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The Planning Department (Department) and the Project Sponsor (Sponsor) are requesting review and comment before the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) regarding the proposed Preservation Alternatives for the Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development project (proposed project).

On March 18, 2015, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) adopted Resolution No. 0746 to clarify expectations for the evaluation of significant impacts to historic resources and the preparation of preservation alternatives in Environmental Impact Reports. Although the resolution does not specify ARC review of proposed preservation alternatives, the HPC, in their discussions during preparation of the resolution, expressed a desire to provide feedback on the range of identified preservation alternatives earlier in the environmental review process – prior to publication of the Draft EIR – particularly for large projects. In response to the resolution, the subject project is being brought to the ARC for feedback as the Department and the Sponsor develop preservation alternatives to address the anticipated significant impacts to historic resources.

The Department is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the physical environmental effects of the proposed project. The Department has determined that the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to three individually-eligible historic resources and to the Third Street Historic District, which has triggered the development of several preservation alternatives, per the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Thus, the proposed preservation alternatives are being brought to the ARC for comment prior to the preparation of the Draft EIR, and review of the Draft EIR by the HPC. The Draft EIR is scheduled to be published in the fall of 2018.
PROPERTY DESCRIPTION
The project site is located in San Francisco’s Central Waterfront neighborhood, south of the recently approved, but not yet constructed, Pier 70 Mixed-Use Project. The project is within the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution & Repair -1- General) and M-2 (Heavy Industrial) Zoning Districts and 40-X and 65-X Height and Bulk Districts. The project site sits on an irregularly shaped industrial site that is bordered by 22nd Street to the north, the San Francisco Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south, and Illinois Street to the west. The address is 1201 Illinois Street and encompasses the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 4232/006, 4232/001, 4175/002, 4175/017, and 4175/018. The site has a long industrial history including as a sugar refinery from 1881 to 1951 and as a power plant from 1902 to 2011.

CEQA HISTORIC RESOURCES EVALUATION
The proposed project site includes three extant and previously documented individually-eligible properties to the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR): the Meter House, the Compressor House, and Station A. These resources are significant under Criterion 1 (Events) for the association with the development of power generation and the early history of PG&E.

The Meter House, the Compressor House, Station A, and the Gate House were also found to contribute to the CRHR-eligible Third Street Industrial District. The Third Street Industrial District is significant under Criterion 1 (Events) for association with the industrial development of the City of San Francisco and under Criterion 3 (Architecture) based on its collection of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American industrial buildings and structures that remain substantially intact. The contributors identified on the project site are specifically associated with the history of power generation on the City’s waterfront and are a significant example of masonry industrial architecture in the Classical style.

In addition, the Historic Resources Evaluation (HRE) Part 1 by Page & Turnbull (February 2018), attached to this memo, found that Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack contributed to the Third Street Industrial District with an extended period of significance of 1872 to 1965. All six buildings are considered historic resources for the purposes of the CEQA, Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq. Page & Turnbull evaluated the other buildings, structures, and landscape features on the site and found them to be ineligible for listing in the California Register individually or as part of a historic district or cultural landscape in association with either the Spreckels’ sugar refinery or the Pacific Gas & Electric power station.

The Department concurs with the historic resources identified by Page & Turnbull. These properties summarized in the below table are therefore considered historic resources for the purpose of review under CEQA. Additional descriptions of the identified historic resources can be found in the attached HRE Report, Part 1, prepared by Page & Turnbull.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Period of Significance</th>
<th>Historic Resource Applicable Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compressor House</td>
<td>ca.1924</td>
<td>Individually eligible CRHR Criterion 1 (Events); Contributor to Third Street Industrial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate House</td>
<td>ca.1914</td>
<td>Contributor to Third Street Industrial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter House</td>
<td>ca.1902</td>
<td>Individually eligible CRHR Criterion 1 (Events); Contributor to Third Street Industrial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A</td>
<td>1901-02; 1930-31</td>
<td>Individually eligible CRHR Criterion 1 (Events); Contributor to Third Street Industrial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Contributor to Third Street Industrial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3 Boiler Stack</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Contributor to Third Street Industrial District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project is located on an approximately 29.0-acre site along San Francisco’s Central Waterfront, encompassing the site of the former Potrero Power Plant that closed in 2011. California Barrel Company LLC, the Sponsor, seeks to redevelop the site for a proposed multi-phased, mixed-use development, and to activate a new waterfront open space. The proposed project would provide for development of residential, commercial (including office, research and development [R&D]/life science, retail, hotel, and production, distribution, and repair [PDR]), parking, community facilities, and open space land uses. Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 5.3 million gross square feet of new uses. The proposed project would include amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code, creating a new Potrero Power Station Special Use District (SUD). The proposed rezoning would modify the existing height limits of 40 and 65 feet to various heights ranging from 65 to 300 feet. Most new buildings would range in height from 65 to 180 feet, with one building at 300 feet. Approximately 6.3 acres would be devoted to publicly accessible open space.

