DATE: March 11, 2016
TO: Melinda Sarjapur
FROM: Julian J. Bañales, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-015789PPA

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Kimberly Durandet at (415) 575-6816 or kimberly.durandet@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Julian J. Bañales, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: March 11, 2016
Case No.: 2015-015789PPA
Project Address: 828 Brannan Street
Block/Lot: 3780/004E
Zoning: UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District
68-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Showplace Square/ Potrero Hill
Project Sponsor: Melinda Sarjapur
415-567-9000
Staff Contact: Kimberly Durandet 415-575-6816
kimberly.durandet@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 November 30, 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:

This site is located on a parcel on the northwest corner of Langton and Brannan, bounded by Brannan Street, 8th Street, Bryant Street, and Langton Street, in San Francisco’s South of Market neighborhood. The proposal is to demolish the existing 12,605 square-foot (sf) wholesale building and construct a 6-story, 68-foot-tall, approximately 61,000-square-foot mixed-used building over a subterranean parking garage. The existing building on the 13,000-sf subject lot was constructed in 1936. The proposed new building would
include 60 dwelling units, comprised of 25 studios, 10 one-bedroom, and 25 two-bedroom units and about 2,800 square feet of commercial space. The garage would include 18 parking spaces. The project would include approximately 15 feet of soil excavation for the foundation and subterranean parking garage.

**BACKGROUND:**

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

*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 proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*. If the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it would be eligible for a community plan exemption (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 *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, 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 *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* 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 *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, 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 *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* 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 *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* 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](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.

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](http://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

A detailed and accurate description of the proposed project is essential for adequate environmental review. Please update the EEA project description as necessary to reflect feedback provided in this PPA letter, and include any additional documents requested herein. Furthermore, please include the following information regarding the proposed project: clarifying access to the proposed bike parking, clarify driveway ramp dimensions, and label existing and proposed curb cuts and sidewalk dimensions. The proposed driveway curb cut should be reduced to 10 feet. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and volume of excavation as part of the EEA. If you have already filed your EEA, you may provide the requested information and documents as supplements to your application.

Below is a list of topic areas addressed through the environmental review process. Some of these would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application.

1. **Historic Resources.** The project proposes demolition of an age-eligible building located in the Showplace Square Historic Resources Survey Area. The property was found not to be located in a historic district, but no evaluation of the subject building was completed. Therefore, the proposed project 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 HRE scope will require an individual evaluation of the subject building which was not completed as part of the previous survey. The qualified 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. The selected consultant must scope the HRE in consultation with Department Historic Preservation staff. 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 HRE is received.

2. **Archeological Resources.** The project site lies within the Archeological Mitigation Zone J-1: Properties with Previous Studies of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. 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 PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA.

At the time of the filing of the EEA, please provide more detailed plans clarifying access to the proposed bike parking, clarify driveway ramp dimensions, and label existing and proposed curb cuts and sidewalk dimensions. The proposed driveway curb cut should be reduced to between 10 and 12 feet.

5. **Noise.** *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise* addresses requirements related to the use of pile-driving. If the project involves pile driving, *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 Department of Building Inspection (DBI) prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

*Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses* is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors. This measure would apply to the proposed project because the project includes a noise-sensitive use. *Noise Mitigation Measure F-4* requires that the project sponsor conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements for new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn). The analysis must demonstrate, with reasonable certainty, that the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations can be met.
Finally, *Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments* would apply to the proposed project because it includes open space for new noise-sensitive development. This mitigation measure requires that open space required under the Planning Code be protected from existing ambient noise levels. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project’s 60 dwelling units 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.

However, the project includes demolition and construction of a large building and will require heavy-duty diesel powered vehicles and/or equipment. The project is located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (as defined and mapped in Health Code, Article 38). Therefore, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in Mitigation Measure G-1: Construction Air Quality will likely be required.

In addition, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6.

As discussed, the project site is located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. The proposed project would include new sensitive land uses (i.e., residential), which are subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. The project sponsor will be required to submit an Article 38 application to DPH prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the Article 38 application with the EEA.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Given the proposed building’s height of 68-feet, the proposed project would not likely require a backup diesel generator and additional measures, such as those described in Mitigation Measure G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM and Mitigation Measure G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit Other TACS, will likely not be necessary to reduce its emissions. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

---

4 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
5 Refer to [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp) for more information.
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 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. **Shadow.** Planning Code Section 295 restricts new shadows on public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department by any structure exceeding 40 feet, unless the Planning Commission finds the impact to be less than significant. The proposed project would result in construction of a building up to 68 feet in height. The Planning Department conducted a preliminary shadow fan analysis and determined that the proposed project would not cast new shadow on public spaces protected under Section 295 or on any other open spaces. Therefore, further shadow analysis will not be required for this project.

