Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Kansai Uchida, at (415) 575-9048 or kansai.uchida@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Lisa Gibson, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: November 9, 2015
Case No.: 2015-010374PPA
Project Address: 598 Bryant Street
Block/Lot: 3762/121
Zoning: SLI (SoMa Service – Light Industrial) Use District
85-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Eastern Neighborhoods (East SoMa), Central SoMa (Future)
Project Sponsor: Jessie Stuart, Trumark Urban
415-370-1767
Staff Contact: Kansai Uchida – 415-575-9048
kansai.uchida@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 August 10, 2015, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Health, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on the PPA application and plans, the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located in San Francisco’s South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood on the block bounded by Interstate 80 and Stillman Street to the north, 4th Street to the west, Bryant Street to the south, and 3rd Street to the east. The site, currently occupied by a gas station, is located directly across 4th Street from an off-ramp from eastbound Interstate 80. The proposal is to demolish the existing gas station and construct a nine-story-over-basement, 130-foot-tall office building. Rooftop mechanical enclosures would
reach an additional 15 feet above roof level (145 feet above street level). The existing gas station on the 9,199-square-foot (sf) subject lot was constructed in 1964. The proposed new building would include 49,980 sf of office space, 3,300 sf of ground floor retail space, 11 off-street vehicle parking spaces, and 15 bicycle parking spaces. The vehicle parking spaces would be located on the basement level, accessed via a 14-foot-wide curb cut along Bryant Street.

**BACKGROUND:**

The project site is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)*, certified in 2008. The project site also lies within the proposed Central SoMa Plan area, a community planning process initiated in 2011. The *Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public 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](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 SLI (SoMa Service/Light Industrial), which does not allow office uses, while the proposed use district for the project site in the Draft Plan is MUO (Mixed-Use Office), which would allow office uses, as proposed under the project. The height of the proposed project, at 130 feet, would exceed the allowable height in the current 85-X height and bulk district. 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, both of which would change the height and bulk designation for the site to 85-130, allowing a building up to 130 feet tall with a 15-foot setback at the 85-foot level. At this point, it is unknown which height option, if any, would ultimately be approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Further comments in this PPA letter are based on the Draft Plan concepts published to date, which are contingent on the approval of the proposed Central SoMa Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

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

---


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.”
The project’s proposed 130-foot building height would be consistent with both of the height limit alternatives currently being studied in the Central SoMa Plan EIR. Thus, it is possible that the proposal, as currently presented, would qualify for a CPE under the proposed Central SoMa Plan EIR once that EIR is certified and the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have adopted new zoning controls. However, the proposed project would be assessed based on the height limits for the project site in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlements for the proposed project are sought.

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

**Community Plan Exemption**

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR.

As discussed above, the project site is located within the Central SoMa Plan, which will be evaluated in the forthcoming Central SoMa Plan EIR. If the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the Central SoMa Plan, it may 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 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 are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $14,017) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently $7,779).

2. **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the 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 that were 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 $14,017) 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 that were 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 $14,017); (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. 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.** EEA s 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.³

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. Some of the identified studies are based on the analysis and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. As noted above, mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR that are applicable to the proposed project area could be refined, augmented, or superseded under the future Central SoMa Plan EIR.

---
1. **Historic Resources.** The project site contains one or more structures considered to be a potential historic resource (building constructed 45 or more years ago). The subject property was included in the South of Market Historic Resources Survey area, but was not evaluated because it was not age-eligible at the time the survey was conducted. The proposed alteration or demolition is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The professional must be selected from the Planning Department’s Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors should not receive and/or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete draft HRE is received.

2. **Archaeological Resources.** The project site lies within the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Archeological Mitigation Zone J-1: Properties with Previous Studies. Therefore, the proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of project mitigation measures (such as archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

3. **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 additional transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant impact. Therefore, the Planning Department requires that a consultant listed in the Planning Department’s Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a Transportation Technical Memorandum. You may be required to pay additional fees for the Memorandum; please contact Virnaliza Byrd at (415) 575-9025 to arrange payment. As this is a Transportation Technical Memorandum, rather than a Transportation Impact Study, you may select any consultant from the Planning Department’s pre-qualified Transportation Consultant Pool (http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/Transportation%20Pools%20Effective%2003042015%20-%20Contact%20Updates%2005182015%20CURRENT(9.2.15).pdf). After selection of a transportation consultant by the project sponsor, the Department will assign a transportation planner who will direct the scope of the consultant-prepared memorandum.

