DATE: October 22, 2015
TO: Amy Neches, TMG Partners
FROM: Joshua Switzky, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-0090704PPA for 505 Brannan Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Steve Wertheim, at (415) 558-6612 or steve.wertheim@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

[Signature]
Joshua Switzky, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: October 22, 2015
Case No.: 2015-009704PPA
Project Address: 505 Brannan Street
Block/Lot: 3786/322
Zoning: MUO – Mixed-Use Office
85-X
Area Plan: East SoMa Plan area
Proposed Central SoMa Plan area
Project Sponsor: Amy Neches, TMG Partners
415-400-2480
Staff Contact: Steve Wertheim – 415-558-6612
steve.wertheim@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 July 27, 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 proposal is to construct a “Phase II” addition to an approved, but not yet built, office building (Case 2012.1187BCX). The approved “Phase I” project includes an 85 foot (six story) development consisting of 162,738 square feet of development, including 137,446 square feet of office, 732 square feet of retail, and 24,560 square feet of parking. The proposed addition would add 165 foot (11 story) development
consisting of 168,820 square feet of office space. The resulting project, upon completion of Phases I and II, would be a 250 foot project with a total of 331,558 square feet. The approved project includes 66 parking spaces. No new parking would be built as part of proposed project. The approved project includes 2,800 square feet of public open space plus 4,000 square feet of public lobby that is designed to serve as an indoor Privately-Owned Public Open Space (POPOS) serving the development proposed in Phase II.

BACKGROUND:

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 FEIR), certified in 2008. The project site also lies within the proposed Central SoMa Plan area, which is the focus of an ongoing community planning process initiated in 2011. The Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public Review (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 MUO (Mixed-Use Office), which would not be changed by the Draft Plan. Office uses, as proposed under the project, are allowed within MUO Districts. The Draft Plan includes two height alternatives. The Central SoMa Plan EIR will study the Draft Plan’s Mid-Rise Height Alternative and a modified High-Rise Height Alternative. Under the Mid-Rise Height Alternative and the modified High-Rise Height Alternative, the proposed height and bulk designation for the project site is 85P/250T, which would allow a building up to 250 feet tall. At this point, it is unknown which height option 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:

As discussed under Planning Context, the proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. However, the proposed project is not consistent with the development density (zoning) identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, and it is therefore not eligible for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

The project’s proposed 240-foot building height would be consistent with both of the two height limit alternatives currently being studied in the Central SoMa Plan EIR. Thus, it is possible that the proposal, as
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2 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.”
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 limit 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 FEIR, any development on the project site would potentially be subject to the mitigation measures identified in that document. However, mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR 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 Central SoMA Plan EIR is certified, and the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the Central SoMa Plan and adopted by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, it would be eligible for a CPE. Please note that a CPE is a type of exemption from environmental review, and cannot be modified to reflect changes to a project after approval. Proposed increases beyond the CPE project description in project size or intensity after project approval will require reconsideration of environmental impacts and issuance of a new CEQA determination.

Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

1. **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the forthcoming Central SoMa Plan EIR, and there would be no new "peculiar" significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Central SoMa Plan EIR would be applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,659) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently $7,580).

2. **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that are not identified in the forthcoming Central SoMa Plan EIR, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts encompassed by the Central SoMa Plan EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Central SoMa Plan EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,659) and (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value).

3. **Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts encompassed by the forthcoming Central SoMa Plan EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Central SoMa Plan EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,659); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value). 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 Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

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. The proposed project would require environmental review individually, with either a project-specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR). 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 Environmental Coordinator. 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 a calculation of environmental application fees.

