DATE: October 17, 2016
TO: Jonathan Pearlman, Elevation Architects
FROM: Joy Navarette, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2016-009538 PPA for 300 5th Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Chris Thomas, at (415) 575-9036 or christopher.thomas@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Joy Navarrete, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: October 17, 2016
Case No.: 2016-009538PPA
Project Address: 300 5th Street
Block/Lot: 3753/146
Zoning: MUR (Mixed Use – Residential)
Within ¼ Mile of an Existing Fringe Financial Service
Youth and Family Zone
85-X
Area Plan: Eastern SoMa (Eastern Neighborhoods)
Central SoMa
South of Market
Project Sponsor: Jonathan Pearlman, Elevation Architects
415-537-1125
jonathan@elevationarchitects.com
Staff Contact: Chris Thomas – 415-575-9036
christopher.thomas@sfgov.org

DISCLAIMERS:

This Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) letter provides feedback to the project sponsor from the Planning Department regarding the proposed project described in the PPA application submitted on July 15, 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 proposal is to demolish the existing one-story, approximately 1,660-square-foot (sf) Shell gas station service center and construct an eight-story, 85-foot-tall (100 feet tall with elevator penthouse), approximately 13,400 sf mixed use building with 1,300 sf of commercial space on the ground floor and nine residential units on floors 2 through eight (four one-bedroom units and five two-bedroom units). The commercial space and the residential lobby would be provided on the ground floor and four Class 2 bicycle parking spaces would be provided on Folsom Street in front of the project site. No vehicular parking would be provided. The depth and volume of excavation was not provided in the application documents; however, in a September 22, 2016 email the project architect stated that the project will not have a basement and be constructed over a mat slab foundation, likely with piers. The mat slab might be 24 inches thick resulting in approximately 166 cubic yards of excavated material over the approximately 2,250-sf lot. The project site is within the boundaries of the Central SoMa Historic Resources Survey; however, it is not within a designated historic district. The existing gas station service center was built in 1990 and is not considered a historic resource.

PLANNING CONTEXT:

The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR), certified in 2008. The project site also lies within the proposed Central SoMa Plan area, a community planning process initiated in 2011. The Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public Review (Draft Plan) was released in April 2013, with proposed changes to the allowed land uses and building heights in the Plan area, including a strategy for improving the public realm within the Plan area and vicinity. The Central SoMa Plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which is currently underway. The Draft Plan and its proposed rezoning are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in 2016.

The existing zoning for the project site is MUR (Mixed Use – Residential), which allows residential and commercial uses, while the proposed use district for the project site in the Draft Plan is MUG (Mixed Use – General), which allows residential and small-scale retail uses. The Draft Plan includes two height alternatives; for both the mid-rise and high rise alternatives the project site height limit is 85-X. Further comments in this Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) are based on the Draft Plan concepts published to date, which are contingent on the approval of the proposed Central SoMa Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Community Plan Exemption

---

2 Please note that the Central SoMa Plan was formerly called the Central Corridor Plan. To avoid ambiguity, this letter uses the current “Central SoMa Plan” when referring to the ongoing planning process, while “Draft Plan” refers to the document published in April 2013 under the name “Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public Review.”
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). The Planning
Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

If the proposed project is not consistent with the height and density identified for the project site in the adopted Central SoMa Plan, the proposed project would be precluded from qualifying for a CPE under the Central SoMa Plan. The proposed project would be analyzed in a separate environmental document that would not rely on the environmental analysis undertaken for the Central SoMa Plan. In this case, the applicable fees would be (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) the standard EIR fee, if an EIR is required.

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

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.** Constructed in 1990, the existing gas station service building on the project site is less than 45 years of age and was found ineligible for national, state, or local listing in the South of Market Area Historic Resource Survey. Thus, the proposed project is not subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff; no additional analysis of historic architectural resources is required.

2. **Archaeological Resources.** The project site lies within the East South of Market (SoMa) Area Plan which is part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (Eastern Neighborhoods Plan). The project site is within an area subject to Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Mitigation Measure J-2 (Properties With No Previous Studies). Therefore, the proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, depth and volume of 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. However, the project site is
located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero. Planning staff have reviewed the
proposed site plans and recommends that site plans submitted with the EEA show the existing and
proposed sidewalks (that is, any streetscape plan including the location of the Class 2 bicycle spaces),
so that potential pedestrian and bicyclist safety hazards may be evaluated.

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

*Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise* requires that the project
sponsor develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified
acoustical consultant when the environmental review of a development project determines that
construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and
sensitivity of proximate uses. This mitigation measure requires that a plan for such measures be

---

submitted to DBI prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

6. Air Quality. The proposed project, with nine dwelling units, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operation screening levels for criteria air pollutants.\textsuperscript{5} 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.

