DATE: 11/15/2016
TO: Thomas Tunny/Reuben Junius Rose LLP
FROM: Mark Luellen, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2016-004810PPA for 1 Montgomery

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Marcelle Boudreaux, at (415) 575-9140 or marcelle.boudreaux@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Mark Luellen, Northeast Team Leader
Preliminary Project Assessment

**Date:** November 15, 2016  
**Case No.:** 2016-004810PPA  
**Project Address:** 1 & 25 Montgomery Street  
**Block/Lot:** 0292/001A & 002  
**Zoning:** C-3-O, Downtown-Office  
250-S  
**Area Plan:** Downtown Plan  
**Project Sponsor:** Thomas Tunny  
Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP  
One Bush Street, Suite 600  
415-567-9000  
**Staff Contact:** Marcelle Boudreaux – 415-575-9140  
marcelle.boudreaux@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 17, 2016, 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 1 Montgomery and 25 Montgomery Street parcels are currently occupied by two-story buildings, historic resources under CEQA, that are internally contiguous and occupied currently by one banking use at the ground floor. Combined, these two structures are historically known as the Crocker Bank Building.
Public open space caps the 1 Montgomery Street parcel, which is adjacent to and accessible from the Crocker Galleria. The proposal is to develop one 33-story, 500-foot tower to be positioned at the southwest corner of the existing 1 Montgomery Street parcel. The proposal under review in this PPA Letter includes a 234 room hotel (approximately 176,875 square feet) with 5 residential units at the top five levels (approximately 35,375 square feet). Two other schemes were proposed by the sponsor in the application; these will be referenced in certain code sections as necessary. No information was provided by the sponsor about the potential satisfaction of inclusionary housing requirements.

An existing original entry at the south elevation on Montgomery is proposed as the entry to the new tower. According to information provided by the sponsor, the new tower would be inserted through portions of the existing historic portion of 1 Montgomery Street. In addition, the existing interior envelope and exterior facade is proposed for refurbishment and retention. Further, the project proposes improvements to the public open space onto the roof of 1 Montgomery Street parcel and the roof of the 25 Montgomery Street parcel.

The depth of excavation is approximately 50 feet to support the proposed deep piles for the new tower. No curb cuts are proposed for loading or for off-street parking. Bike parking is proposed as follows: 13 Class 1 spaces and 8 Class 2 spaces.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) for the full scope of the project. EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.¹ Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.

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

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool ([http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf](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.

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 site contains one or more buildings previously determined to be eligible for national, state, or local listing as a historic resource. Therefore, 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 project proposes alterations to an historical resource and the HRE scope will require a Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties analysis of the project. 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](mailto: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](mailto: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. **Archeological Resources.** 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 one of the Planning Department’s three standard archeological mitigation measures (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 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.

Transportation Demand Management Program: On April 28, 2016, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution to initiate Planning Code amendments that would require development projects to comply with a proposed Travel Demand Management (TDM) Program. The intent of the proposed TDM Program is to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to make it easier for people to get around by sustainable travel modes such as transit, walking, and biking.

Under the proposed TDM Program, land uses are grouped into four categories, A through D. For each land use category that is subject to the TDM Program, the City would set a target based on the number of parking spaces proposed. To meet each target, the project sponsor must select TDM measures from a menu of options. In general, the number of TDM measures that the sponsor must implement would increase in proportion to the number of parking spaces proposed. Some of the TDM measures included in the menu are already required by the Planning Code. Points earned from implementing these measures would be applied towards achieving a project’s target(s). Project sponsors would be required to implement and maintain TDM measures for the life of the project.

5. **Noise.** Construction noise would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. If pile driving is to be used during the construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project. The EEA application should indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, with 234 hotel rooms or 52 dwelling units, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operation screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, please provide detailed information related to the volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

---

2 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
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.