One important item of consideration for the environmental review would be the project description, specifically the appropriate characterization of what is now being termed “Phase I” of the project. As noted in the project description for this PPA, Phase I refers to the approved, but not yet built, office building on top of which the currently proposed “Phase II” addition would be constructed. Phase I received a CPE under the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR on November 20, 2014. At the time Phase I received the CPE, the Planning Department was not aware of any project phasing or intent on the sponsor’s part to construct an addition in the future. Therefore, the prior CPE did not address the current proposed project. The project that is the subject of this PPA would be analyzed as a separate project. The approved project would then be included in the cumulative conditions analysis for the environmental review of the proposed project. Should environmental review of the proposed project commence before construction of the approved project begins, the Planning Department would analyze the project so that the surface parking lot currently on the project site would be the existing condition, thereby analyzing the whole of the approved and proposed projects during the environmental review process.

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 dated July 27, 2015. The following discussion is also based on the project sponsor’s intention to obtain a CPE under the future Central SoMa Plan EIR. As such, Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR mitigation measures are not included in the discussion below because it is unlikely the proposed project would be
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analyzed under the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. In addition, this discussion assumes that the environmental analysis of the project description would be limited to Phase II. If the Planning Department determines that both Phase I and Phase II must be analyzed collectively as the proposed project, additional review may be required.

1. **Historic Resources.** The existing building on the project site is less than 45 years of age and/or was previously evaluated in a historical resources survey and found ineligible for national, state, or local listing. 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.** Project implementation would not entail soil-disturbing activities. Therefore, the proposed project would likely not require a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR).

3. **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.

4. **Transportation.** Based on the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, the project would require transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant transportation impact. Therefore, the Planning Department requires that a consultant listed in the Planning Department’s Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a Transportation Impact Study. You are required to pay additional fees for the study; 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 study.

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:

- Coordinate project implementation with Central SoMa Plan Area efforts.

---


• Plans submitted with the EEA should show the width of existing and proposed curb cuts.
• The plans should also include parking stall numbers.

5. Noise. Construction noise would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Police Code Article 29), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. Detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and the duration of each phase shall be provided during the environmental review in order to assess construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible.

In addition, construction of the proposed project would occur in proximity to noise-sensitive receptors on Brannan Street. Therefore, the project sponsor would be required to retain a qualified acoustical consultant to prepare a noise study. The noise study should be scoped in coordination with the Environmental Review Planner prior to proceeding with the analysis.

6. Air Quality. The proposed 162,400-gross-square-foot addition is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. Please 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 would 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 the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH).

The project site is 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. As the proposed project would not include the introduction of new sensitive-receptor land uses, the project is not subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. However, equipment exhaust measures during construction would likely also be required and include development of a specific plan to minimize construction emissions. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Construction equipment engines would be required to have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or California Air Resources Board Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy.

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 project’s proposed height of 240 feet, the proposed project would likely 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, including specification sheets, proposed location, and testing plans.

7. **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 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 Review 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.

8. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of an approximately 155-foot-tall vertical addition, resulting in a building height of 240 feet. The project would therefore require a consultant-prepared wind tunnel analysis. The consultant would be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Review Planner prior to proceeding with the analysis.

9. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. Planning Code Section 295 requires that a preliminary shadow fan analysis be performed to determine whether a project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Planning Department staff prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis that indicates the project would not cast new shadows on Recreation and Parks Commission property or other public open space. Therefore, further shadow analysis is not anticipated.

10. **Geology.** The project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill). The proposed project would include the construction of an approximately 155-foot-tall addition on an 85-foot-tall office building on a project site located in a Liquefaction Hazard Zone. Therefore, a geotechnical study must be prepared for this project by a qualified consultant, and 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 boring logs for the project site accompany the geotechnical report submitted for the project.
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11. **Hazardous Materials.** The project site is within the Maher Area, which indicates the potential presence of soil and/or water contamination. Projects that propose soil disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more in the Maher Area are subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The proposed addition would not include excavation or soil disturbance. Therefore, the proposed project is not subject to the Maher Ordinance. In addition, the project site was enrolled in the Maher program on November 11, 2013 in compliance with the environmental review of Phase I, and is required to remediate any identified subsurface contamination as directed by DPH in accordance with Article 22A.

