DATE: October 13, 2015

TO: Courtney Pash, Build Inc.

FROM: Brittany Bendix, Planning Department

RE: PPA Case No. 2015.009460PPA for 830 Eddy Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Brittany Bendix, at (415) 575-9114 or brittany.bendix@sf.gov, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Brittany Bendix, Acting Senior Planner
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 July 15, 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 subject properties are developed with a six-story office building and a two-story accessory parking garage. The proposed project would demolish the existing structure and construct a new, 130-foot tall, 14-story, 120-unit residential building with 1,000 sf of ground floor retail space. The project will result in
excavation 28-feet below the lower level of the existing garage and disturb 14,500 cubic yards of soil. The primary residential entrance would be on Willow Street and the retail space would open onto Eddy Street. The new building would provide 100 off-street underground parking spaces, 40 of which would be retained for use by the commercial building at 825 Van Ness Avenue and 60 of which would serve the new residential building. The project retains an existing 25 foot 7 inch curb cut on Eddy Street that will serve as an entrance to off-street parking and a drive thru. Two additional curb cuts are proposed on Eddy Street, each 10 feet wide, that provide access to off-street parking in the two basement levels. No alterations are proposed to the commercial building at 825 Van Ness Avenue.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) for the full scope of the project. EEAs 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 under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees. Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.

If the additional analysis outlined below indicates that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the project could be eligible for a Class 32 infill development categorical exemption under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332. If a Class 32 exemption is appropriate, Environmental Planning staff will prepare a certificate of exemption.

If it is determined that the project could result in a significant impact, an initial study would be prepared. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Department’s environmental consultant pool or by Department staff. Should you choose to have the initial study prepared by an environmental consultant, contact Devyani Jain at (415) 575-9051 for a list of three eligible consultants. If the initial study finds that the project would have a significant impact that could 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 (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for public review, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND). Additional information regarding the environmental review process can be found at: http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631.

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool (http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf). The Planning
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Department will 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 addressed through the environmental review process. Some of these would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application.

1. **Historic Resources.** The existing building on the project site is less than 45 years of age. Thus, the proposed project is not subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff; no additional analysis of historic architectural resources is required.

2. **Archeological Resources.** The proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. 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 one of the Planning Department’s three standard archeological mitigation measures (archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

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.

**Tribal Cultural Resources.** Tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are a class of resource established under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 2015. TCRs are defined as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is either included on or eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register, or is a resource that the lead agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, determines is a TCR. Planning Department staff will review the proposed project to determine if it may cause an adverse effect to a TCR; this will occur in tandem with preliminary archeological review. No additional information is needed from the project sponsor at this time. Consultation with California Native American tribes regarding TCRs may be required at the request of the tribes. If staff determines that the proposed project may have a potential significant adverse impact on a TCR, mitigation measures will be identified and required. Mitigation measures may include avoidance, protection, or preservation of the TCR and development of interpretation and public education and artistic programs.
3. **Transportation.** Based on the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review,[1] 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 Circulation Memorandum. Please contact Manoj Madhavan at (415) 575-9095 or manoj.madhavan@sfgov.org so that he can provide you with the pre-qualified Transportation Consultant Pool. A consultant of your choice from this list shall prepare the Circulation Memorandum. Upon selection of a transportation consultant, the Department will assign a transportation planner who will direct the scope of the consultant-prepared memorandum. To aid in the Department’s determination, please clarify the nature and extent of proposed streetscape improvements and indicate them on the plans for the proposed project.

Upon completion of the Memorandum, you may be required to pay additional fees. Please contact Virnaliza Byrd at (415) 575-9025 to arrange payment.

4. **Noise.** Based on the General Plan’s Background Noise Levels map, the project site is located along a segment of Van Ness Avenue with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Therefore, an acoustical analysis is required for the proposed new residential development. The acoustical analysis must demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations can be met. Should such concerns be present, the department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

Additionally, the Planning Department requires that residential open space required under the Planning Code be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Measures to protect required open space from noise include 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.

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.

5. **Air Quality.** The proposed project’s 14,500 cubic yards of soil disturbance exceeds the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants.² Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is likely to be required. Please
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² BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

In addition, 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.

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.

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 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. The project sponsor may 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 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.