In addition, the project site is not 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 and modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given that the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, no additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are anticipated. However, if the project would include 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. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with 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 Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **Wind.** The project site is in the C-3-O zoning district, and is subject to Planning Code limits on ground-level wind speeds. A wind tunnel analysis may be required in order to determine project compliance with these Planning Code provisions. Additionally, ground-level wind speeds will be assessed as part of the project’s environmental review. The proposed project will therefore require a consultant-prepared wind analysis. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the assigned Current Planning and Environmental Planning staff prior to proceeding with the analysis.

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 cast shadows on a Recreation and Parks Department property subject to Planning Code Section 295, and would cast a shadow on a non-Recreation and Parks Department

---

public open space. The proposed project would cast a shadow on the existing privately-owned public open space (POPOS) on the roof of 1 Montgomery Street building and potentially other open spaces.

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project is located on a site with known or suspected soil and/or groundwater contamination. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine 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.


11. **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major Projects.** The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any “major project.” A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding $1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a Community Plan Exemption (CPE); certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations occur, the filing requirement shall be triggered by the earliest such determination.) A major project does not include a residential development project with four or fewer dwelling units. The first (or initial) report must be filed within 30 days of the date the Planning Commission (or any other local lead agency) certifies the EIR for that project or, for a major project relying on a program EIR, within 30 days of the date that the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts a final environmental determination under CEQA. Please submit a Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. This form can be found at the Planning Department or online at [http://www.sfethics.org](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. A **Legislative Amendment** would be required to amend the Height and Bulk District. The project would require a Text Amendment, a General Plan Amendment, and a Zoning Map Amendment. Each proposed amendment requires a separate application. **Note that the Planning Department does not support the increase to 500 feet Height from the existing 250-S Height and Bulk District.**

2. **Downtown Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 309 for (1) the construction or substantial alteration of structures in C-3 Districts, (2) the granting of exceptions to certain requirements of this Code where the provisions of this Section are invoked, and (3) the approval of open space and streetscape requirements of the Planning Code.

3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the construction of a new building on the subject property.

Downtown 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.

1. **Neighborhood Outreach.** This project is required to undertake additional public outreach in advance of the Planning Commission hearing on the Legislative Amendments, Conditional Use, Downtown Project Authorization. The developer is required to conduct an additional outreach meeting, notifying owners and tenants who live within 300’ of the project as well as all registered neighborhood organizations for the Financial District neighborhood, after initial design comments have been provided from the Planning Department and prior to the scheduling of the aforementioned Planning Commission hearing. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the community abreast of the project’s evolution, presenting the latest design of the project – including the Department’s requested changes – to the community in advance of the Commission taking action on the hearing.

2. **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. **Height.** Within the Downtown Plan Area, the existing Height and Bulk District for the 1 Montgomery and 25 Montgomery parcels is “250-S”. Pursuant to Sections 260 and 263.9 of the Planning Code, the maximum permitted height is 250 feet plus an additional 10% (25 feet) may be allowed as an extension of the upper tower, provided that the volume of the upper tower as extended is reduced by the percentage shown in Chart C of Section 271 of the Planning Code.

2. **Floor Area Ratio (FAR).** The basic Floor Area Ratio (FAR) within the C-3-0 District is 9.0:1, which may be increased to 18.0:1 with the acquisition of Transferable Development Rights (TDRs). Prior to the Department's determination of available development potential at the proposed site, more information is required. The two project site parcels (1 & 25 Montgomery Street, Assessor’s Block 0292, Lots 002 and 001A, respectively), and most of the block with exception of Assessor’s Block 0292 Lot 009, were part of a large redevelopment project dating to the late 1970s/early 1980s (beginning with EIR Case No. 1978.298 and potentially others). This large redevelopment project resulted in the approximately 38-story tower at the northeast corner of Post Street and Kearny Street, the Crocker Galleria, and the removal of the top 11 stories of 1 Montgomery (subsequently replaced by open space). In order to calculate available developable area for the proposed tower:
   - the overall site area from the 1970s/1980s is the basis for determining maximum allowable FAR per Planning Code; and
   - the gross floor area (GFA) of existing structures on the overall site area must be calculated and the maximum allowable FAR subtracted from the calculated existing GFA would result in the available developable area. As-built drawings of existing structures are suitable for Department review, with GFA exclusions as noted per Section 102 of the Planning Code.