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. **Height District Reclassification.** The project site is located within the 85-X height and bulk district, and the zoning concepts published in the Central Corridor Draft Plan (April 2013) indicate that a height limit of 250 feet is being considered for this site. This proposal is being analyzed in the Central SoMa Plan EIR, but this analysis is not an indication the height will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan, nor does it guarantee the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve changes to height limits. The proposed 250-foot tower does not conform to the existing height limit of...
85 feet, but does conform to the proposed height limit of 250 feet. Please see further discussion in the Preliminary Project Comments section.

2. **A 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 and greater than 25,000 gross square feet. The application is available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street.

3. An **Office Allocation** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 321 for the development of office space in excess of 25,000 square feet.

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

**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](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Permits & Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Resource Center” tab.

The project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use District and requires **Neighborhood Notification** to owners and occupants within 150 feet of the project site prior to approval of the site permit, in accordance with Planning Code Section 312.

**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 significantly impact the proposed project.
1. **Existing Zoning.** The subject property is zoned as a Mixed Use - Office (MUO) district, which allows housing and various commercial uses. It is located within the 85-X height and bulk district, which does not permit the project’s proposed height and bulk. Therefore, the project could not be approved under the existing zoning.

2. **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 Central Corridor Draft Plan was published in April 2013. The Draft Plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Draft Plan proposes changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and includes a strategy for improving the public realm in this area. The certification of the EIR, and adoption of the Plan and the proposed rezoning and affiliated Code changes are anticipated to be before decision-makers for consideration of approval in 2016.

The Central Corridor 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](http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org). Further comments in this section of the PPA are based on the draft Central Corridor Draft Plan.

3. **Land Use.** The Central SoMa Draft Plan recommends the subject property remain in the Mixed-Use Office (MUO) zoning district that allows the proposed residential and retail uses. The area of the development parcel is less than 30,000 square feet and will not be subject to the requirements to provide non-residential uses on the site. The Central SoMa Plan is supportive of the office use on the site, as it fulfills the objective of the Central SoMa Plan to provide substantial space to help meet ongoing and expected demand for office uses.

4. **Urban Form: Height and Bulk.** In recognition of the desire to accommodate more growth in the area, the draft Central SoMa Plan recommends changing the height limit of the subject property to 250 feet. Projects of that height will be subject to bulk controls that will be adopted as part of the Central SoMa Plan. The most recent policy position on bulk is contained in the Central SoMa Draft Policy Paper on Bulk, and is reflected in the following comments:

- Up to 85 feet in height, the building may maximize lot coverage as long as it accounts for rear yard and exposure requirements (as discussed below).
- All buildings along the major streets in Central SoMa area are expected to support the “streetwall” by being built along the property line up to 65 to 85 feet, although buildings along 4th Street will be required to be set back five feet from the property line in order to enable sidewalks that meet City standards.
- Above 85 feet in height, a stepback of at least 15 feet will be required along all property lines.
- The “tower” portion of the development is considered all of the development above 85 feet in height. For the tower portion, the Central SoMa Plan proposes that the maximum floor size for office uses cannot exceed 17,000 square feet, and that the average floor size cannot exceed 15,000 gross square feet.
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• The maximum horizontal (“plan”) dimension is proposed to be 150 feet, and the maximum diagonal dimension is proposed to be 190 feet.
• To receive the maximum floor plate, the tower must be separated by at least 115 feet from any other towers (i.e., buildings above 160 feet). This tower separation may be reduced to 85 feet if the second tower has a floor plate less than 10,000 gross square feet. Determining which tower is subject to reduced bulk and height will be based on timing of entitlements considered by the Planning Commission. The second tower that is entitled shall conform to the design of the first.