In addition, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6. The proposed project is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH).

The project site is also located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The project proposes to construct 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.\textsuperscript{6} In addition, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in Eastern Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1, Construction Air Quality, will likely be required.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Given the project’s proposed height of 85 feet, a backup diesel generator would likely be required and additional measures, such as that described in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators, will likely be necessary to reduce its emissions. 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

\textsuperscript{5} BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{6} Refer to http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp for more information.
Analysis Compliance Checklist.7 The project sponsor is required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. The project will therefore require a consultant-prepared wind analysis, which may include wind tunnel analysis if needed. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning coordinator prior to proceeding with the analysis.

9. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project would not cast shadows on any Department of Recreation and Parks property or any other open space. Therefore, a detailed shadow study would not be required.

10. **Geology.** The project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (a Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill). Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.8 A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

11. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed site is located in an area with potentially contaminated soils as indicated by the Department of Public Health’s Maher Map.9 Please confirm the volume and depth of excavation necessary for construction of the proposed project in the EEA. If the amount of excavation is greater than 50 cubic yards, or if otherwise determined by the Department of Public Health, the proposed project may be 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. If these steps are required, they must 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/EA/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/EA/Fees.asp?haz. Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EEA.

12. Tree Planting and Protection. The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any such trees must be shown on the site plans with the size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit the Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the EEA and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans. Also see the comments below under “Street Trees.”

13. Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects. The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any “major project.” A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding $1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a Community Plan Exemption (CPE); certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations occur, the filing requirement shall be triggered by the earliest such determination.) A major project does not include a residential development project with four or fewer dwelling units. The first (or initial) report must be filed within 30 days of the date the Planning Commission (or any other local lead agency) certifies the EIR for that project or, for a major 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. A **Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the construction of a new building exceeding 75 feet in height.

2. A **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 202.5 for the conversion of an automotive service station.

3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the new construction of the proposed development.

All applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the PIC at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available from DBI at 1660 Mission Street.

**NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:**

Project Sponsors are encouraged to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. A **Pre-Application Meeting** with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups is required 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.

Notifications for Section 312, Large Project Authorizations and Conditional Use will be combined into one Planning Commission Notice of Public Hearing.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:**

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that are relevant to the proposed project.

1. **South of Market Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the South of Market Area Plan 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 [http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/General_Plan/South_of_Market.htm](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/General_Plan/South_of_Market.htm).

2. **East SoMa Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the East SoMa Area Plan 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 [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/East_SoMa.htm](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/East_SoMa.htm).
3. Central SoMa Plan. The subject property falls within the ongoing Central SoMa Plan study area generally bounded by 2nd, 6th, Townsend and Market Streets. The Central Corridor Draft Plan was published in April 2013. The draft plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The draft Plan proposes changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and includes a strategy for improving the public realm in this area. The Central SoMa Draft Plan recommends rezoning the subject property from the Mixed-Use Residential (MUR) to the Mixed-Use General (MUG) zoning district, but does not recommend changing the existing allowable Height and Bulk at the subject property. Please note that the MUR and MUG zoning have no residential density limits, and that both require similar residential unit mix. The EIR, the Plan, and the proposed rezoning and affiliated Code changes are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in 2017. The Central Corridor Draft Plan includes recommendations for new land use controls as well as new height and bulk controls for the subject property. The Draft Plan is available for download at http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org. Further comments in this section of the PPA are based on the draft Central Corridor Draft Plan and any Plan refinements posted to the Plan website as of the drafting of this letter.

4. Density Maximization & Affordable Housing Provision. It is the Department’s priority to give precedence to the development of all new net housing, and to encourage the direct building of more affordable housing and the maximization of permitted density, while maintaining quality of life and adherence to Planning Code standards.

The project proposes 5 two-bedroom units and 4 one-bedroom units, for a total of 9 residential units. This is just short of the 10 units that trigger Section 415 of the Planning Code, which requires 12% of units be Below Market Rate (BMR) units. Both the subject property’s existing MUR zoning and the MUG zoning recommended under the Draft Central SoMa Plan require 40% two-bedroom units and set no limit on residential density. The plans demonstrate that it is possible to increase the proposed unit count to 10 or more by changing the proposed unit mix. The Department strongly encourages increased density on the site, while maintaining the required bedroom mix and livability of the units. Per the Director’s Bulletin No. 2, if the project were to maximize density and include 20% on-site BMRs, it would qualify for priority processing: http://www.sfplanning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8460.