3. **Hotel Use.** Conditional Use Authorization is required for hotel use in C-3 Zoning Districts pursuant to Planning Code Sections 210.2 and 303. In addition to the standard Conditional Use findings, the Planning Commission shall consider:
   - The impact of the employees of the hotel or motel on the demand in the City for housing, public transit, child-care, and other social services. To the extent relevant, the Commission shall also consider the seasonal and part-time nature of employment in the hotel or motel;
   - The measures that will be taken by the project sponsor to employ residents of San Francisco in order to minimize increased demand for regional transportation; and
   - The market demand for a hotel or motel of the type proposed.
4. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth, at the lowest story containing a Dwelling Unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building. Reduction in requirements are permitted through Section 309 process, provided that the building location and configuration assure adequate light and air to windows within the residential units and to the usable open space provided.

5. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 36 square feet of open space (private dwelling unit) or 1.33 times for common open space. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g).

6. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Section 138 requires this project to provide one foot of open space for every 50 square feet of non-residential uses. The proposal includes 176,875 square feet hotel (retail) space. Therefore, 3,538 square feet of publicly-accessible open space is required.

7. **Streetscape Plan – Better Streets Plan Compliance.** Pedestrian and streetscape improvements consistent with the Better Streets Plan are required if your project meets the conditions delineated in Planning Code Section 138.1. Projects that trigger Section 138.1 will be reviewed by the Department’s Streetscape Design Advisory Team (SDAT). SDAT is an interagency group that includes representatives from the Planning Department, Department of Public Works and the Municipal Transportation Agency that provides design guidance on private developments that impact the public right-of-way.

   Based on the submitted plans, the project triggers the requirements of a Streetscape Plan project the project site has over 250 feet of streetscape frontage and involves an addition of over 20%. This Streetscape Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department no later than 60 days prior to any Planning Commission action, and shall be considered for approval at the time of other project approval actions. The streetscape plan should show the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, curb radii, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the property. Please see the Department’s Better Streets Plan and Section 138.1(c)(2)(ii) for the additional elements that may be required as part of the project’s streetscape plan. See initial comments provided in this PPA Letter.

8. **Vision Zero.** In 2014, the City adopted the Vision Zero Policy which seeks to eliminate all traffic deaths in the City by 2024. The City subsequently established a network of Vision Zero Corridors which have higher rates of traffic-related injuries and fatalities compared to most San Francisco Streets. The City has determined that streets on the Vison Zero network should be prioritized for safety improvements especially those that improve the safety of vulnerable users like people walking and people on bikes.

   This project is located on a pedestrian, high-injury corridor, and is encouraged to incorporate safety measures into the project.
If the project is required to submit a streetscape plan per Section 138.1, the Department’s Streetscape Design Advisory Team may require additional pedestrian safety streetscape measures.

9. **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. As proposed, each residential unit consists of an entire floor, thus it appears that each unit faces onto a street right-of-way. If additional units are included, this will be re-evaluated for compliance. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception.

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

11. **Shadow Analysis (Section 147).** Section 147 requires that new buildings and additions to existing buildings in C-3, South of Market Mixed Use, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts that exceed 50 feet shall be shaped to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publicly accessible spaces other than those protected under Section 295. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project may cast new shadow on the publicly accessible open space on the roof of 1 Montgomery Street, and potentially numerous other open spaces. Therefore, a detailed shadow analysis would need to be prepared to determine if the project would create new shadow that results in an adverse impact to these open spaces pursuant to Section 147. If this detailed shadow analysis finds that the project would cast shadow on the publicly accessible open space on the roof of 1 Montgomery Street or other open spaces, the sponsor should explore sculpting of portions of the project to avoid casting new shadows on the open space.

12. **Wind.** The project site is in the C-3-O zoning district, and is subject to Planning Code limits on ground-level wind speeds. A wind tunnel analysis may be required in order to determine project compliance with these Planning Code provisions. Additionally, ground-level wind speeds will be assessed as part of the project’s environmental review. The proposed project will therefore require a consultant-prepared wind analysis. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the assigned Current Planning and Environmental Planning staff prior to proceeding with the analysis.