5. **Sustainability and 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 beneficial to the stakeholders, the district, and the City by formulating a portfolio of innovative projects at a district or block-level. The Planning Department has identified the Central SoMa Plan area as a Type 2 Eco-District—an area composed of many smaller parcels and property owners. Benefits to the district include greater resilience, economic prosperity, higher quality built environment, and community cohesion and capacity. The volunteer Central SoMa Task Force produced a set of Recommendations in November of 2013 ([http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3051](http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3051)). All major new development in the Central SoMa Area Plan area will be expected to participate in some capacity in the Eco-District program and the Sustainability Management Association set up to guide it once the program is formulated in parallel with the Area Plan process. For more information please see: [http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3051](http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3051).

6. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** An Interdepartmental Project Review is required for all new construction that is eight stories or more, or located within a seismic hazard zone, and should be conducted prior to submittal of the development application. An application for the Interdepartmental Project Review 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).

7. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** The Central Corridor Draft Plan proposes a requirement that commercial developments include a minimum amount of Privately-Owned Public Open Space (POPOS), similar to those required in the C-3 district under Section 138. Provision of this space would be in lieu of meeting the current requirements of Section 135.3. If these requirements are adopted as part of the plan, such spaces would need to meet specified provisions on accessibility, design quality, and operations and maintenance. Particularly, this policy paper emphasizes the need for the POPOS to be at street level and outdoors, and at a ratio of 1 square foot of POPOS for every 50 square feet of office. As proposed, the project addition would require 3,376 square feet of POPOS, which is more than the 2,805 square feet of outdoor POPOS shown in the PPA. The Department suggests expanding the outdoor POPOS to meet this requirement, and/or to consider the potential for greening portions of Bluxome Alley as an “off-site” POPOS. For more information, please see the Central SoMa policy paper on POPOS, found here: [http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Draft_CentralSoMa_POPOS_Policy_-_November2014.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Draft_CentralSoMa_POPOS_Policy_-_November2014.pdf). For more information on the proposed Bluxome Street linear park, see here:
8. **Street Frontages in Mixed Use Districts.** Planning Code Section 145.1 requires that frontages with active uses that are not residential or PDR must be fenestrated with transparent windows and doorways for no less than 60 percent of the street frontage at the ground level and allow visibility to the inside of the building. The use of dark or mirrored glass shall not count towards the required transparent area.

9. **Streetscape Plan.** The project is located on a lot that is greater than half an acre of land and proposes the addition of gross floor area greater than 20% of the Phase 1 project, and as such, 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 and the Central SoMa Plan, whose proposed street changes would supersede that of the Better Streets Plan (for more information, see Chapter 4 “Streetscape and Circulation” of the draft Central SoMa 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. For more information, please refer to the Better Street Plan [http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/BetterStreets/proposals.htm](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/BetterStreets/proposals.htm).

10. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Please note that the proposal will be subject to Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird Safe Buildings. Please note the Feature Related requirements, under subsection (c)(2).

11. **Vision Zero.** The project is not located on a “high-injury corridor”, identified through the City’s [Vision Zero Program](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Draft_CentralSoMa_Bluxome_Street_Linear_Park_Policy-January2014.pdf). The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project. The Department’s Streetscape Design Advisory Team may require additional pedestrian safety streetscape measures due to the project’s location.

12. **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 would not cast new shadow on Recreation and Park property.

13. **Shadow Analysis (Section 147)** Section 147 requires that new buildings and additions to existing buildings in C-3, South of Market Mixed Use, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, new buildings that exceed a height of 50 feet shall be shaped, consistent with the dictates of good design and without unduly restricting the development potential of the site in question, to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publicly accessible spaces other than those protected under Section 295. A preliminary shadow study was conducted by Staff in conjunction
Preliminary Project Assessment

with this PPA Application, and it indicated that the project will not cast a shadow on open space protected under Planning Code Section 147.