The proposed project includes the demolition of about 20 existing buildings on the property, including four historic resources: Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. As discussed above, Station A, the Meter House and the Compressor house are individually-eligible resources and contributors to the Third Street Industrial Historic District. The Gate House is not individually-eligible but is a district contributor. The proposed project retains and seismically stabilizes the 300-foot tall Boiler Stack, and repurposes it as ground floor retail space occupying approximately 1,000 square feet, including adding openings to the stack structure. Under the proposed project, the project sponsor would repurpose and convert the Unit 3 power block on Block 9 into a hotel, if feasible. Repurposing and converting Unit 3 would involve the removal of obsolete mechanical equipment, including the boiler and control room. The structure would not exceed the existing height of the 150-feet concrete elevator shaft, though two additional floors would be added, creating a 10-story building. In some areas, the building envelope would increase to create a floor plate suitable for a hotel. The reuse of the building may not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for...
Rehabilitation. If it is not feasible to repurpose and convert Unit 3 into a hotel, Unit 3 would be demolished and replaced with a residential or hotel use on Block 9. Both Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are District contributors.

PROJECT IMPACTS
The proposed project includes the demolition of Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. Demolition is considered a significant impact on a historic resource for the purposes of the CEQA. Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are proposed to be retained, though Unit 3 may be demolished and replaced by a new hotel or residential building. Even if repurposed, changes to Unit 3 may not meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and it is assumed that the building will no longer contribute to the Third Street Industrial District. The proposed project impact analysis in the HRE Part 2 (Page & Turnbull, February 2018) assumed that Unit 3 would be demolished as it is unknown if or to the extent the building will be retained. The HRE Part 2 concluded that when considering demolition of five contributing resources to the Third Street Industrial District the proposed project would compromise the Third Street Industrial District’s eligibility for listing in the California Register. Although it is not known if Unit 3 will be retained or demolished, the District impacts identified for the proposed project will remain the same in either case. Proposed new construction, due to height and density, would affect the District’s integrity of setting and feeling, but due to the location of the proposed construction in relationship to most of the District contributors the HRE Part 2 concluded that new construction alone was not identified as a significant impact to District.

PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES
As the proposed project is anticipated to result in a significant impact on historic resources due to the demolition of Station A, the Meter House, the Compressor House, the Gate House and demolition or alteration of Unit 3; the EIR considers alternatives to the proposed project. Alternatives considered under CEQA do not need to meet all of the project objectives; however, they should preserve the features of the resource that convey its significance while still meeting most of the basic objectives of the project. The project sponsor’s project objectives are included in the attached Preservation Alternatives Report provide by Page & Turnbull.

Department staff and the project team have identified the following preservation alternatives: No Project Alternative, Full Preservation Alternative, and four Partial Preservation Alternatives (Partial Preservation Alternatives 1 through 4). Schematics are provided for the Full and Partial Preservation Alternatives as an appendix to the attached Preservation Alternatives Report. Explored but rejected alternatives are outlined in the attached Preservation Alternatives Report.

No Project Alternative
As required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), the No Project Alternative is evaluated to allow decision-makers to compare the environmental effects of approving the proposed project with the effects of not approving the project. Under this alternative, the project site would remain in its current condition and no new development would occur.

The No Project Alternative does not meet the objectives of the project.
Full Preservation Alternative
The Full Preservation Alternative would retain the majority of the exterior character-defining features of all individually eligible historic resources and the Third Street Industrial District contributing structures on-site, namely, the Compressor House, Meter House, Station A, Gate House, Unit 3, and the Boiler Stack. The significant features of the historic buildings would be rehabilitated in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Station A would be used as office space, while the Meter House, Compressor House, and Gate House would be used for retail. Unit 3 would be converted to a hotel. The Full Preservation Alternative would cause a less than significant impact to individual resources at the site. The impact of the Full Preservation Alternative on the Third Street Industrial District would also be less than significant.