9. **Geology.** The project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill). Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review. A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would involve demolition of an existing structure, which may contain hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during demolition. The project site is located within a Maher Area and 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 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.

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Material 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 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 DBI for requirements related to the demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

11. Hydrology. The project is located on a San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Block of Interest, which identifies areas prone to flooding. The SFPUC shall be notified at the beginning of the planning process to review the project and determine whether the project would result in ground level flooding during storms.

12. Stormwater. If the project would result in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf or greater, it would be 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. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the SFPUC, Wastewater Enterprise, and Urban Watershed Management Program. 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. The project’s environmental evaluation would generally assess how and where the implementation of necessary stormwater controls would reduce the potential negative impacts of stormwater runoff. 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.

13. **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. Also see the comments below under “Street Trees.”

14. **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 an EIR; adoption of a 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. **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. Modifications may be sought for certain Planning Code requirements through the 329 process.

2. **A Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.
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3. **A Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Large Project 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:**

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

1. **Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan, one of the Eastern Neighborhoods area plans in the General Plan. As proposed, the project is generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan, though the project and design comments below discuss any items where more information is needed to assess conformity with either specific policies or Code standards or where the project requires minor modification to achieve consistency. The project sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan, which can be viewed at:


   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, for an equivalent amount to the value of
the improvements. This process is further explained in Section 423.3(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.

2. **Land Use in Urban Mixed Use (UMU) Zones.** The subject property is currently designated as an industrial building in the Urban Mixed Use (UMU) district. The project proposes a change in land use from ‘Production, Distribution and Repair’ (PDR) to residential and commercial uses. The original intent of the UMU when the Eastern Neighborhoods (EN) Plans and rezoning were adopted in 2009 was to allow UMU areas to transition over time from PDR uses to primarily housing, while the Plans zoned other parcels specifically as protected PDR areas (i.e. PDR zones). However, the pace of this transition since adoption of the EN Plans and UMU zoning controls has progressed faster than anticipated. Furthermore, since that time demand for PDR space has increased in the City. As a result, the Planning Commission has expressed concern regarding displacement of PDR uses in the UMU District. The Planning Department is analyzing the issue and considering whether changes should be made to the land use controls in the UMU. While preservation of existing PDR and construction of new PDR space are not requirements at this time in the UMU zoning district, project sponsors proposing development in the UMU should consider inclusion of some PDR space in their projects regardless of whether PDR currently exists on the subject property.

3. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. Because this project is located on a corner site, one of the street frontages must be designated as the front of the property, and the rear yard would then be provided based on that determination. The “interior courtyard” configurations proposed for the rear yard is not permitted in Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use Districts, except as an approved modification through the Large Project Authorization process. While such configurations can be supported, a minimum of 25 percent (95x145=3,444 square feet) or comparable area is strongly recommended. The proposed modified rear yard (23.5x61=1,434) provides an area that is exceedingly deficient by a total of 2,010 square feet. Further, rear yards shall be provided at the lowest story containing a Dwelling Unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building. The Department recommends revising the plans to provide a comparable rear yard.

4. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 80 (private) or 54 (publicly accessible) square feet of open space for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). There is insufficient information regarding the private open space on balconies proposed for this project to determine if the minimum dimensional requirements are met. Therefore, the proposed project may require revision to meet the minimum open space requirement, or you may request an open space modification through the Large Project Authorization process. The Department generally would recommend providing an equivalent amount of open space.

5. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one foot of open space for every 250 square feet of retail (and similar) uses. The proposal includes 2,800 square feet of commercial space. Therefore, 11.2 square feet of open space would be required. Alternatively, per Section 426, an in-lieu fee may be paid instead of providing the open space on site.
6. **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?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sanc=JD_806

7. **Standards for Bird Safety.** Adopted on July 14, 2011, the Standards for Bird Safe Buildings, Section 139, specify requirements for a bird safe building. Please review the standards and indicate the method of glazing treatment where applicable.

8. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposed rear yard is not code-complying and does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement for those units that only have windows fronting the courtyard area. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum exposure requirement, or you may request an exception through the Large Project Authorization process. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception. Please refer to comment number 2 for rear yard requirements.

