CODE REQUIREMENTS.

3. BACKFLOW PREVENTER FOR RECYCLED WATER
SYSTEM MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND
PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

HEAVY LINES:
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION.
SFPUC RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF NEW SERVICE UP TO THE END
OF METER ASSEMBLY.

LIGHT LINES: &
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION.
OWNERSHIP REMAINS WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER.

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

INSTALLATION OF RECYCLED WATER SERVICE LINES
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REV. NO. 2
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW
Effective: August 30, 2013

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.)
DATE: April 1, 2007  (V1.3)
TITLE: Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding

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

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

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

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

The permit applicant shall refer to PUC requirements for information required for the review of projects in flood prone areas. Requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters.

www.sfplanning.org