14. Off-Street Parking and Loading. Planning Code Section 151.1 allows up to seven percent of the gross floor area of the offices uses in the MUO zoning district and up to one off-street parking space for each 1,500 square feet of gross floor area of retail use. Given the approximately 306,266 gross square feet of office use, up to 21,439 square feet of off-street parking space for the office use is allowed (without limitation on the number of spaces therein) and given the approximately 732 square feet of retail, one off-street parking space is allowed for the retail use. The project proposes 24,560 square feet of parking area. Approximately 14,939 gross square feet of non-accessory parking garage was approved under Motion No. 19294, therefore, the remaining difference between what would be permitted accessory parking and the proposed amount is 3,121 square feet of non-accessory parking. Two loading spaces are required for office uses between 200,001 and 500,000 square feet.

15. Bicycle Parking and Showers. Planning Code Section 155.2 requires this project to provide 1 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces for every 5,000 square feet of occupied floor area for the office use and 1 Class 1 space for retail for every 7,500 square feet. Class 2 parking spaces shall provide a minimum two spaces for any office use greater than 5,000 gross square feet and one Class 2 space for each additional 50,000 occupied square feet and one Class 2 space for every 2,500 sq. ft. of occupied floor area for the retail use. The project description does not include occupied floor area calculations. The requirements based on gross square feet would be 62 Class 1 and 10 Class 2 spaces. Please refer to Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9 – Bicycle Parking Requirements: Design and Layout to ensure the project meets the layout requirements. Furthermore, 4 showers and 24 clothes lockers are required where the occupied floor area exceeds 50,000 square feet per Sec. 155.4.

16. Car Share Requirements. Planning Code Section 166 requires one car share parking space for projects proposing at least 50 off-street parking spaces plus one for every 50 parking spaces over 50. Please indicate the car share parking space on the floor plans.

17. Building Height. As stated above, the proposed 250-foot tall building exceeds the current 85 feet height limit and proposed 250 feet height limit identified in the Draft Central SoMa Plan.

18. Transportation Management Program. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 163, an agreement will be required to be executed with the Planning Department to ensure that transportation brokerage services are provided for the life of the project.

19. Transit Impact Development Fee. The proposal is subject to Planning Code Section 411, the Transit Impact Development Fee, for the proposed office and retail development. The Fee is based upon the Economic Activity Category, which for the proposal is considered to be Management, Information and Professional Services and Retail/Entertainment and is paid on a gross square foot basis.

20. Jobs Housing Linkage Program. The proposal is subject to Planning Code Section 413, the Jobs Housing Linkage Program, as it increases by 25,000 or more gross square feet the total amount of office and retail. The Jobs Housing Linkage Program requirements may be met by contributing a sum or land of value at least equivalent to the in-lieu fee, according to the formulas set forth in
Section 413.1, to one or more housing developers who will use the funds or land to construct housing units pursuant to Section 413.5; or paying an in-lieu fee to the Development Fee Collection Unit at DBI according to the formula set forth in Section 413.6; or combining the above options pursuant to Section 413.8.

21. **Child Care Requirements for Office Development.** The proposal is subject to Planning Code Section 414, the Child Care Requirements for Office Development, as the proposal will add 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space. One of the six options listed under Section 414.4(c) may be elected to fulfill the requirements of Section 414.

22. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** This project is subject to the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee as a Tier 3 project. The tiers for specific lots are based on height increases or decreases received as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan. Please note that Project Sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City by entering into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement subject to the requirements of Planning Code Section 423.3(d). 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 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.

23. **Central SoMa Public Benefits Requirement.** The Central SoMa Plan is considering raising requirements for public benefits commensurate with additional development potential granted by the Plan. For more information, please see the Central SoMa Memo entitled “Potential Public Benefits” ([http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central-SoMa_Potential-Public-Benefits-Memo.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central-SoMa_Potential-Public-Benefits-Memo.pdf)).

24. **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.