The Full Preservation Alternative meets or partially meets a majority of the objectives of the proposed project.

Partial Preservation Alternative
Partial Preservation Alternatives 1 through 4 proposes to retain and rehabilitate individually eligible historic resources on the Potrero Power Station site to different degrees. The four Partial Preservation Alternatives each meet or partially meet a majority of the objectives of the project.

Partial Preservation Alternative 1
Partial Preservation Alternative 1 would retain and rehabilitate Station A for office use, but would demolish the Meter House and Compressor House, which are also individual resources. Similar to the proposed project, the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated, the Gate House would also be demolished and Unit 3 may or may not be retained, but it is assumed it would no longer contribute to the District. The purpose of Partial Preservation Alternative 1 is to lessen impacts on individual resources by rehabilitating Station A while also reducing impacts on the District. This alternative would preserve more historic resources than the proposed project, nevertheless, Partial Preservation Alternative 1 would have a significant and unavoidable impact. Impacts to the Third Street Industrial District would be reduced to less than significant as Station A and the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated. The rehabilitation of Station A would maintain the significant power generation association and the masonry typology represented by the former PG&E buildings within the District, while also functioning as a link between Third Street and the remaining waterfront District contributors.

Partial Preservation Alternative 2
Partial Preservation Alternative 2 would retain and rehabilitate all or a portion of the exterior character-defining features of the southern portion of Station A, nearest 23rd Street, which would be used as offices. The southern portion would be retained because there are more character-defining features at that end, it creates a unique southern entrance for the site, and it provides a backdrop to the proposed public open space. Similar to Partial Preservation Alternative 1, this alternative would not retain the Meter House and Compressor House, which are also individual resources. Similar to the proposed project, the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated, the Gate House would also be demolished and Unit 3 may or may not be retained, but it is assumed it would no longer contribute to the District. This alternative would preserve more historic resources than the proposed project, nevertheless, Partial Preservation
Alternative 2 would have a significant and unavoidable impact. Impacts to the Third Street Industrial District would be reduced to less than significant as a portion of Station A and the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated. The rehabilitation of a portion of Station A would maintain the significant power generation association and the masonry typology represented by the former PG&E buildings within the District, while also functioning as a link between Third Street and the remaining waterfront District contributors.

Partial Preservation Alternative 3
Partial Preservation Alternative 3 would retain and rehabilitate the individually-eligible Meter House and the Compressor House for retail use, but would demolish Station A. Similar to the proposed project, the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated, the Gate House would also be demolished and Unit 3 may or may not be retained, but it is assumed it would no longer contribute to the District. This alternative would preserve more historic resources than the Proposed Project, nevertheless, Partial Preservation Alternative 3 would have a significant and unavoidable impact. Impacts to the Third Street Industrial District would be reduced to less than significant as Meter House, the Compressor House and the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated. The rehabilitation of Meter House and the Compressor House would maintain the significant power generation association and the masonry typology represented by the former PG&E buildings within the District, while also functioning as a link between Third Street and the remaining waterfront District contributors.

Partial Preservation Alternative 4
Partial Preservation Alternative 4 would retain the facades of all three individually eligible buildings, but their integrity would be compromised. Similar to the proposed project, the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated, the Gate House would be demolished, and Unit 3 may or may not be retained, but it is assumed it would no longer contribute to the District. This alternative would preserve more historic resources than the proposed project, nevertheless, Partial Preservation Alternative 4 would have a significant and unavoidable impact. As the facades of Station A, Meter House, and Compressor would be retained and the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated, impacts to the Third Street Industrial District would be reduced to less than significant. The retention of the facades of Station A, the Meter House and the Compressor House would maintain the significant power generation association and the masonry typology represented by the former PG&E buildings within the District, while also functioning as a link between Third Street and the remaining waterfront District contributors.

REQUESTED ACTION
The Department seeks comments on the adequacy of the proposed Preservation Alternatives.