9. **Street Frontages in Mixed Use Districts.** Planning Code Section 145 requires active uses at the ground floor in mixed use districts. Residential uses are considered active uses only if more than 50 percent of the linear residential street frontage at the ground level features walk-up dwelling units that provide direct, individual pedestrian access to a public sidewalk, and are consistent with the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines, as adopted and periodically amended by the Planning Commission. Further, the UMU zoning district requires a ground floor height for commercial uses to be 17 feet. The proposed ground floor appears to meet this requirement. For additional information please see the Preliminary Design Comments Section below.

10. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires this project to provide at least 60 Class 1 and 3 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. It is unclear from the submittal if bicycle parking will meet all Code requirements, including number of spaces, design and layout. Please refer to Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9 for further information on these requirements.


11. **Car Sharing.** Planning Code Section 166 requires this project to provide at least one car share space. The proposed project contains no car share spaces.

12. **Dwelling Unit Mix.** Planning Code Section 207.6 outlines requirements for minimum dwelling unit mixes for new residential units in the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts. In these zoning districts, no less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least
two bedrooms; or, no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms; where any fractions resulting from these calculations shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of dwelling units.

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

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

14. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an ‘Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program’: Planning Code Section 419 to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or affordable housing fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units; unless a Costa Hawkins agreement is possible. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project. The minimum Affordable Housing Percentages for this site are 25% affordable housing fee, 16% on-site, or 25% off-site. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a minimum requirement of 10 units if provided on-site, and 15 units if provided off-site.

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

- direct financial construction from a public entity
- development bonus or other form of public assistance

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

15. **Additional Requirements for Affordable Housing in UMU.** Planning Code Section 419 establishes additional requirements for affordable housing in the UMU zoning district. The subject property is a Tier B designation per Section 419.3.

16. **Anti-Discriminatory Housing Policy.** Administrative Code Section 1.61 requires the Planning Department to collect an application/form with information about an applicant’s internal anti-discriminatory policies for projects proposing an increase of ten (10) dwelling units or more. You
17. **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 square feet or more; any new, modified, or existing irrigated areas of 10,000 square feet 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](http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687).

18. **Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (POE).** New residential development within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment must go through an Entertainment Commission outreach process ([Ordinance Number 070-015](http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=338)). In addition, new residential development will also be required to record a Notice of Special Restrictions (NSR) on the site. The subject site is located within 300 feet of an existing POE, see enclosed map. Please note that the Planning Department will not consider an entitlement application complete until the following are completed:

(A) The Entertainment Commission has provided written notification to the Planning Department indicating that it either did not wish to hold a hearing, or that it held a hearing and the Project Sponsor attended; and

(B) The Project Sponsor has included a copy of any comments and/or recommendations provided by the Entertainment Commission regarding the proposed Project as well as the date(s) when those comments were provided. This shall be done as an additional sheet in any plan set submitted to the Planning Department and as an attachment in an entitlement application.

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

19. **Impact Fees.** This project will be subject to various impact fees. Please refer to the [Planning Director’s Bulletin No. 1](http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=338) for an overview of Development Impact Fees, and to the Department of Building Inspection’s [Development Impact Fee webpage](http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=338) for more information about current rates.

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

a. Transportation Sustainability Fee (411A)
b. UMU Affordable Housing Fee (419)
c. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees (423)
d. Childcare Fee (414A)
PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends a code complying rear yard or 25% of the lot area for open space at the rear of the building. The project should meet exposure requirements. The limited number of parking spaces coupled with the familiarity of users justifies a reduced vehicular entry. Please reduce the width to a single lane width (11’-12’ maximum).

2. **Architecture.** The Planning Department believes the rational and utilitarian architectural expression may be compatible with the context and residential use, but will depend to a high degree on the use of high-quality materials and appropriate detailing.
   a. Specifically, the Department recommends design features that add a usable and human scale while contributing to an active interface between the building frontages and the street/easement, such as balconies, bays, and ground floor stoops and patios.
   b. Slightly recess the storefront and consider contemporary reinterpretations of more traditional storefront elements, for example bulkheads and transoms, to add a finer-grain more human-scale at the sidewalk.
   c. The residential units at the ground floor should conform to the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines with usable transition space and elevated entries directly accessible from the Langton frontage. If elevated entries are infeasible, the ground floor units should be recessed 8’-10’ and expressed for the height of the entire dwelling unit.