25. **Public Art.** The project is subject to the Public Art requirement under Planning Code Section 429 as the project proposes construction of a new building of floor area in excess of 25,000 square feet. To meet the requirements of Section 429, an amount equal to one percent of the construction cost of the building or addition as determined by the Director of DBI (the “Public Art Fee”) shall be dedicated and expended. Please refer to Section 429.3(d) for alternate options to fulfill the requirements.

26. **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.

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

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

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The project is located in the Central SoMa Plan Area currently in progress. The property is currently zoned for 85’ but is proposed to be up-zoned to 250T/85P with the adoption of the plan. The area is currently primarily commercial and industrial with one- to eight-story buildings predominantly brick and masonry in expression. The anticipated development in the area will increase the density and height substantially including nearby high-rise construction due to its proximity to the 4th and King Caltrain Station and the coming 4th Street subway. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space and Massing.** The Planning Department supports a vertical addition to the proposed podium structure that complies with the proposed Central SoMa bulk controls including maximum plan dimensions and plan area, as articulated above. As proposed, the project exceeds the proposed plan length maximum of 150 feet by over 40 feet, and the maximum diagonal of 190 feet by up to 18 feet.

   Additionally, as discussed above, to receive the maximum floor plate, the tower must be separated by at least 115 feet from any other towers (i.e., buildings above 160 feet). This tower separation may be reduced to 85 feet if the second tower has a floor plate less than 10,000 gross square feet. The Planning Department has received an application for a tower on the adjacent parcel to the east (Block 3786 Lot 035). Because of the proximity of the proposed buildings, it is unlikely that a tower separation of 85 feet could be achieved. Determining which tower is subject to reduced bulk and height will be based on timing of entitlements considered by the Planning Commission. The second tower that is entitled shall conform to the design of the first.

2. **Street Frontage.** As the project has significant POPOS requirements, we recommend continuing to work with the Planning Department staff to fulfill this requirement. See comments in the Open Space section above.
3. **Architecture.** The Planning Department recommends that the tower be articulated as two vertical components. This would help to emphasize that the area is intended to be a mid-rise district punctuated with occasional “spire-like” towers as it would help break the horizontal mass of the floorplate.

The Department further requests the use of high-quality materials and more articulated façade so that there more relief to the curtainwall. The crown of the tower should be characteristically related but different than the rest of the façade and visible from many directions.

**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 25, 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

cc: Amy Neches, TMG Partners
Kimberly Durandet, Current Planning
Jenny Delumo, Environmental Planning
Steve Wertheim, Citywide Planning and Analysis
Maia Small, Design Review
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
Jerry Sanguinetti, San Francisco Public Works
Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH
Planning Department Webmaster (webmaster.planning@sfgov.org)
Neighborhood Group Mailing List
Angelica Cabande  
Organizational Director  
South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)  
1110 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Corinne Woods  
0  
Mission Creek Harbor Association  
300 Channel Street, Box 10  
San Francisco, CA 94158

Ethan Hough  
Secretary  
One Ecker Owners Association  
16 Jessie Street Unit 301  
San Francisco, CA 94105

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

Keith Goldstein  
0  
Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association  
800 Kansas Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107

San Francisco, CA 94102-6526

Rodney Minott  
Chair  
Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill  
1206 Mariposa Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107

Tiffany Bohee  
Executive Director  
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco  
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Antonio Diaz  
Project Director  
People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)  
474 Valencia Street #125  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Alexandra Goldman  
Community Planner  
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department  
215 Taylor Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

Janet Carpinelli  
Board President  
Dogpatch Neighborhood Association  
934 Minnesota Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107

Katy Liddell  
President  
South Beach/Rincon/ Mission Bay Neighborhood Association  
403 Main Street #813  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Ken Baxter  
Director  
Citizens for Change  
355 11th Street, Suite 200  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Patsy Tito  
Executive Director  
Samoan Development Centre  
2055 Sunnydale Avenue #100  
San Francisco, CA 94134-2611

Sonja Kos  
Community Advocate  
TODCO Impact Group  
230 Fourth Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