ATTACHMENTS
- Preservation Alternatives Report, prepared by Page & Turnbull
  - Appendix A: Notice of Preparation
  - Appendix B: Preservation Alternatives Graphics
  - Appendix C: Ability of Preservation Alternatives to Meet Project Sponsor’s Objectives Matrix
- Historic Resource Evaluation, prepared by Page & Turnbull
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I. INTRODUCTION

This Preservation Alternatives Report has been prepared for Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project (Figure 1). The project site is located in San Francisco’s Central Waterfront neighborhood, south of the recently approved, but not yet constructed, Pier 70 mixed-use project. It is within a PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution & Repair -1- General) and M-2 (Heavy Industrial) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. It sits on an irregularly shaped industrial site that is bordered by 22nd Street to the north, the San Francisco Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south, and Illinois Street to the west. The address is 1201 Illinois Street and encompasses the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 4232/006, 4232/001, 4175/002, 4175/017, and 4175/018. The site has a long industrial history, functioning as a sugar refinery from 1881 to 1951 and as a power plant from 1902 to 2011.

The subject site includes three extant and previously documented individually eligible properties to the California Register: the Meter House, the Compressor House, and Station A. The Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, and the Gate House were also found to contribute to the California Register-eligible Third Street Industrial District. In addition, the Historic Resources Evaluation (HRE) Part 1 (Page & Turnbull, February 2018) found that Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack contributed to the Third Street Industrial District with an extended period of significance of 1872 to 1965. All six buildings are considered historic resources for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq. Page & Turnbull evaluated the other buildings, structures, and landscape features on the site and found them to be ineligible for listing in the California Register individually or as part of a historic district or cultural landscape in association with either Spreckels’ sugar refinery or the Pacific Gas & Electric power station.

The project proposes to redevelop the property into a mixed-use site with commercial, residential, and outdoor public space. The Proposed Project includes the demolition of Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. Demolition is considered an impact on a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA. Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are proposed to be retained, though Unit 3 may be demolished and replaced by a new hotel or residential building. Even if repurposed, changes to Unit 3 may not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. The Proposed Project impact analysis in the HRE Part 2 (Page & Turnbull, February 2018) assumed that Unit 3 would be demolished, as it is unknown if or to what extent the building will be retained. The Proposed Project in this report assumes that Unit 3 will be retained but that the building will no longer contribute to the Third Street Industrial District. The HRE Part 2 concluded that when considering both demolition of five contributing resources to the Third Street Industrial District and new construction that would affect the historic district’s integrity of setting and feeling, the Proposed Project would compromise the Third Street Industrial District’s eligibility for listing in the California Register. Although it is not known if Unit 3 will be retained or demolished, the district impacts identified for the proposed project will remain the same in either case.

As the Proposed Project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to individual historic resources and to the Third Street Industrial District, the project team, Page & Turnbull, and the Planning Department have developed preservation alternatives pursuant to CEQA. The preservation alternatives analyzed in this technical report include a No Project Alternative, a Full Preservation Alternative, and several Partial Preservation Alternatives.
METHODOLOGY

This report follows the scope provided by the San Francisco Planning Department for preservation alternative reports and includes a summary of the significance and character-defining features of historic resources on the Potrero Power Plant site as well as the Proposed Project description. Following guidance provided by Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746, this report analyzes a Full Preservation Alternative and Partial Preservation Alternatives pursuant to CEQA. For purposes of this

1 As of July 2017, the three large fuel storage tanks located between 22nd and Humboldt streets were demolished.

The description of the Proposed Project is derived from the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of a Public Scoping Meeting, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department (November 1, 2017, Case No. 2017-011878ENV), with minor clarifications or updates. The descriptions for the Full Preservation and Partial Preservation Alternatives were developed in collaboration between the project team, Page & Turnbull, and Planning Department staff.

**Determination of Significant Adverse Change Under CEQA**

According to CEQA, a “project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” Substantial adverse change is defined as: “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired.” The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance” and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to local ordinance or resolution. Thus, a project may cause a substantial change in a historic resource but still not have a significant adverse effect on the environment as defined by CEQA as long as the impact of the change on the historic resource is determined to be less than significant, negligible, neutral or even beneficial.

---

2 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).
3 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(1).
4 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(2).
II. SUMMARY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

This section of the report is excerpted from Section II. “Summary of Historic Status” in the HRE Part 2.

POTRERO POWER STATION PROPERTY

The subject site includes three extant and previously documented individually eligible properties to the California Register: the Meter House (ca.1902), the Compressor House (ca.1924), and Station A (1901-02; 1930-31). Ward Hill of Dames & Moore determined the period of significance for both the Meter House and Compressor House to span from their dates of construction to 1930, at which point the supply of cleaner and less expensive natural gas increased and reliance on manufactured gas diminished. These buildings were determined individually eligible based on their association with the Pacific Gas & Electric’s (PG&E) gas manufacturing facility and their significance in the history of gas manufacturing in Northern California.