Additionally, the project site is located on a high injury corridor (4th Street) 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:

- The Transportation Technical Memorandum should be focused on vehicle circulation (given the project site’s proximity to a freeway off-ramp) and pedestrian and bicycle safety.
- Please show the sidewalk widths and label the number of bicycle parking spaces on the proposed ground floor plans.

5. Noise. Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise addresses requirements related to the use of pile driving. The project sponsor has not indicated whether the project would involve pile driving. If pile driving is proposed, Noise Mitigation Measure F-1 would apply to the proposed project. This mitigation measure prohibits the use of impact pile drivers wherever feasible and requires that contractors use pile driving equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Project sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise requires that the project sponsor develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant when the environmental review of a development project determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and

---

sensitivity of proximate uses. This mitigation measure requires that a plan for such measures be submitted to DBI prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

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

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project at 49,980 sf of office space and 3,300 sf of retail space 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.

Project-related demolition, excavation, grading, and other construction activities may cause wind-blow 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 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. Equipment exhaust control measures during construction will likely be required. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and the volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from 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 and additional measures will likely be required to reduce stationary source emissions. Based on the information in the PPA application, the proposed project likely would require a backup diesel generator due to the proposed height, but this will be confirmed at the time of the EEA submittal. If a generator is required, please include the equipment specifications, operating schedule, and location on the site plan as part of the EEA.

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

---

6 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
Analysis Compliance Checklist.7 The project sponsor is required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **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.

9. **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 would not cast shadows on recreational properties subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code or other public parks or open spaces. Therefore, a detailed shadow study will not likely be required.

10. **Geology.** The project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill). Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.8 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.

11. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would require more than 50 cubic yards of excavation on a site containing an existing gas station with underground fuel tanks. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine 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.

---


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

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

12. **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.”

13. **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
The project relies on a program EIR, within 30 days of the date that the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts a final environmental determination under CEQA. Please submit a Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. This form can be found at the Planning Department or online at http://www.sfethics.org.

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

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

Note that the subject parcel is within the Central SoMa Plan area. The Central SoMa Plan process is anticipated to be completed in 2016. As discussed above, the proposals in the Draft Plan are subject to change and are contingent on the eventual approval by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Please see the Preliminary Project Comments section for more details on proposed requirements under the Draft Plan.

1. **Rezoning.** The project site is located within the SLI (SOMA-Light Industrial) District. The proposed office use is not permitted under this zoning. In order for the project to proceed, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors would need to approve new zoning controls for the subject parcel.

   The zoning concepts included in the Draft Plan indicate that a reclassification to MUO (Mixed Use Office) is being considered for the site. Residential and retail uses are permitted in the MUO Zoning District. Please see further discussion in the Preliminary Project Comments section.

2. **Height District Reclassification.** The project site is located within the 85-X Height and Bulk District. The height of the proposed project would exceed this height limit of both designations. In order for the project to proceed, the Board of Supervisors would need to approve a Height District Reclassification for the subject parcel.

   The zoning concepts published in the Draft Plan include height limits of 85-130 feet (proposed Mid-Rise and High-Rise Scenarios). The proposed glass wall located on the roof of the structure exceeds the allowable 130 foot height limit. The Planning Code will allow for encroachments above this height for stairs, elevators and mechanical. However, this element appears excessive (also see Design Comment below). This analysis is not an indication of which height scenario will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan and is not a guarantee that the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve changes to height limits. Please see further discussion in the Preliminary Project Comments section.

3. **Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required for the following:

   a. Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 25,000 gross sf.
4. **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required for the following:
   
a. Planning Code Section 202.5 for the conversion of a Gas Station to another use.

5. **Office Allocation** from the Planning Commission would be required for the following:
   
a. Small Office Project under 50,000 square feet of office space (49,980 square feet proposed, plus additional commercial space).

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

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

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

**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:**

*Central SoMa Plan*

The following analysis examines the proposed project under both existing zoning and the proposed zoning outlined in the Draft Plan.
1. **Existing Zoning/Height-Bulk.** The subject property is zoned as a SOMA-Light Industrial (SLI) district, which does not permit the proposed office use. It is located within the 85-X height and bulk district, which does not permit the project’s proposed height and bulk. The project could not be approved under existing zoning.