5. Rear Yard: Under Planning Code Section 134, the project is required to provide a rear yard equal to 25 percent of the lot depth at the ground level and above. Currently, the project does not provide a code-complying rear yard. Therefore, the project requires an exception from the rear yard requirements under a Large Project Authorization. If the project chooses to seek an exception for rear yard, please ensure that the project provides code-complying open space equivalent to and/or exceeding the amount of open space that would have been provided via a code-complying rear yard.
6. **Open Space**: Planning Code Section 135 requires 80 square feet of open space per unit. Nine residential units are proposed and therefore 720 square feet of open space is required. The project complies with the open space requirements in that a 1,000 square foot common roof deck is proposed along with private open spaces.

7. **Dwelling Unit Exposure**: Planning Code Section 140 requires that dwelling units face a required rear yard, a complying courtyard or a street. The one-bedroom units that face the rear do not meet the exposure requirements because they do not face a code-complying rear yard. Therefore, the project requires an exception from the exposure requirements.

8. **Shadow**: Planning Code Section 147 states that a shadow analysis is required for any project over 50 feet in height in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area. Similarly, Planning Code Section 295 requires a shadow analysis be conducted for any project greater than 40 feet in height. The preliminary analysis for the proposed project indicates that it would not cast shadows on any nearby public parks. No further shadow studies are required.

9. **Bicycle Parking**: Planning Code Section 155.2 outlines requirements for bicycle parking for residential developments. The proposed project is required to provide (9) Class 1 bicycle parking spaces. These spaces should be located in a secure area. Future plans for the project shall clearly demonstrate that the secured area can accommodate nine bicycles in keeping with the Zoning Administrator's Bulletin No. 9 Bicycle Parking Requirements: Design & Layout.

10. **Height Exemptions**: Planning Code Section 260(b) establishes permitted height exception for roof-top elements and specifies that the totality of such elements shall not exceed 20 percent of the roof's surface area. Future plans should call out the total surface area of roof-top features to demonstrate compliance with this code sections.

11. **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 those comments were provided. This shall be done as an additional sheet in any plan set submitted to the Planning Department and as an attachment in an entitlement application.
You may contact Entertainment Commission staff at (415) 554-6678 or visit their webpage at http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=338 for additional information regarding the outreach process.

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

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

a. Transportation Sustainability Fee (411A)
b. Residential Child Care Impact Fee (414A)
c. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee (423)

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. Site Design, Open Space, and Massing. The Planning Department recommends maximizing the number of housing units on site and providing inclusionary units as may be required.

2. Street Frontage. Consider architectural elements that will distinguish and provide hierarchy to ground floor entrances, such as material choices, canopies, or awnings. If PDR use is maintained on site, the Department encourages transparency and openings at the ground floor façade along Fifth Street.

The Department recommends maximizing bicycle parking.

3. Architecture. The Department recommends providing a clearer and continuous rooftop termination at the front of the Fifth Street façade. As the property sidewalls are tall and may be exposed, consider shaping them volumetrically or expressing a more human scale through material changes or articulation. All rooftop features, such as elevator overruns or mechanical equipment, should be distinguished in character, material, or plane from any exterior façade wall visible from the public realm.