Station A (1901-02; 1930-31) was evaluated and found not to be an individual resource due to impacted integrity in the Dames & Moore report, and the Planning Department’s 2001 Central Waterfront Cultural Resources Survey relied on the Dames & Moore findings. However, Station A was subsequently identified as individually significant and eligible for listing in the California Register under Criteria 1 and 3 as part of expert testimony in 2002 in a case regarding the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Application for Certification. The expert testimony was on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco. While there has been disagreement regarding the integrity of Station A among professional architectural historians, for the purposes of CEQA review, the San Francisco Planning Department assumes that Station A is an individual historic resource.

The Gate House (ca.1914) was previously evaluated and found not to be an individual resource due to impacted integrity.

The Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, and the Gate House were all previously determined to be contributors to the Third Street Industrial District, which is a sub-district of the Central Waterfront/Potrero Point Historic District that was first identified by the San Francisco Planning Department in the Central Waterfront Survey in 2001 and documented in the Central Waterfront Survey Update in 2008. Additionally, Page & Turnbull evaluated a possible expansion of the Third Street Industrial District’s period of significance (1872 to 1958) and found reason to expand the length of time to 1965 (see the next section for more information). This would make Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack, both built in 1965, contributors to the historic district.

THIRD STREET INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

The Third Street Industrial District is a sub-district of the Central Waterfront Historic District (also known as the Potrero Point Historic District) and was documented by Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull in 2008. The Third Street Industrial District is a narrow, linear district that includes the blocks bounded by 18th Street to the north, Illinois Street to the east, 24th Street to the south, Third Street to the west, and the parcels that once constituted PG&E’s Potrero Power Station and the remnants of the

---

5 Page & Turnbull believes the construction date of the Meter House to be ca.1902, rather than the 1914 date recorded on the DPR 523 form, due to the fact that the building is depicted on the 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.
6 Station A includes: the Boiler Hall (1901-02; demolished in 1983); the Turbine Hall (1901-02); the Switching Center (1930-31); the Machine Shop Office (ca.1911); and the Machine Shop (ca.1915).
Western Sugar Refinery.\textsuperscript{8} The district also includes several properties on the west side of Third Street between 20\textsuperscript{th} and 22\textsuperscript{nd} streets and the contiguous block bound by 19\textsuperscript{th}, 20\textsuperscript{th}, and Tennessee streets. The Third Street Industrial District is significant under Criterion 1 (Events) for association with the industrial development of the City of San Francisco and under Criterion 3 (Architecture) based on its collection of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American industrial buildings and structures that remain substantially intact. It was originally identified with a period of significance of 1872 to 1958. The end date for the period of significance was justified as 50 years prior to the time of survey in 2008, and cuts short a sustained period of productive industrial activity lasting until 1965, despite a post-World War II decline in employment.\textsuperscript{9} The immediate area saw continuing industrial activity up until 1965, prior to a general decline in the late 1960s. Industrial productivity through 1965 and the area’s subsequent decline suggest that the Third Street Industrial District’s period of significance should be extended beyond 1958 to 1965.

Four contributing buildings have been demolished since the historic district was documented in 2008. However, the boundaries of the district have not changed. With an expanded period of significance of 1872 to 1965 that adds Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack, the district currently includes 25 extant contributing resources and 28 non-contributing properties (Figure 2). All of the non-contributing properties were reviewed, and aside from Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack at Potrero Power Station, none of the other properties changed status from non-contributing to contributing within the extended period of significance.

\textsuperscript{8} Former Western Sugar Refinery warehouses located south of the subject site were determined eligible for listing in the National Register.

\textsuperscript{9} Survey methodology used 50 years as a cut-off date, which means that the period of significance has a shelf-life that needed to be updated as time passes.
Figure 2. Map of Third Street Industrial District boundaries, showing boundary that includes the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses at 435 23rd Street (map included in 2008 DPR 523D form is incorrect). Pink shading indicates contributing resources to the district. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map, edited by Page & Turnbull, February 2018.

CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

This section provides lists of character-defining features identified in Page & Turnbull’s HRE Part 2 for all historic resources at the Potrero Power Station site, including Station A, the Meter House, the Gate House, the Compressor House, Unit 3, and the Boiler Stack. A separate table contains character-defining features of the Third Street Industrial District, as inferred from the Central Waterfront DPR 523D form authored by Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull in 2008.