2. **Central SoMa Plan.** As discussed in the “Background” section above, the subject property falls within the ongoing Central SoMa Plan study area bounded by Second, Sixth, Townsend, and Market Streets. The Draft Plan is currently being evaluated in an 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 EIR, the Plan, and the proposed rezoning and affiliated Code changes are anticipated to be brought before decision makers for approval in 2016.

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

3. **Land Use.** The Draft Plan recommends rezoning the subject property to the Mixed-Use Office (MUO) zoning district, in which the proposed office and ground floor retail would be allowed. These office and retail uses are generally consistent with key objectives of the Central SoMa Plan, which include providing support for substantial development in a transit-rich area.

   The proposed plan also calls for a SoMa Entertainment SUD, in which entertainment uses would be permitted. In order to create a diverse and dynamic 24-hour neighborhood characteristic of SoMa, the Central SoMa Plan’s preliminary land use principles envision a mixed-use neighborhood in which office development is balanced with retail, arts, entertainment, industrial, and residential uses. The proposed 3,300 sf of ground floor retail use supports this vision of a mixed-use neighborhood; the project sponsor is encouraged to further explore inclusion of a variety of uses for these ground floor spaces.

4. **Urban Form.** In recognition of the desire to accommodate more growth in the area, the Draft Plan recommended changing the height limits of the subject property to 130 feet along Bryant Street. The Draft Plan and subsequent policy papers have recommended new requirements for major streets. See: [www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central_SoMa_Draft_Policy_Paper-Feb2015_graphics.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central_SoMa_Draft_Policy_Paper-Feb2015_graphics.pdf).

   The proposed building tower height of 145 feet (including mechanical) on Bryant Street would not be possible with the existing and proposed controls, as it would conflict with the proposed sun angle requirements of Draft Central SoMa Plan and Planning Code allowances for height exceptions. Therefore, the Planning Department recommends that the proposed height be adjusted to comply with the future 130 foot height requirement and adjust the mechanical screening to comply with the allowance of the Planning Code.

5. **Streetscape Improvements.** The Draft Plan calls for streetscape improvements across the study area, with extensive streetscape improvements proposed along Bryant Street in order to support a safe,
convenient, and attractive street environment for all users. Proposed improvements on this section of Bryant Street include wider sidewalks, fewer traffic lanes, and a new signalized mid-block crossing. The Plan would also prohibit new curb cuts on this street. The proposed project will be expected to implement street improvements consistent with the Plan along any adjacent street and alley frontages. Please see the Preliminary Design Comments for further discussion.

6. **Vision Zero.** The project is located on a “high-injury corridor”, identified through the City’s [Vision Zero Program](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/plans/emerging_issues/sustainable-development/CentralSoMa_EcoDTaskForceReport_112513.pdf). The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project.

7. **Sustainability and Central SoMa Eco-District.** The Department sees a special opportunity for this area to exhibit a variety of sustainability best practices including and beyond those required by the Green Building Code and other City and State sustainability requirements. The proposed project could contribute to the Central SoMa Eco-District. An "eco-district” is a neighborhood or district where residents, community institutions, property owners, developers, and businesses join together with city staff and utility providers to meet sustainability goals 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 infill area composed of many smaller parcels and property owners. All major new development in the Central SoMa Plan Area will be expected to participate in some capacity in the Eco-District Program and a possible Sustainability Management Association to help guide it. For more information please see:

San Francisco Eco-District Program:

Central SoMa Eco-District Task Force Recommendations Report (2013):

**Planning Code and Other Issues**

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

1. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** As noted previously, this review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones. You may download the application at the following link: [http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=522](http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=522).

2. **Floor Area Ratio.** The maximum floor area ratio for a nonresidential project within the MUO district is 7.5 square feet to each square foot of lot area, which in this case would allow up to 68,992.5 square feet of gross floor area. The proposed project includes 54,680 gross square feet, which is within the allowed square footage.
3. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one square foot of open space for every 250 sf of retail (13.2 square feet) and one square foot per 50 square feet of office (974.2 square feet). Therefore, approximately 987.4 square feet of open space would be required for the proposed development. It appears that the project provides approximately 1,000 square feet of open space, which satisfies the requirement.

4. **Permitted Obstructions.** Planning Code Section 136 allows specific architectural elements to encroach in to the required front setback and rear yard. The proposed plans do not indicate any of these types of features. Please be aware of the requirements when refining the architecture of the building.