13. **Parking and Curb Cuts.** Section 151.1 does not require any off-street parking within the C-3 District. The project does not propose any off-street parking. Curb cuts on Montgomery Street from Market Street to Columbus Avenue require Conditional Use Authorization. In C-3, NCT and RTO Districts, no curb cuts accessing off-street parking or loading shall be created or utilized on street frontages.
identified along any Transit Preferential, Citywide Pedestrian Network or Neighborhood Commercial Streets as designated in the Transportation Element of the General Plan or official City bicycle routes or bicycle lanes, where an alternative frontage is available. At minimum, Post Street is a designated bicycle path, a Neighborhood Commercial Street and secondary Transit Preferential Street.

14. **Off-Street Loading.** Section 152.1 requires two off-street loading spaces for between 200,001sf - 500,000sf of gross floor area for Apartment and Hotel Uses. The project does not propose any off-street loading spaces. Pursuant to Sections 155 and 161, exceptions may be requested through the Section 309 process, however provisions for hotel and apartment loading are to be made.

15. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires this project to provide at least 29 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project contains 13 Class 1 spaces and 8 Class 2 spaces. If additional residential units are added and/or hotel rooms reduced, the number of Class 1 and Class 2 spaces will require re-calculation.

16. **Diaper Changing Accommodations.** Please be advised that pursuant to Planning Code Section 168, Retail Sales and Service uses which exceed 5,000 square feet are required to provide and maintain baby diaper-changing accommodations. At each floor level containing publicly accessible restrooms, at least one baby diaper-changing station must be made accessible to both men and women. Please indicate baby diaper-changing accommodations in restrooms serving eating and drinking uses which exceed 5,000 square feet, both on the roof and at the ground floor.

17. **Requirements for Shower Facilities and Lockers.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 155.4, two showers and 12 clothes lockers are required where the occupied floor area of a hotel use exceeds 50,000 square feet. If the residential use square footage increases and/or hotel use square footage decreases, this number will need to be re-calculated.


19. **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

20. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing – 25+ Dwelling Units.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an
'Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415,' to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or affordable housing fee. The following Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements are those in effect at the time as of issuance of this letter. In the event that the requirements change, the Project Sponsor shall comply with requirements in place at the time of the issuance of first construction document. 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 exception agreement is secured by the project sponsor. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be affordable units for the life of the project. The applicable percentage is dependent on the number of units in the project, the zoning of the property, and the date that the project submitted a complete Environmental Evaluation Application. A complete Environmental Evaluation Application has not been submitted; therefore, pursuant to Planning Code Section 415.3 and 415.6 the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program requirement for the On-site Affordable Housing Alternative is to provide 25% of the proposed dwelling units as affordable with a minimum of 15% of the units affordable to low-income households and the remaining 10% of the units affordable to low- or moderate/middle-income households, as defined by the Planning Code and Procedures Manual.

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.

21. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing 10-24 Unit Project.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an ‘Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415,’ to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or affordable housing fee. The following Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements are those in effect at the time as of issuance of this letter. In the event that the requirements change, the Project Sponsor shall comply with requirements in place at the time of the issuance of first construction document. 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 exception agreement is secured by the project sponsor. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be affordable units for the life of the project. The applicable percentage is dependent on the number of units in the project, the zoning of the property,
and the date that the project submitted a complete Environmental Evaluation Application. A complete Environmental Evaluation Application has not been submitted; therefore, pursuant to Planning Code Section 415.3 and 415.6 the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program requirement for the On-site Affordable Housing Alternative is to provide 12% of the proposed dwelling units as affordable to low-income households as defined by the Planning Code and Procedures Manual.

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.

22. 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.