3. **Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** The Planning Department suggests the project sponsor explore the opportunity to enhance the easement with public realm improvements such as trees and sidewalk planters, and a standard sidewalk with an accessible path of travel, that faces the area of Langton.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An application as listed above, **must be submitted no later than September 11, 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: Peter Hekemian, Property Owner
    Kimberly Durandet, Current Planning
    Lana Russell-Hurd, Environmental Planning
    Nicholas Perry, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
    Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
    Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
    Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
    June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH
    Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
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.)
PLANNING BULLETIN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

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

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

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

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

RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

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

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

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

INSTALLATION OF RECYCLED WATER SERVICE LINES

APPROVED BY:                        DRAWN:        DRAWING NO.
                                      W.Villasica   A-1290.2
DESIGNED BY:                         CHECKED:      REV. NO.
Cheryl Munoz                        M.Gardiner     2
SCALE: NTS                          DATE: 05/28/08
<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>Local Field Representative</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22</td>
<td>470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94113</td>
<td>415-986-7014</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Lantsberg</td>
<td>Research Analyst</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22 &amp; NCCRC Research</td>
<td>265 Hegenerberger Road, Ste. 220</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94621</td>
<td>510-430-9706</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alantsberg@nccrc.org">alantsberg@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 Melton Circle, #128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134</td>
<td>415-586-1235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hn3782@earthlink.net">hn3782@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 6420/1</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-921-4192</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@communityleadershipalliance.com">admin@communityleadershipalliance.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>94107-1243</td>
<td>415-644-7043</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ls4524@att.com">ls4524@att.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Coalition for Adequate Review</td>
<td>364 Page Street, #36</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-826-4854</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mta1zealot@sonic.net">mta1zealot@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>1188 Franklin Street, S1.203</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-345-9333</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike@sfbctc.org">mike@sfbctc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sona</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:sionta@earthlink.net">sionta@earthlink.net</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>94115</td>
<td>415-292-3656</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SMW@stevewilliamslaw.com">SMW@stevewilliamslaw.com</a></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>94102</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>Gullicksen</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@sftu.org">ted@sftu.org</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>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 Valdenia Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-382-2500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:poder@sfgov.org">poder@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mission Creek Harbor Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 456</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-902-7635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corinne@pacbell.net">corinne@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrine</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Trenderon Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department</td>
<td>215 Taylor Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-358-3920</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agoldman@tnoc.org">agoldman@tnoc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</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>94141</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>Ethan</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Ecker Owners Association</td>
<td>16 Jessie Street Unit 301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ethanhough@gmail.com">ethanhough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hallam Street Homeowners Association</td>
<td>1 Brush Place</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-626-6650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wolf@earthlink.net">wolf@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>0 HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102- 4689</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.kim@sfgov.org">jane.kim@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:April.veneracion@sfgov.org">April.veneracion@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org">Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market</td>
<td></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>94107</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jc@carpinelli.com">jc@carpinelli.com</a></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 Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@scbglobal.net">jhenders@scbglobal.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>Kyti</td>
<td>Liddell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>South Beach/Rincon Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>403 Main Street #13</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ctkiddl@mac.com">ctkiddl@mac.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</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>415-724-1953</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LMNOP@yak.net">LMNOP@yak.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association</td>
<td>809 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@eventstarf.com">keith@eventstarf.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Magnani</td>
<td>0 American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>65 Ninth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-586-0291</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sffoffice@afsc.org">sffoffice@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvis</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>210 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102- 6526</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvi.phillips@gmail.com">marvi.phillips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Samoan Development Centre</td>
<td>2055 Sunnydale Avenue #100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134- 2611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bayview, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon Hill Residents Association</td>
<td>75 Folsom Street #1800</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhbement@scbglobal.net">rhbement@scbglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Minott</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill</td>
<td>1206 Mariposa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-503-5969</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodmnott@hotmail.com">rodmnott@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Koss</td>
<td>Community Advocate</td>
<td>TODCO Impact Group</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-426-6919</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@todco.org">sonja@todco.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TJPA/CAC</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114- 1709</td>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olssonreid@yahoo.com">olssonreid@yahoo.com</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:mke.grisso@sfgov.org">mke.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>650-794-7775</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@potreroboosters.org">president@potreroboosters.org</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Loo</td>
<td>0 York Realty</td>
<td>243A Shipley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107- 1010</td>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorkllo@gmail.com">yorkllo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>York, South of Market</td>
<td></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>94118</td>
<td>415-677-6010</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dyan.ruiz@hotmail.com">dyan.ruiz@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Mission, Out South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>De Guzman</td>
<td>Development Specialist</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:michelle.deguzman@sfgov.org">michelle.deguzman@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>