For a property to be eligible for national, state, or local designation under one of the significance criteria, the essential physical features (or character-defining features) that enable the property to convey its historic identity must be evident. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms such as form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials.

Station A – inclusive of the Turbine Hall, Machine Shop, Machine Shop Office, and Switching Center – is primarily referenced as one resource throughout the HRE Part 1, with the exception of the Buildings Table, where the portions of Station A are described chronologically by date of construction. Rather than retain the chronological order featured in the HRE Part 1, the character-defining features table below groups the physical portions of Station A one after another for clarity. The Meter House, Gate House,
Compressor House, Unit 3, and Boiler Stack follow. All numbers in the left column are referenced in the site plan (Figure 3), which is included in the HRE Part 1.

Figure 3: Site map with buildings, structures and features at Potrero Power Station showing Third Street Industrial District contributors and non-contributors. Map is not drawn to scale. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map, edited by Page & Turnbull.
### Potrero Power Station Historic Buildings – Character-Defining Features Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Station A Turbine Hall</th>
<th>Date of Construction: 1901-02; 1903</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character-Defining Features:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rectangular plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Built out to lot lines between 23rd and Humboldt streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Four stories tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Massive brick masonry construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classical decorative brick quoin patterning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-lite steel-sash windows at the north façade, deeply recessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-lite steel-sash windows at the south façade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Symmetrical window pattern at north and south facades; irregular window pattern at east façade (west façade not visible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Slightly-pitched gable roof with steel trusses; corrugated metal roof material at northern portion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East façade of Turbine Hall

South façade of Turbine Hall. The two left (west) bays constitute the adjacent Station A Switching Center, built in 1930-31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Station A Machine Shop Office</th>
<th>Date of Construction: ca.1911</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character-Defining Features:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rectangular plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One story tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reinforced concrete construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flat roof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greek Revival features at the primary façade, including: gabled pediment; pedestrian entrance and full-height windows with corbels and triangular and arched pedimented hoods; pilasters topped with Doric capitals and egg and dart molding; and dentil cornice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concrete stairs parallel to facade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North façade of Machine Shop Office with addition to the right (west)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Character-Defining Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Machine Shop          | ca.1915              | 4175/017 | • Irregular plan  
|                       |                      |        | • Tall single story  
|                       |                      |        | • Reinforced concrete construction with brick cladding  
|                       |                      |        | • Corbelled brick detailing at parapet  
|                       |                      |        | • Decorative brick quoin patterning  
|                       |                      |        | • Flat roof  |
| Switching Center      | 1930-31              | 4175/017 | • Rectangular plan  
|                       |                      |        | • Four stories tall  
|                       |                      |        | • Concrete construction with brick cladding  
|                       |                      |        | • Multi-lite steel-sash windows  
|                       |                      |        | • Flat roof  
|                       |                      |        | • Corbelled brick detailing at parapet  
|                       |                      |        | • Decorative quoin patterning  
|                       |                      |        | • Engraved signage reading “Station A” and “Pacific Gas and Electric Company”  |
| Meter House; Gas Meter Shop | ca.1902          | 4175/017 | • Rectangular plan  
|                       |                      |        | • One story  
|                       |                      |        | • Brick masonry construction  
|                       |                      |        | • Multi-lite wood-sash windows with concrete sill and brick arched lintel  
|                       |                      |        | • Multi-lite wood-sash lunette windows at the gable peaks of the west and east façades  
|                       |                      |        | • Rhythmic brick pilasters and cornice  
|                       |                      |        | • Dentil cornice  
|                       |                      |        | • Steel truss gable roof with a raised central monitor  
|                       |                      |        | • Partially glazed metal pedestrian doors  
<p>|                       |                      |        | • Loading door opening at the west façade  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Gate House</th>
<th>Date of Construction: ca.1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character-Defining Features:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rectangular plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Single story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brick masonry construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flat roof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Simple decorative brick cornice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rectilinear wood-sash transomed windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brick window and door surrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Compressor House</th>
<th>Date of Construction: ca.1924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character-Defining Features:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- L-shaped plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tall one story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brick masonry construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multi-lite steel-sash windows with decorative brick surround</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brick parapet (partial stepped parapet at the east façade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corbeled brick cornice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brick quoin patterning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Round openings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loading door openings at all facades [metal roll-up doors not historic]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Slightly pitched concrete gable roof with steel trusses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two monitor roof skylights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Unit 3 Power Block: Generator, Turbine, Boiler, and Unit 3 Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction: 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4232/006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character-Defining Features:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eight-story steel frame structure, primarily exposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concrete elevator shaft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Control room and offices of concrete construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metal panel cladding and glazing of south office portion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrial character with remnants of equipment infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Name: Boiler Stack |
| Date of Construction: 1965 |
| APN: 4232/006 |
| Character-Defining Features: |
| • Reinforced concrete construction |
| • Tapered form |
| • 300-foot height |
| • Crow’s nest walkway |
| • Exterior metal ladder |