23. SFPUC Requirements & Project Review. The SFPUC administers San Francisco’s various water, sewer, and stormwater requirements such as the Stormwater Design Guidelines, construction site runoff, sewer connections, recycled water and onsite water reuse, water efficient irrigation, and hydraulic analysis for fire suppression systems. To assist developers and property owners in meeting these requirements, the SFPUC provides project plan review, technical assistance, and incentives. The SFPUC also has a separate project review process for projects that propose to use land owned by the SFPUC or are subject to an easement held by the SFPUC; or projects that propose to be constructed above, under, or adjacent to major SFPUC infrastructure. For projects meeting these criteria, please contact SFPProjectReview@sfwater.org for a SFPUC Project Review and Land Use Application. For more information regarding SFPUC Project Review or any of the SFPUC requirements, please visit www.sfwater.org/reqs.
24. **Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (POE).** New residential development within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment must go through an Entertainment Commission outreach process (Ordinance Number 070-015). In addition, new residential development will also be required to record a Notice of Special Restrictions (NSR) on the site. The subject site is located within 300 feet of an existing POE, see enclosed map. Please note that the Planning Department will not consider an entitlement application complete until the following are completed:

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

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

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

25. **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. As the number of residential units is increased and/or the hotel use decreases, the applicability of some Impact Fees will be re-assessed:

   a. Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), (§411A)
   b. Jobs-Housing Linkage (§413)
   c. Child-Care (§414)
   d. Child-Care Fee Residential (§414A)
   e. Affordable Housing Fee (§415)
   f. Public Art (§429)

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

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

**Project Design**
The project is located in a C-3-O Downtown-Office zoning district and Downtown planning area. The Downtown Area Plan provides objectives and policies that serve as the basis for design review. Relevant policies are cited below.

1. Site Design, Open Space, and Massing. The Planning Department does not support increasing the height to 500 feet. The Planning Department does not support the loss of privately owned publicly accessible open space (POPOS), nor a qualitative diminishment of the existing POPOS. The project should demonstrate how the POPOS is enlarged and enhanced qualitatively to meet square footage requirements. New shadows cast on public plazas, parks or open space are likewise discouraged. Demolition of the historic resource and/or features is not supported. The Department recommends a code-complying proposal and encourages sustainable design.

POLICY 10.4
Provide open space that is clearly visible and easily reached from the street or pedestrian way.

POLICY 10.5
Address the need for human comfort in the design of open spaces by minimizing wind and maximizing sunshine.

POLICY 11.2
Introduce elements of the natural environment in open space to contrast with the built-up environment. Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural, or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.

POLICY 12.2
Use care in remodeling significant older buildings to enhance rather than weaken their original character.

POLICY 12.3
Design new buildings to respect the character of older development nearby. Care should also be exercised in the design of new buildings proposed near landmarks or in older areas of distinctive character. New and old can stand next to one another with pleasing effects, but only if a similarity or successful transition is achieved in scale, building form, and proportion. The detail, texture, color, and material of the old should be repeated or complemented by the new.

POLICY 13.2
Foster sculpturing of building form to create less overpowering buildings and more interesting building tops, particularly the tops of towers. (See Figures 2 and 3 on page 30).

In previous eras of city building, the height of new development within an area might be expected to vary considerably. The pressure to maximize development on a site was not as significant a factor then. Under such conditions, extended areas with the same height limit did not pose any city form problems. A natural variety of heights resulted in a complex, interesting city form.
There is now, however, an increasing tendency to build to the height limit, particularly in height districts lower than 400 feet. When many buildings are constructed at the height limits, a visible lining up of building tops occurs. This phenomenon called benching causes an awkward city form.

To avoid this benching effect, narrower height districts of varied height and mechanisms which allow greater height for more slender buildings should be created. Height limits should be structured so as to allow the presence of new buildings to affect the existing skyline in a positive way, softening existing "benching," and providing more variety and interest in the skyline and general view of the city.

2. Parking and Circulation. The Planning Department recommends eliminating or minimizing off-street parking and maximizing bicycle parking in this transit rich district.

3. Architecture. At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission. The Department recommends that the project express significant façade depth, provide high-quality materials, and meet the architectural detailing and character of the neighborhood. Innovative architecture is encouraged.

POLICY 13.3
Create visually interesting terminations to building towers.