J.R. Eppler  
President  
Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association  
1459 - 16th Street, Suite 133  
San Francisco, CA 94107

Carolyn Diamond  
Executive Director  
Market Street Association  
870 Market Street, Suite 456  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Eric Lopez  
President  
SoMaBend Neighborhood Association  
P.O. Box 410805  
San Francisco, CA 94141

Ian Lewis  
0  
HERE Local 2  
209 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

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

Laura Magnani  
0  
American Friends Service Committee  
65 Ninth Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

Ted Olsson  
Chair  
TJPA CAC  
30 Sharon Street  
San Francisco, CA 94114-1709

York Loo  
0  
York Realty  
243A Shipley Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107-1010
Aaron Peskin  
Citywide  
470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211  
San Francisco, CA  94133

Chuck Turner  
Director  
Community Design Center  
5 Thomas Mellon Circle, #128  
San Francisco, CA  94134

Grace Shanahan  
President  
Residential Builders Association  
1711 17th Street, Ste. 200  
San Francisco, CA  94103

Michael Theriault  
Secretary-Treasurer  
SF Building and Construction Trades Council  
1188 Franklin Street, Ste.203  
San Francisco, CA  94109

Sue Hestor  
Attorney at Law  
870 Market Street, #1128  
San Francisco, CA  94102

Adrian Simi  
Local Field Representative  
Carpenters Local 22  
2085 Third Street  
San Francisco, CA  94107

David Villa-Lobos  
Executive Director  
Community Leadership Alliance  
P.O. Box 642201  
San Francisco, CA  94109

Lynn Sousa  
Public Works Coordinator  
AT&T Construction and Engineering  
795 Folsom Street, Rm.426  
San Francisco, CA  94107-1243

Sona Trauss  
President  
SF Bay Area Association of Renters  
1618 12th Street  
Oakland, CA  94607

Ted Gullicksen  
Office Manager  
San Francisco Tenants Union  
558 Capp Street  
San Francisco, CA  94110

Alex Lantsberg  
Research Analyst  
Carpenters Local 22 c/o NCCRC Research  
265 Hegenberger Road, Ste. 220  
Oakland, CA  94621

Diego Hernandez  
Organizer  
Laborers Local 261  
3271 18th Street  
San Francisco, CA  94110

Mary Miles  
Coalition for Adequate Review  
364 Page Street, #36  
San Francisco, CA  94102

Stephen Williams  
Attorney  
Law Office of Stephen M. Williams  
1934 Divisadero Street  
San Francisco, CA  94115
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 abovereferenced applications.

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

**Interdepartmental Project Review fees:**

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

2. **$1,859** for all other projects.

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

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

*Interdepartmental Project Reviews are scheduled no sooner than two (2) weeks from the receipt of the request form and check.*
Submittal requirements:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name _____________________________________________ Phone No. (     )____________________
Address __________________________________________________________________________________
City _____________________________ Zip Code _____________________________
FAX No. (     )____________________ E-Mail Address ________________________________
Name of Property Owner___________________________________________________________

PROJECT INFORMATION:
Address ____________________________________________________________________________
How many units does the subject property have? ____________________________
Assessor’s Block/Lot(s) ____________________________ Zoning District _______________________
Height and Bulk Districts __________________________ Located within Geologic Hazard Zone? Y ☐ N ☐

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE OF MEETING/SPECIFIC QUESTIONS:
(Use separate sheet, if necessary)
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

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

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) ____________________________
Previously contacted staff (if applicable) ____________________________
(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)
PURPOSE:

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

BACKGROUND:

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

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

The SFPUC and/or its delegate (SFDPW, Hydraulics Section) will review the permit application and comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. The SFPUC will receive and return the application within a two-week period from date of receipt. The permit applicant must comply with SFPUC requirements for projects in flood-prone areas. Such requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, special sidewalk construction, and deep gutters.
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Blocks of Interest

Legend
- Blocks of Interest
- Blocks of Interest
- Blocks of Interest
- Blocks of Interest

Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding
Recycled Water Installation Procedures for Developers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

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

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

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

**New Service Line Permits**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Services
(415) 551-3000
STREET - SIDE

NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST APPROVED BY SFPCU 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, SFPCU 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.
Re: SFPUC Stormwater Management Requirements

Dear Project Proponent,

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

- Disturbance of 5,000 square feet or more of ground surface, and
- Filing for a site permit application or building permit application with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection after January 12, 2010.