5. **Street Trees.** The Department of Public works requires the planting of Street Trees pursuant to Article 16, Section 805(a) and (d) and 806 (d). Generally, one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction will be required. You may contact Carla Short at the Department of Public Works for additional information (carla.short@sfdpw.org). You may also view the code requirements at the following link: view the requirements at the following link: http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/publicworks/article16urbanforestryordinance?fe=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_806

6. **Bird Safety.** Planning Code Section 139 requires architectural features to be design in a manner to reduce potential bird collisions with the glazing on the building. The site is not located near an Urban Bird Refuge. The formal submittal will need to demonstrate that the glazing on the structure complies with the required treatment for architectural features.

7. **Street Frontage.** Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for street frontages to ensure that they consist of pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, active space and are appropriate and compatible with the buildings in an MUO District. Currently, the proposed project appears to meet most of these requirements. Please ensure that the ground floor street frontage meets all of these requirements as related to use, height, active space, transparency, fenestration, gates, railings, and grillwork and include dimensions on the plans to assist staff with verification of conformance with these requirements with the formal submittal.

8. **Parking.** The MUO District does not require any parking for the proposed retail and office; however, Section 151.1 allows for accessory parking with up to 1 per 2,500 square feet of retail and a parking area of up to 7% or the total gross office use area (7% x 49,980 square feet = 3,498.6 square feet). The proposed parking basement totals 4,500 square feet; however, it is unclear if the mechanical and storage areas have been excluded. Please note that the maximum allows is 3,498 square feet and please clarify compliance on the plans. Additionally, please note that the subject site is located immediately adjacent to the future Central Subway and accessory parking above the permitted would be difficult to support. Design of the garage ramp should allow a level cars length coming out of the garage to assist with visibility and pedestrian safety and the walls around the garage opening currently limit visibility and should be reworked.

9. **Loading.** Planning Code Section 152.1 requires loading spaces dependent of the type and size of the use. Based on the proposal, the Office portion of this development would require 5 loading spaces.
This requirement may be further refined through the Central SoMa plan due to the location of the site and proposed uses of Bryant and 4th Streets.

10. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires this project to provide at least 11 Class I bicycle parking spaces and 4 Class II spaces. Based on the PPA submittal, the proposed project is 1 Class I space short of the amount required (Section 153(a)(5) requires rounding up). Additionally, you may want to reconsider the location of the bicycle parking in relation to the locker area and showers. Currently, bicyclists have to walk the bikes through the locker area, which makes for an odd configuration.

11. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross sf 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

12. **Transportation Management Programs.** Planning Code Section 163 requires office development over 25,000 square feet to provide on-site transportation brokerage services for the actual lifetime of the project. The project sponsor shall execute an agreement with the Planning Department for the provision of on-site transportation brokerage services and preparation of a transportation management program to be approved by the Director of Planning and implemented by the provider of transportation brokerage services prior to the issuance of a temporary permit of occupancy.

13. **Flood Notification.** The project site is in a block that has the potential to flood during storms. The SFPUC will review the permit application to comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. Please note that there may be issues with adding an underground garage. Applicants for building permits for either new construction, change of use, or change of occupancy, or for major alterations or enlargements must contact the SFPUC at the beginning of the process to determine whether the project would result in ground-level flooding during storms. Requirements may include provision of measures to ensure positive sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, DBI, or the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. For information required for the review of projects in flood-prone areas, the permit applicant shall refer to Bulletin No. 4:


14. **Stormwater.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf or greater, it is subject to San Francisco’s stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including:
(a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR (b) stormwater treatment for areas in separate sewer systems. The SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program is responsible for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. To view the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to http://sfwater.org/sdg. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

15. **Recycled Water.** Projects located in San Francisco’s designated recycled water use areas are required to install recycled water systems for irrigation, cooling, and/or toilet and urinal flushing in accordance with the Recycled (or Reclaimed) Water Use Ordinance, adopted as Article 22 of the San Francisco Public Works Code. New construction or major alterations with a total cumulative area of 40,000 sf or more; any new, modified, or existing irrigated areas of 10,000 sf or more; and all subdivisions are required to comply. To determine if the proposed project is in a designated recycled water use area, and for more information about the recycled water requirements, please visit sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687.

16. **Gas Station Conversion.** Section 202.5 requires a separate Conditional Use Authorization (CUA) for the conversion of a Gas Station to any other use. Please be aware of the requirements set forth in this section. The CUA would move forward concurrent with the LPA. All required findings and tank removal items would need to be full addressed in the application.