The Department appreciates the intent to express the concrete frame and encourages the design team to detail it thoughtfully. The Department further recommends that the project express significant façade depth and provide high-quality materials. Innovative architecture is encouraged.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Large Project Authorization, Conditional Use Authorization, and Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than April 17, 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:  
South of Market Neighborhood Group Mailing List  
300 5th Street Shadow Fan Analysis  
Places of Entertainment within 300 feet of 300 5th Street  
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin  
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet
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300 5th Street, LLC, Property Owner  
Daniel Sirois, Current Planning  
Chris Thomas, Environmental Planning  
Amnon Ben-Pazi, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
Maia Small, Design Review  
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)
<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>Angelica</td>
<td>Cabeza</td>
<td>Organizational Director</td>
<td>South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)</td>
<td>1110 Howard Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabende@somcan.org">acabende@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 Valencia Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td>poderfl.org</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersten</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Market Street Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 458</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-563-2500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smadjew@exxon.com">smadjew@exxon.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Mission Creek Harbor Association</td>
<td>300 Channel Street, Box 10</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94158</td>
<td>415-902-7835</td>
<td><a href="mailto:continenwoods@cs.com">continenwoods@cs.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department</td>
<td>215 Taylor Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-559-3920</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agoldman@nyc.org">agoldman@nyc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SOMA Bend 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>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Escher 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>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iren</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>208 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 6</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td>415-594-7770</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.kim@sfgov.org">jane.kim@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Board President</td>
<td>Dogpatch Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>824 Minnesota Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janetc@cs.com">janetc@cs.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Market District Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0517</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janethr@global.com">janethr@global.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>Whitaker</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</td>
<td>201 Harrison Street #229</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-835-6010</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somajournals@cs.com">somajournals@cs.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Locke</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero-Hill-Rincon-Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>403 Main Street #712</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dstill@me.com">dstill@me.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>SOMA Bend Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1047 Mina Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-724-1953</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHBP1994@sbcglobal.net">JHBP1994@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td>Board President</td>
<td>Potrero Dogpatch Merchants Association</td>
<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@weaverworld.com">keith@weaverworld.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Magnani</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>65 Ninth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-505-0251</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfafscf@afsc.org">sfafscf@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marita</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street, Suite 100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td>415-674-1835</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maritaphillips@gmail.com">maritaphillips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>San Francisco Development Center</td>
<td>2055 Sutter Street, 10th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon Hill Residents Association</td>
<td>75 Financial Street #1800</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td>415-882-7877</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bement@global.com">bement@global.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Minotti</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1209 Meade Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-553-9989</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodminotti@hotmail.com">rodminotti@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanja</td>
<td>Kres</td>
<td>Co-Chair</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:sanja@labinc.org">sanja@labinc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TPAC/PAC</td>
<td>30 Sheridan Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-407-0064</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olsson@comcast.net">olsson@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohon</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-505-0251</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohon@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohon@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.</td>
<td>Egler</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-704-7775</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jilegie@global.com">jilegie@global.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>York Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>243A Shelly Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-751-9802</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorkloa@gmail.com">yorkloa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>Co-Founder</td>
<td>People Power Media</td>
<td>386 10th Ave</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-657-9010</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bryan.ruiz@normal.com">bryan.ruiz@normal.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>De Guzman</td>
<td>Development Specialist</td>
<td>Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-669-0916</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michele.digueman@sfgov.org">michele.digueman@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Baugh</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>700 Hayes Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-265-0546</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@hayesvalley.org">president@hayesvalley.org</a></td>
<td>south of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Bisinger</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>O Foundation - AIDS Housing Alliance/SF</td>
<td>350 Golden Gate Ave, Suite A</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-552-3242</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@ahaf.org">info@ahaf.org</a></td>
<td>south of Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Title: Preliminary Shadow Fan - Proposed 300 5th Street Mixed Use Project
Comments: Assumes 85 foot height covering entire parcel.
Places of Entertainment Within 300 Feet of Project Site

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

Printed: 7, October 2016
PLANNING DIRECTOR

BULLETIN NO. 4

Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding

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

PURPOSE:

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

BACKGROUND:

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

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

The SFPUC and/or its delegate (SFDPW, Hydraulics Section) will review the permit application and comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. The SFPUC will receive and return the application within a two-week period from date of receipt. The permit applicant must comply with SFPUC requirements for projects in flood-prone areas. Such requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, special sidewalk construction, and deep gutters.
The City and County of San Francisco’s (CCSF) Recycled Water Ordinance requires property owners to install dual plumbing for recycled water use within the designated recycled water use areas in these situations:

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

For more information on the Recycled Water Ordinance and the designated recycled water use areas, please visit [www.sfpuc.org/recycledwater](http://www.sfpuc.org/recycledwater)

The following are procedures to guide developers and property owners with the installation of recycled water service lines. Drawings A and B show how and where the lines are to be installed, and the required backflow prevention assembly for development when recycled water mains have been installed in the streets (Drawing A), and when the mains have not been installed in the streets (Drawing B).

### Number of Water Lines Coming onto a Property

Three to four lines:

1. Fire
2. Potable water domestic
3. Recycled water domestic
4. Recycled water irrigation (if property has landscaping)

### Number of Water Meters

One water meter is required for each water line.

### Required Backflow Prevention Assembly

- Fire line — reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
- Potable water domestic — reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
- Recycled water domestic — reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
- Recycled water irrigation line — reduced pressure principle backflow preventer

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

The backflow prevention assembly for domestic water plumbing inside the building and for 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 — described in the CCSF’s Plumbing Codes

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

### Temporary Potable Water Use Until Recycled Water Becomes Available

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

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

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

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

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

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

**New Service Line Permits**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Service
(415) 551-3000
BUILDING LOT
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NOTES:

1. BACKFLOW PREVENTER TO BE APPROVED BY
SFPU.

2. BACKFLOW PREVENTER FOR RECYCLED WATER
SYSTEM MUST MEET TITLE 17, CCR,
REQUIREMENTS AND PUBLIC HEALTH SAFETY
CODE.
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HEAVY LINES:

OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION.
SFWD RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF NEW SERVICE UP TO
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OWNERSHIP REMAINS WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER.

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