POLICY 15.2
Assure that new buildings contribute to the visual unity of the city. For the most part, buildings in San Francisco are light in tone. The overall effect, particularly under certain light conditions, is that of a whole city spread over the hills. To maintain continuity with this existing pattern, disharmonious colors or building materials should be avoided. Buildings should be light in color. Highly reflective materials, particularly mirrored or highly reflective glass, should be used sparingly.

POLICY 15.1
Ensure that new facades relate harmoniously with nearby facade patterns.
As a general rule, facades composed of both vertical and horizontal elements fit better with older as well as most new facades.

POLICY 15.3
Encourage more variation in building facades and greater harmony with older buildings through use of architectural embellishments and bay or recessed windows.

Streetscape and Public Realm

The Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) provides design review and guidance to private developments working within the City’s public right-of-way. SDAT is composed of representatives from the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) Department of Public Works (SF Public Works), the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).
The 1 Montgomery Street/25 Montgomery Street project came to SDAT on September 12, 2016. Below are the SDAT comments from that meeting.

1. Corner Bulbout on Post Street
   - The project sponsor shall install a 6’ wide bulbout projecting into Post Street in order to improve pedestrian safety by shortening the pedestrian crossing distance across Post Street and widen the sidewalk at the intersection.
   - This bulbout will require result in a reduction in width of an existing commercial loading zone on Post Street.
   - The construction of the bulbout will also necessitate the relocation of, a PG&E manhole, and a catch basin stormwater inlet.
   - Per guidelines established in the San Francisco Better Streets Plan the tangent of the curb return on a corner bulbout should start a minimum of 5’ beyond the property line.
   - To ensure that bulbouts are sweepable with standard City street sweeper equipment, bulbout curb returns shall conform to SF Public Works’ Standard Plan for Curb Bulbs. See: [http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/pedestrian-safety-and-traffic-calming/traffic-calming-overview/curb-extensions/#codes_docs](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/pedestrian-safety-and-traffic-calming/traffic-calming-overview/curb-extensions/#codes_docs)
   - Modification of the curb line will require Sidewalk Legislation, contact BSM Mapping/Subdivision Section. It is strongly encouraged that a sidewalk legislation package is submitted at the time a Street Improvement Permit application is submitted since the permit will not be approved until the Sidewalk Legislation is approved, which can take a minimum of 6-12 months for approval.

Relocate Historic Street Light
   - The existing historic street lamp is part of the Golden Triangle Light Standards (Landmark No. 233), and is sited in the crosswalk blocking the accessible path of travel. Project sponsor shall relocate the light stand out of the crosswalk. Work with Preservation Staff for review and approval of relocation of light under a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Electrical Transformer Room
   - If a new electrical power transformer is required by PG&E to provide power to the building, please show the location of the transformer room on the plans.
   - SF Public Works typically does not permit new transformer vaults in the public right-of-way. If an exception is requested, a Vault Permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Street Use & Mapping (BSM) will be required.

Street Trees
   - Given high pedestrian volumes, SDAT does not recommend installing additional trees on either Montgomery or Post Street frontages. Per section 806(d) Public Works code, an in-lieu fee for required street trees may be required.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Downtown Project Authorization, and/or Legislative Amendment Application as listed above, must be
submitted no later than **May 15, 2018**. 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:**
- SDAT Letter
- Neighborhood Group Mailing List
- Shadow Fan
- Places of Entertainment Map

**cc:**
- 601 W Companies, Property Owner [601 West 26th Street, New York, NY 10001]
- Marcelle Boudreaux, Current Planning
- Brett Bollinger, Environmental Planning
- Robin Abad Ocubillo, Citywide Planning and Analysis
- David Winslow, Design Review
- Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
- Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
- Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
- Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
- Planning Department Webmaster (webmaster.planning@sfgov.org)
The Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) provides design review and guidance to private developments working within the City’s public right-of-way. SDAT is composed of representatives from the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) Department of Public Works (SF Public Works), the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).

The 1 Montgomery Street/ 25 Montgomery Street project came to SDAT on September 12, 2016. Below are the SDAT comments from that meeting.