As discussed below under “Preliminary Project Comments,” the project site is in the Van Ness Special Use District and is subject to Planning Code limits on ground-level wind speeds. A wind tunnel analysis may be required in order to determine project compliance with these Planning Code provisions. Additionally, ground-level wind speeds will be assessed as part of the project’s environmental review. The project will therefore require a consultant-prepared wind analysis. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the assigned Current Planning and Environmental Planning staff 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 staff indicates that the
proposed project could cast shadows on Jefferson Square Park, a Recreation and Parks facility. The project therefore requires a shadow study, and the project sponsor is required to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a detailed shadow study. The consultant would be required to submit a Shadow Study Application, which can be found on the Planning Department’s website. A separate fee is required. Upon submittal, please submit a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Coordinator prior to preparing the analysis.

9. **Geology.** As the project proposes more than 50 cubic yards of excavation, 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 construct residential units on a parcel subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, therefore the proposed project may also be subject to Article 22A. 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 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. To aid in the Department’s determination, please submit any available ESA with the Environmental Evaluation Application.

   DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp](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](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.

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.

1. **Letter of Determination.** Please submit a request for a Letter of Determination regarding the interpretation that Lots 018 and 022-044 constitute one development lot.

2. **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 253.2 for the new construction of a building greater than 50 feet in height within the Van Ness Special Use District. Additionally, if the proposal moves forward as a single development lot, the project may also seek exceptions from the Planning Code through Conditional Use Authorization as a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

3. A **Rear Yard Modification** is required per Planning Code Section 134 and 307(g). Please submit a Variance application for the modification request, unless the project proceeds as a PUD.

4. **Variances** from Planning Code Sections 145.1 and 155.2 are required. Similarly, incorporate this into the aforementioned Variance or PUD requests.

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

6. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.
Conditional Use 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. Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Project Sponsors are encouraged, and in some cases required, 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.

Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review. Notice may be required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and, to the extent feasible, occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review process. Please be prepared to provide mailing addresses on a CD upon request during the environmental review process.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. Development Lot. Given the site’s ownership and subdivision history, the proposal suggests that Lots 018 and 022-044 should be reviewed as one development lot for the purpose of applying the requirements of the Planning Code. While this approach seems reasonable, please present the argument in a request for a Letter of Determination, including any relevant exhibits to outline the justification for considering the two sites as one development lot.

If the project moves forward where the subject properties are considered a single development lot, the total lot size will be 21,980 square feet and exceptions noted below could be sought as a Planned Unit Development. Otherwise, the exceptions would need to be processed as Variances from their respective Planning Code requirement.

2. Rear Yard. The RC-4 Zoning District requires a rear yard equal to 25 percent of the lot depth. However, the Van Ness Special Use District allows the Zoning Administrator to waive or modify that requirement pursuant to Section 307(g) if the following findings are met:

   • The interior block open space formed by the rear yards of abutting properties will not be adversely affected; and,
- A comparable amount of usable open space is provided elsewhere on the lot or within the development where it is more accessible to residents; and,

- The access of light and air to abutting properties will not be significantly impeded.

As proposed, the project does not provide the required rear yard and must seek a modification by filing a Variance per Section 307(g) or including this request as an exception to a Planned Unit Development.

3. **Streetscape Plan.** If the project proceeds as a single development lot, the size of the parcel and amount of frontage on Eddy Street, Willow Street, and Van Ness Avenue requires the submittal of a Streetscape Plan to the Planning Department to ensure that the new streetscape and pedestrian elements are in conformance with the Department’s Better Street Plan. This Streetscape Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department no later than 60 days prior to any Planning Commission action, and shall be considered for approval at the time of other project approval actions. The streetscape plan should show the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the property. Please see the Department’s Better Streets Plan and Section 138.1(c)(2)(ii) for the additional elements that may be required as part of the project’s streetscape plan.

Also, see ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ below for suggested and required streetscape improvements.

4. **Vision Zero.** The project is located on a “high-injury corridor”, identified through the City’s Vision Zero Network. Specifically, Eddy Street and Van Ness Avenue are high-injury corridors; the 800 block of Eddy Street, west of Van Ness Avenue, is just off the cyclist and pedestrian high-injury network; all of Eddy Street east of Van Ness Avenue is on the cyclist and pedestrian high-injury network; and Van Ness Avenue is on the pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicle high-injury network. The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project.

See ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ below for suggested and required streetscape improvements.

5. **Street Frontage.** As proposed the Project does not comply with the following requirements of Planning Code Section 145.1:

- **Parking and Loading entrances.** No more than one-third of the width or 20-feet, whichever is less, of any given street frontage of a new structure parallel to and facing a street shall be devoted to parking and loading ingress or egress. Additionally, the total street frontage dedicated to parking and loading access should be minimized and combining entrances for off-street parking with those for off-street loading is encouraged. The placement of parking loading entrances should minimize interference with street-fronting active uses and with the movement of pedestrians, cyclists, public transit, and autos.
The current proposal dedicates 45-feet 7-inches to parking and loading entrances and therefore does not comply with the requirements of this section. Please consider the suggestions in the ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ below and revise the proposal accordingly. Exceptions may be considered through a Variance or Planned Unit Development review process.