17. **Office Development Annual Limit.** Planning Code Section 321 establishes limits on the allowed square footage for office development within the City. It is broken down into two categories, large projects over 50,000 square feet and small project below 50,000 square feet. The proposed development appears to be small office project under 50,000 square feet (49,980 square feet, based on the application). This would require an Office Allocation Permit (“B” Case) from the Planning Commission. Additional information about the City Office Allocation process and application may be found at the following links:

   o **Office Allocation Webpage:** http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3254v

   o **Office Allocation Application:**


18. **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 as currently zoned, the following impact fees, which are assessed by the Planning Department, will be required:

   a. Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF)
   b. Jos Housing Linkage (Planning Code Section 413)
c. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees (Planning Code Section 423)
d. Public Art (Planning Code Section 429)

Please be aware that the fee package for Central SoMa projects will likely be increased from the existing requirements. 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).

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The project site is located in the Central SoMa Plan, currently in progress. The area buildings are primarily masonry in character, two to four stories in height. With the adoption of the plan, the area will likely see an increase of height and bulk with the predominance of office use. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may substantially affect the proposed project:

1. Site Design, Open Space and Massing. The Planning Department appreciates the articulated application of the apparent mass reduction (“skyplane”) as proposed by the Central SoMa Plan Urban Form: Bulk draft policy paper. It should be noted that the parapet or roof screen would also be included in the calculation; for design and proportion reasons, the Department suggests that this screen be lowered or minimized.

The Planning Department recommends the configuration of public open space affect the massing as described below in “Street Frontage.”

2. Street Frontage. As the project proposes new office space, as per the draft policy paper on Privately Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS), the project will be asked to provide POPOS in the amount of one square foot per 50 square feet of new office area. In this case, as this amount is less than 15% of the site, it will be required to be at grade, open to the sky, and connected to the public realm. The Department recommends either that this be located along Bryant towards the east corner of the site or that the sponsor continue to work with Department staff on an appropriate configuration. The Department does not support the current location as it is under cover and makes a narrow, pass-through colonnade along Bryant.

The Department requests a five-foot setback at the first and second floors along 4th Street as it has a narrow sidewalk.

3. Architecture. The Planning Department supports the unique and expressive architectural sensibility as shown in the PPA. While the design takes the signage structures as precedents, it will also be important that the building use high-quality materials and demonstrate a sense of durability. There should be significant depth in the façade as well.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation Application, Conditional Use Authorization Application, Large Project Authorization Application, or Office Allocation Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than Tuesday, May 9th, 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  
Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis  
Interdepartmental Project Review Application  
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin  
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet

cc: ELISIA, LLC, Property Owner  
Shaunn Mendrin, Current Planning  
Kansai Uchida, Environmental Planning  
Jon Swae, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
Maia Small, Design Review  
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary  
Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA  
Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works  
Ken Nim, Mayors Office of Workforce and Economic Development  
Pauline Perkins, SFPUC  
June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH  
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>Aaron</td>
<td>Peskin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94113</td>
<td>415-886-7014</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Simi</td>
<td>Local Field Representative</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22</td>
<td>2085 Third Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-355-1322</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aSIM@NCCRC.org">aSIM@NCCRC.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Lantzberg</td>
<td>Research Analyst</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22 c/o NCCRC Research</td>
<td>265 Heiserger Road, Ste. 220</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94621</td>
<td>510-430-9706 x109</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alantzberg@nccrc.org">alantzberg@nccrc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Community Design Center</td>
<td>5 Thomas Meton Circle, #128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-586-1235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hr3782@earthlink.net">hr3782@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Villa-Lobos</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Community Leadership Alliance</td>
<td>P.O. Box 642201</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-921-4192</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@communityleadershipalliance.net">admin@communityleadershipalliance.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Laborers Local 261</td>
<td>3271 18th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-826-4650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dhemandez@nccrc.org">dhemandez@nccrc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyan</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>Co-Founder</td>
<td>People Power Media</td>
<td>366 10th Ave</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-657-6010</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dyan.ruiz@hotmail.com">dyan.ruiz@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Shanshan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Residential Builders Association</td>
<td>1717 17th Street, Ste. 200</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-250-1900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gracac@tauaf.com">gracac@tauaf.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Sousa</td>
<td>Public Works Coordinator</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Construction and Engineering</td>
<td>795 Folsom Street, Rm-426</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-644-7043</td>
<td><a href="mailto:1s4534@att.com">1s4534@att.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Coalition for Adequate Review</td>
<td>364 Page Street, #36</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Rodgers</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Alabama Street Pioneers</td>
<td>1014 Alabama Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-826-4854</td>
<td><a href="mailto:at2ze90@sonic.net">at2ze90@sonic.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide, Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Theriault</td>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>SF Building and Construction Trades Council</td>
<td>1189 Franklin Street, Ste.203</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94108</td>
<td>415-345-9333</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mika@sfbbtc.org">mika@sfbbtc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Trauss</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SF Bay Area Association of Renters</td>
<td>1618 12th Street</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94607</td>
<td>215-900-1457</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja.trauss@gmail.com">sonja.trauss@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Law Office of Stephen M. Williams</td>
<td>1934 Divisadero Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-292-3656</td>
<td>stevewilliamslaw.com</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Hestor</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>870 Market Street, #1128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-362-2778</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hestor@earthlink.net">hestor@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Gulliksen</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>San Francisco Tenants Union</td>
<td>558 Capp Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-5525</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ted@jitsu.org">ted@jitsu.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Schuetz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95 Minna Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>215-241-5635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rebschu@gmail.com">rebschu@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NAME</td>
<td>LAST NAME</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>Cabande</td>
<td>Organizational Director</td>
<td>South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)</td>
<td>1110 Howard Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabande@somcan.org">acabande@somcan.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)</td>
<td>474 Valenda Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-362-2500</td>
<td>podersf.org</td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Market Street Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 456</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-902-7635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corinnewoods@cs.com">corinnewoods@cs.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mission Creek Harbor Association</td>
<td>300 Channel Street, Box 10</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-358-3920</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agoldman@tndc.org">agoldman@tndc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department</td>
<td>215 Taylor Street</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, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SoMaBend Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 410805</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ethanough@gmail.com">ethanough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Ecker Owners Association</td>
<td>16 Jessie Street Unit 301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
<td>415-626-6650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wolfsp@earthlink.net">wolfsp@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hallam Street Homeowners Association</td>
<td>1 Brush Place</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
<td>415-626-6650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wolfsp@earthlink.net">wolfsp@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Carpinelli</td>
<td>Board President</td>
<td>Dogpatch Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>934 Minnesota Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td>jcarpineelli.com</td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Board</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>Whitaker</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</td>
<td>201 Harrison Street Apt. 229</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-935-5810</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somajournal@yahoo.com">somajournal@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>Liddell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>South Beach/Rincon Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>403 Main Street #813</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cliddell@me.com">cliddell@me.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaya</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>LMNOP Neighbors</td>
<td>1047 Minna Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-724-1593</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LMNOP@yak.net">LMNOP@yak.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association</td>
<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@everestaf.com">keith@everestaf.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Magnani</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>65 Ninth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-965-0201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfoffice@afsc.org">sfoffice@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvisphilips@gmail.com">marvisphilips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patey</td>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>SOMA Development Centre</td>
<td>2055 Sunnydale Avenue #100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134-</td>
<td>2611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bayview, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon HI Residents Association</td>
<td>75 Polson Street #1800</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhbement@sbcglobal.net">rhbement@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Minott</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighborhoods/Save the Hill</td>
<td>1206 Mariposa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-553-5969</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodminott@hotmail.com">rodminott@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Koos</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TDCO Impact Group</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-426-6819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@tcco.org">sonja@tcco.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TJP AIC</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114-</td>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olssonr@earthlink.net">olssonr@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grisso@sfgov.org">mike.grisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Bayview, Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market, Visitacion Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.</td>
<td>Eppler</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>650-704-7775</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jre@potreroboosters.org">jre@potreroboosters.org</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Loo</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>York Realty</td>
<td>243A Shipley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorkboo@gmail.com">yorkboo@gmail.com</a></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.)
PURPOSE: This bulletin alerts project sponsors to City and County review procedures and requirements for certain properties where flooding may occur.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

New Service Line Permits
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Service Bureau
(415) 551-3000
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NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST APPROVED BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.
2. BACKFLOW PREVENTION FOR DOMESTIC WATER PLUMBING INSIDE THE BUILDING MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.
3. BACKFLOW PREVENTER FOR RECYCLED WATER SYSTEM MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

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

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