CONTEXT

Project Description
The proposed project consists of three potential schemes. The proposed project would entail adding a residential and/or hotel tower at One Montgomery Street. The tower would be constructed atop the existing building at the property, now occupied by Wells Fargo. The tower would be 500 feet tall, which would require a re-zoning to raise the height limit.

The PPA was submitted on 8/17/16 and the 90 day deadline is 11/15/16.
Better Streets Plan
The Better Streets Plan (BSP) adopted by the city in December 2010, provides a comprehensive set of guidelines for the design of San Francisco’s pedestrian realm. The Plan seeks to balance the needs of all street users, with a particular focus on the pedestrian environment and how streets can be used as public space. The BSP polices can be found at: www.sfbetterstreets.org.

- Under the BSP, Montgomery and Post Streets are classified as Downtown Commercial Streets.

Vision Zero
In 2014, the SFMTA Board joined the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, SF Planning, SFDPH and multiple other city agencies in adopting the City’s Vision Zero Policy which seeks to eliminate all traffic deaths in the City by 2024. The City subsequently established a network of Vision Zero Corridors which have higher rates of traffic-related injuries and fatalities compared to most San Francisco Streets. The City has determined that streets on the Vision Zero network should be prioritized for safety improvements especially those that improve the safety of vulnerable users like pedestrians. See: http://visionzerosf.org/about/support-for-vision-zero, links to all agency resolutions are at the bottom of the page.

- Post Street has been designated a Vision Zero Corridor and falls on the Vision Zero High Injury Network for pedestrians. All plans should prioritize improving safety for all users along this corridor.

Citywide Bike Network
The 2009 San Francisco Bicycle Plan contains specific proposed near-term bicycle route network improvement projects for a safe, interconnected bicycle network that supports bicycling as an attractive alternative to private auto use. The San Francisco Bike Plan is the guiding policy document defining where bicycle improvements should be made in the City.

- Post Street is identified as a bike route under the San Francisco Bicycle Plan and is the primary east/west route through downtown connecting the Financial District to the Western Addition.

SDAT DESIGN COMMENTS
Corner Bulbout on Post Street
- The project sponsor shall install a 6’ wide bulbout projecting into Post Street in order to improve pedestrian safety by shortening the pedestrian crossing distance across Post Street and widen the sidewalk at the intersection.
- This bulbout will require result in a reduction in width of an existing commercial loading zone on Post Street.
- The construction of the bulbout will also necessitate the relocation of, a PG&E manhole, and a catch basin stormwater inlet.
- Per guidelines established in the San Francisco Better Streets Plan the tangent of the curb return on a corner bulbout should start a minimum of 5’ beyond the property line.
• To ensure that bulbouts are sweepable with standard City street sweeper equipment, bulbout
curb returns shall conform to SF Public Works’ Standard Plan for Curb Bulbs. See:
http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/pedestrian-safety-and-traffic-calming/traffic-
calming-overview/curb-extensions/#codes_docs
• Modification of the curb line will require Sidewalk Legislation, contact BSM
Mapping/Subdivision Section. It is strongly encouraged that a sidewalk legislation package is
submitted at the time a Street Improvement Permit application is submitted since the permit
will not be approved until the Sidewalk Legislation is approved, which can take a minimum
of 6-12 months for approval.

Relocate Historic Street Light
• The existing historic street lamp is sited in the crosswalk blocking the accessible path of travel.
The project sponsor shall relocate the light stand out of the crosswalk

Electrical Transformer Room
• If a new electrical power transformer is required by PG&E to provide power to the building,
please show the location of the transformer room on the plans.
• SF Public Works typically does not permit new transformer vaults in the public right-of-way.
If an exception is requested, a Vault Permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Street Use &
Mapping (BSM) will be required.

Street Trees
• Given high pedestrian volumes, SDAT does not recommend installing additional trees on
either Montgomery or Post Street frontages. Per section 806(d) Public Works code, an in-lieu
fee for required street trees may be required.