6. Off-Street Parking. The current proposal includes 60 off-street parking spaces for the new residential use (120 units) and 40 off-street parking spaces for the existing office use (approx. 29,690 gsf). Planning Code Section 151.1 sets maximum parking limits for sites within an RC Zoning District. Accessory off-street parking for office uses is limited to seven percent of the gross floor area dedicated to office uses (approx. 2,079 gsf). To verify compliance with this requirement please designate the area dedicated to off-street parking spaces for the office uses. Additionally, accessory off-street parking for residential uses in the Van Ness SUD is principally permitted up to a ratio of one car for every two dwelling units. The proposal currently complies with the residential off-street parking maximum.

7. Bicycle Parking. The project proposes an increase in the capacity of off-street vehicle parking spaces for the development lot. Accordingly, bicycle parking is required for the new residential uses, the sum of all retail uses, and the existing office uses. The table below specifies the amount of Class 1 and Class 2 bicycle parking spaces required per use. Please revise the plans accordingly or seek an exception from Section 155.2 through an in-lieu fee, Variance or the PUD process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100 + 1 per every four dwelling units over 100. (105)</td>
<td>One per 20 units. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1 for every 7,500 SF of OFA (0) OFA = Occupied floor area</td>
<td>Minimum of 2; or one for every 750 SF of OFA. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1 for every 5,000 SF of OFA (48)</td>
<td>Minimum of 2; one for each additional 50,000 SF of OFA (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Car sharing. Planning Code Section 166 requires this project to provide at least one car share space. Please designate the propose Car Share space on future plans.

9. Unbundled Parking. Planning Code Section 167 outlines a requirement for unbundled parking spaces for newly constructed residential buildings of ten dwelling units or more. All off-street parking spaces accessory to residential uses shall be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units for the life of the dwelling units, such that potential renters or buyers have the option of renting or buying a residential unit at a price lower than would be the case if there were a single price for both the residential unit and the parking space. The Planning Commission may grant an exception from this requirement for projects which include financing for affordable housing that requires that costs for parking and housing be bundled together.
10. New Building Greater than 50 Feet Tall. Planning Code Section 253 requires Conditional Use Authorization for any proposal for a building or structure exceeding 50 feet in height in an RC District where the street frontage of the building is more than 50 feet. The Planning Commission will thereby consider the proposal and may permit a height up to, but not exceeding, the 130-foot height limit prescribed by the 130-V Height and Bulk District.

Please see the ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ below for direction on massing and bulk setbacks.

11. Shadow Analysis (Section 295). Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project may cast new shadow on Jefferson Square Park. Therefore, a detailed shadow analysis would need to be prepared to determine if the project would create new shadow in that results in an adverse impact to Jefferson Square Park, pursuant to Section 295. If this detailed shadow analysis finds that the project would cast shadow on Jefferson Square Park, the sponsor should explore sculpting of portions of the project to avoid casting new shadows on the park.

12. Wind. The project site is in the Van Ness SUD. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 243(c)(15), the proposed project is subject to the following wind regulations: ground-level wind speeds shall not exceed the seating comfort criterion of 7 mph for more than 10 percent of the time year-round, shall not exceed the pedestrian comfort criterion of 11 mph for 10 percent of the time year-round, and shall not reach or exceed the wind hazard criterion of 26 mph for a single hour of the year. The Planning Commission may grant exceptions from the comfort criteria, but no exceptions from the wind hazard criterion may be granted. In order to demonstrate project compliance with the provisions of Section 243(c)(15), a wind tunnel test is required.

Please retain a consultant who is familiar with San Francisco’s methodology to conduct the wind tunnel test. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the assigned Environmental Planning and Current Planning staff prior to proceeding with the wind tunnel test. Please see the topic of wind under the Environmental Review section of this PPA letter for additional information.

13. First Source Hiring Agreement. A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more. For more information, please contact:

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

14. Inclusionary Affordable Housing. Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an ‘Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415,’ to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or affordable housing fee. Any
on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units; unless a Costa Hawkins agreement is possible. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project. The minimum Affordable Housing Percentages are 20% affordable housing fee, 12% on-site, or 20% off-site. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a minimum requirement of fourteen (14) units if provided on-site, and twenty-four (24) units if provided off-site.

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

- direct financial construction from a public entity
- 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.