If your project triggers compliance with the Guidelines your project must:

1. Determine if your project is located in the area served by the combined sewer or by the separate sewer.

2. Meet the applicable performance measure:
   - Combined Sewer Areas:
     - For sites with existing imperviousness of less than or equal to 50%, stormwater runoff rate and volume shall not exceed pre-development conditions for the 1- and 2-year 24-hour design storm.
     - For sites with existing imperviousness of greater than 50%, stormwater runoff rate and volume shall be decreased by 25% from the pre-development conditions for 2-year 24-hour design storm.
     - This requirement is equivalent to LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.1.
   - Separate Sewer Areas:
     - Capture and treat the rainfall from a design storm of 0.75 inches.
     - This requirement is equivalent to LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.2.

3. Develop a Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) in accordance with the Guidelines and submit it for review and approval to the SFPUC prior to receiving a Site or Building Permit; and

---

1 Disturbed ground surface is measured cumulatively. Activities that disturb the ground surface include, but are not limited to, the construction, modification, conversion, or alteration of any building or structure and associated grading, filling, excavation, change in the existing topography, and the addition or replacement of impervious surface. All sidewalks, parking, driveways, and landscaped and irrigated areas constructed in conjunction with the Development Project are included in the disturbed area. Disturbed ground surface does not include interior remodeling projects, maintenance activities such as top-layer grinding, repaving, and re-roofing, or modifications, conversions or alterations of buildings or structures that does not increase the ground surface footprint of the building or structure. (Stormwater Management Ordinance No. 83-10)
4. Develop a Final Stormwater Control Plan in accordance with the *Guidelines* and submit it for review and approval to the SFPUC prior to receiving the Certificate of Final Completion.

5. Develop a maintenance plan for all proposed stormwater controls and submit it as part of the Preliminary and Final Stormwater Control Plan.

6. Sign and record a Maintenance Agreement prior to Certificate of Completion.

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

**Other SFPUC related Ordinances:**

Your project may also be subject to other SFPUC requirements. For a list of all water, sewer, or stormwater requirements that may apply to your project, visit [www.sfwater.org/reqs](http://www.sfwater.org/reqs).

Any project that also includes 1,000 square feet or more of new or modified landscape area may be subject to the SPFUC Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance. For more information, please visit: [www.sfwater.org/landscape](http://www.sfwater.org/landscape).

Any project proposing to reuse on-site non-potable water should also submit the SFPUC On-Site Non-Potable Project Application. For information and the application, please visit: [www.sfwater.org/np](http://www.sfwater.org/np).

**The necessary documents can be found online at:**

- Stormwater Design Guidelines informational materials: [www.sfwater.org/sgd](http://www.sfwater.org/sgd)
- Stormwater Control Plan Form and Instructions: Refer to *Guidelines* at: [www.sfwater.org/sgd](http://www.sfwater.org/sgd)
- Municipal separate stormwater sewer system (MS4) and combined sewer system boundary map: Refer to *Guidelines*, p.10

The project review staff looks forward to helping you achieve stormwater management compliance. Upon receipt of this letter please contact the SFPUC project review staff to discuss how the *Guidelines* requirements apply to your project at: [stormwaterreview@sfwater.org](mailto:stormwaterreview@sfwater.org)

Sincerely,

Project Review Team
Urban Watershed Management Program
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Wastewater Enterprise
[stormwaterreview@sfwater.org](mailto:stormwaterreview@sfwater.org)