STANDARD SDAT COMMENTS

Street Improvements (construction within the public right-of-way)
• Infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way will require a Street Improvement
Permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Street Use & Mapping (BSM) and Street Improvement
Plans. Depending on the scope of work the Plans should include the following plan sheets:
Civil (grading, layout, utility erosion control, etc.), Landscaping (planting, irrigation, etc.),
Electrical (lighting, photometrics, conduit, etc.), Joint Trench (power, telephone, and
communication approved by the respective utility companies). Additional permits may be
required. Visit http://www.sfdpw.org/permits-0 for additional information or call 415-554-
5810.

Encroachments into the Public Right-of-Way
• SF Public Works discourages any new encroachments into the public right-of-way. If new
encroachments are proposed, show them on the plans. Examples of encroachments are: steps,
warped driveways with diverters/planters, fire department connections (FDC), out swinging
doors, bollards, etc. For new building construction, the Building Code does not allow building
encroachments unless a variance to the Building Code is allowed by the DBI. If a variance is approved, a Minor Sidewalk Encroachment Permit (MSE) or other encroachment permit will be required from BSM. Some permits require public notification and an annual assessment fee may be applied.

For SF Public Works permit information visit http://www.sfdpw.org/permits-0 or call 415-554-5810.

SFPUC- Water

- A hydraulic analysis will be required to confirm the adequacy of the water distribution system for proposed new potable, non-potable and fire water services. If the current distribution system pressures and flows are inadequate, the Project Sponsor will be responsible for any capital improvements required to meet the proposed project’s water demands. To initiate this process, please contact the SFPUC Customer Service Bureau at 415-551-2900.
- The project sponsor will be required to design all applicable water facilities, including potable, fire-suppression, and non-potable water systems, to conform to the current SFPUC City Distribution Division (CDD) and San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) standards and practices. These include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - SFPUC- CDD Protection of Existing Water and AWSS Facilities;
  - SFPUC Standards for the Protection of Water and Wastewater Assets;
  - Rules and Regulations Governing Water Service to Customers;
  - SFPUC- CDD Design Criteria for Potable Water Systems;
  - Application for Water Supply and Responsibility of Applicants;
  - San Francisco Fire Code and Reliability;
  - California Waterworks Standards; California Code of Regulations Titles 17 and 22

For questions please contact cddengineering@sfwater.org.

REFERENCES

Please refer to the following design guidelines when revising the project’s design.

BSP Street Furnishings Guidelines:
http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/streetscape-elements/street-furniture-overview/

BSP Guidelines for Special Paving in the Furniture Zone:
http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/streetscape-elements/sidewalk_paving/

San Francisco’s Water Sewer, and Stormwater Requirements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>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>415-554-7450</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@sfgov.org">aaron.peskin@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:sunny.angulo@sfgov.org">sunny.angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:connie.chan@sfgov.org">connie.chan@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:lee.hepner@sfgov.org">lee.hepner@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>Telegraph Hill Dwellers - Planning &amp; Zoning Committee</td>
<td>224 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94113-4860</td>
<td>415-986-7070</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nshan@mindspring.com">nshan@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Square Historic District Assn.</td>
<td>368 Jackson Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94113-4500</td>
<td>415-986-7070</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nshan@mindspring.com">nshan@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoTel Neighbors</td>
<td>455 Vallejo Street, #112</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94113-4500</td>
<td>415-794-7596</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephgreenburg@sotelneighbors.org">stephgreenburg@sotelneighbors.org</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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:olssoned@yahoo.com">olssoned@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gateway Tenants Association</td>
<td>550 Battery Street, Apt. 1512</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94111-4500</td>
<td>415-291-0822</td>
<td><a href="mailto:whann@att.net">whann@att.net</a></td>
<td>Financial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>640 Davis Street 28</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94111-4500</td>
<td>415-434-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:inq@pacbell.net">inq@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>Financial District, North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent de Paul Society, North Beach</td>
<td>666 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94113-4500</td>
<td>415-421-0809</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcabruno@yahoo.com">marcabruno@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Foundation - AIDS Housing Alliance/SF</td>
<td>350 Golden Gate Ave. Suite A</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-3500</td>
<td>415-552-3242</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@ahasf.org">info@ahasf.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11/10/2016