15. SFPUC Requirements & Project Review. The SFPUC administers San Francisco’s various water, sewer, and stormwater requirements such as the Stormwater Design Guidelines, construction site runoff, sewer connections, recycled water and onsite water reuse, water efficient irrigation, and hydraulic analysis for fire suppression systems. To assist developers and property owners in meeting these requirements, the SFPUC provides project plan review, technical assistance, and incentives. The SFPUC also has a separate project review process for projects that propose to use land owned by the SFPUC or are subject to an easement held by the SFPUC; or projects that propose to be constructed above, under, or adjacent to major SFPUC infrastructure. For projects meeting these criteria, please contact SFProjectReview@sfwater.org for a SFPUC Project Review and Land Use Application. For more information regarding SFPUC Project Review or any of the SFPUC requirements, please visit www.sfwater.org/reqs.

16. Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (POE). New residential development within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment must go through an Entertainment Commission outreach process (Ordinance Number 070-015). In addition, new residential development will also be required to record a Notice of Special Restrictions (NSR) on the site. The subject site is located within 300 feet of an existing POE, see enclosed map. Please note that the Planning Department will not consider an entitlement application complete until the following are completed:

(A) The Entertainment Commission has provided written notification to the Planning Department indicating that it either did not wish to hold a hearing, or that it held a hearing and the Project Sponsor attended; and
(B) The Project Sponsor has included a copy of any comments and/or recommendations provided by the Entertainment Commission regarding the proposed Project as well as the date(s) when the those comments were provided. This shall be done as an additional sheet in any plan set submitted to the Planning Department and as an attachment in an entitlement application.

You may contact Entertainment Commission staff at (415) 554-6678 or visit their webpage at http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=338 for additional information regarding the outreach process.

17. **Impact Fees.** This project will be subject to various impact fees. Please refer to the Planning Director’s Bulletin No. 1 for an overview of Development Impact Fees, and to the Department of Building Inspection’s Development Impact Fee webpage for more information about current rates.

Based on an initial review of the proposed project, the following impact fees, which are assessed by the Planning Department, will be required:

a. Affordable Housing Fee (415) (if units are not provided on-site)
b. Transit Impact Development Fee (411) (for new non-residential uses greater than 800 gsf)

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

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

The project site contains one or more structures considered to be a potential historic resource; therefore, the proposed project is subject to further design review by the department’s Historic Preservation staff. Please refer to the Environmental Planning Review – Historic Resources section of the Preliminary Project Assessment for further instruction.

1. **Site Design, Open Space and Massing.** The project is located in the Van Ness SUD in which bulk controls apply to towers above a podium height established by a prevailing street wall. To preserve and enhance the scale and access to light along Willow, the Planning Department recommends establishing a 45’ height with Townhouses (or double stacked townhouses) and setting back the tower to face Eddy Street. Aggregating the tower setback from Willow to 40’ should create appropriate street walls for both frontages. The Planning Department recommends the tower massing comply with bulk controls above the 45’ height. The Planning Department recommends setting the tower back 5’ from side property lines to allow for fenestration on all visible sides of the building.

2. **Architecture.** As the architecture is diagrammatic, the Planning Department does not have comments at this time.
3. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends reducing the number of the curb cuts and garage entry points to the site to a single entrance. Provide access to the car lifts from the interior of the parking area. Provide more active uses at the Eddy street frontage, including more retail and the tower lobby.

4. **Streetscape.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the Department will require standard streetscape elements and sidewalk widening for the appropriate street type per the Better Streets Plan, including landscaping, site furnishings, and/or corner curb extensions (bulb-outs) at intersections (see Better Streets Plan Section 4 for Standard Improvements and Section 5.3 for bulb-out guidelines). The project sponsor is required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating these features, and the department will work with the project sponsor and other relevant departments to determine an appropriate streetscape design. Standard street improvement would be part of basic project approvals not count for as credit towards in-kind contributions. The following are active programs and requirements compiled from the Streetscape Design Advisory Team (SDAT) that will impact the Streetscape Plan:

   a. **Better Streets Plan.** Under the Better Streets Plan (BSP), fronting street segments for this project are classified as:
      i. Eddy Street is a Downtown Residential Street. Recommended sidewalk width is 15’.
      ii. Willow Street is an Alley. Recommended sidewalk width is 9’ or greater.
      iii. Van Ness Avenue is a Commercial Throughway. Recommended sidewalk width is 15’.

   b. **Pedestrian Safety.** Install a raised crosswalk crossing Willow Street at Van Ness Avenue.

   c. **Driveway Access.** Consolidate ingress/egress on Eddy Street to a single driveway, a maximum of 10’ wide.

   d. **Loading.** SDAT recommends all loading be done on Willow Street.

   e. **Landscaping and Site Furnishings.** Incorporate landscaping, street trees, site furnishing, and paving per the Better Streets Plan throughout the project’s public realm.

   f. **Green Connections.** The Green Connections Plan aims to increase access to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront by envisioning a network of ‘green connectors’ – city streets that will be upgraded incrementally over the next 20 years to make it safer and more pleasant to travel to parks by walking, biking, and other forms of active transportation.

   Under the Green Connections Plan, Eddy Street is part of Route #3, an important east-west route that stretches from Ocean Beach to Market Street. The Green Connections planning process generated a concept design for this section on Eddy Street. See pages 150-154 of
Chapter 7 of the Green Connections Plan. Plans for Eddy Street should be consistent with this concept design. See: http://greenconnections.sfplanning.org.

g. **Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).** SFMTA is currently engaged in planning for major transit, infrastructure, and streetscape upgrades to Van Ness Avenue and intersecting streets as part of the Van Ness BRT project. The sponsor shall coordinate with SF MTA to ensure all aspects of its development project are consistent with the Van Ness BRT project. Please coordinate with Peter Gabancho, the Project Manager, peter.gabancho@sfmta.org.

**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 **April 17, 2017**. 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
- Shadow Analysis

cc: 
- Flynn Land Company, Inc., Property Owner
- Brittany Bendix, Current Planning
- Justin Horner, Environmental Planning
- Paul Chasan, Citywide Planning and Analysis
- Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
- Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
- Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
- Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
- Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>LAST</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>Carolyn</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Lower Polk Neighbors Corporation - G0 Department</td>
<td>1033 Polk Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-351-3900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ca@Casabest-Architects.com">ca@Casabest-Architects.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Savoie</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Civic Center Community Benefit District</td>
<td>234 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-626-1819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@ktsiviccenter.org">info@ktsiviccenter.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SoMaBend Neighborhood Association 0 HERE Local 2</td>
<td>P.O. Box 410805</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-669-0916</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somabend.na@gmail.com">somabend.na@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Civic Center Stakeholder Group Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>100 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-285-5048</td>
<td>jHHaas@<a href="mailto:BSQ@ADL.com">BSQ@ADL.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Haas</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</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>415-554-7630</td>
<td><a href="mailto:London.Bread@sfgov.org">London.Bread@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Inner Sunset, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Breed</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 5</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-554-7630</td>
<td><a href="mailto:London.Bread@sfgov.org">London.Bread@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Inner Sunset, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlayne</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>1450 Sutter Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-572-8093</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marlayne16@gmail.com">marlayne16@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Tenderloin Housing Clinic</td>
<td>126 Hyde Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-771-9850</td>
<td><a href="mailto:randy@tncivic.org">randy@tncivic.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</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>415-407-0094</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Bayview, Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market, Visitacion Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bulkley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1800 Market St., PMB #104</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-503-1970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:william.bulkley@gmail.com">william.bulkley@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Western Addition</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 above referenced 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.)
Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding

Date: APRIL 2007
Reprinted: OCTOBER 2009
References: Administrative Code Section 2A.280-2A.285
Formerly known as: Planning Department Bulletin

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

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

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

The SFPUC and/or its delegate (SFDPW, Hydraulics Section) will review the permit application and comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. The SFPUC will receive and return the application within a two-week period from date of receipt. The permit applicant must comply with SFPUC requirements for projects in flood-prone areas. Such requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, special sidewalk construction, and deep gutters.
Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding
FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Call or visit the San Francisco Planning Department

Central Reception
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6378
FAX: 415 558-6409
WEB: http://www.sfplanning.org

Planning Information Center (PIC)
1660 Mission Street, First Floor
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6377
Planning staff are available by phone and at the PIC counter. No appointment is necessary.
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

9/09
NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST BE APPROVED BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.

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

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

PROPERTY LINE OR DEVELOPER COMPLEX

RECYCLED WATER IRRIGATION
SEE NOTE 3

RECYCLED WATER DOMESTIC
SEE NOTE 3

DOMESTIC WATER
SEE NOTES 1 & 2

FIRE SPRINKLER
SEE NOTE 1

PROPERTY LINE

CURB LINE

DOMESTIC WATER MAIN

STREET - SIDE

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

APPROVED BY: Cheryl Munoz
SCALE: NTS
DESIGNED BY: W. Villasica
DRAWN: CHECKED: M. Gardiner
DATE: 05/28/08
DRAWING NO. A-1290.2
REV. NO. 2
Building Height Modeled at 150 feet. Slopes taken into account.