**Third Street Industrial District Character-Defining Features**

Representative sample of contributors with historic uses:

Alberta Candy Company at 2201-2203 Third Street

| Location: primarily along Third Street between 18th and 24th streets, with Potrero Power Station and Western Sugar Refinery Warehouse buildings to the east on 23rd Street |
| Years Constructed: primarily during the first half of the twentieth century |
| Character-Defining Features: |
| • Linear character of district along Third Street, with exception of Potrero Power Station site and Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses, which make the district L-shaped |
| • High concentration of manufacturing, repair, and processing plants and warehouses of industrial character |
- Historic location of industries dependent on nearby waterfront and freight-hauling Santa Fe Railroad trains that ran along Illinois Street

- Buildings with the following typical features:
  - Brick and concrete construction
  - One to four stories in height
  - Flat roofs
  - Ornamented parapets
  - Steel-sash and wood-sash windows
  - Rectilinear and arched window openings
  - American Commercial style
III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The following project description is derived from the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of a Public Scoping Meeting, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department (November 1, 2017, Case No. 2017-011878ENV), with minor updates and clarifications. Additional details regarding the project description are included in the NOP, which is attached in Appendix A. The Proposed Project is also illustrated in a site plan in Appendix B.

The Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development project (Proposed Project) is located on an approximately 29.0-acre site along San Francisco’s Central Waterfront, encompassing the site of the former Potrero Power Plant that closed in 2011. California Barrel Company LLC, the project sponsor, seeks to redevelop the site for a proposed multi-phased, mixed-use development, and activate a new waterfront open space. Most of the site would be redeveloped into new commercial, residential, and outdoor public space. The Proposed Project includes the demolition of about 20 existing buildings on the property, including four historic resources: Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. The Proposed Project retains and seismically stabilizes the 300-foot tall Boiler Stack, and repurposes it as ground floor retail space occupying approximately 1,000 square feet, including adding openings to the stack structure. Seismic retrofit of the Boiler Stack may obstruct the hollow flue. Open space including seating and a garden at the base of the Stack would connect the structure to a proposed Power Station Park.

Under the Proposed Project, the project sponsor would repurpose and convert the Unit 3 power block on Block 9 into a hotel, if feasible. Repurposing and converting Unit 3 would involve the removal of obsolete mechanical equipment, including the boiler and control room. The structure would not exceed the existing height of the 150-feet concrete elevator shaft, though two additional floors would be added, creating a 10-story building. In some areas, the building envelope would increase to create a floor plate suitable for a hotel. The reuse of the building may not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. If not feasible to repurpose and convert Unit 3 into a hotel, Unit 3 would be demolished and replaced with a residential or hotel use on Block 9.

The Proposed Project would include amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code, creating a new Potrero Power Station Special Use District (SUD). The proposed rezoning would modify the existing height limits of 40 and 65 feet to various heights ranging from 65 to 300 feet.

The Proposed Project would provide for development of residential, commercial (including office, research and development [R&D]/life science, retail, hotel, and production, distribution, and repair [PDR]), parking, community facilities, and open space land uses. Overall, the Proposed Project would construct up to approximately 5.3 million gross square feet (gsf) of new uses, including between approximately 2.4 and 3.0 million gsf of residential use (about 2,400 to 3,000 dwelling units), between approximately 1.2 and 1.9 million gsf of commercial uses (office, R&D/life science, retail, hotel, and PDR), approximately 922,000 gsf of parking, and approximately 100,000 gsf of community facilities. While the Project’s Environmental Impact Report studies the aforementioned ranges in square footage to account for uncertainty, the project sponsor’s preferred project includes the square footages listed in Section IV, Table 1 under the “Proposed Project.” Most new buildings would range in height from 65 to 180 feet, with one building at 300 feet. Approximately 6.3 acres would be devoted to publicly accessible open space.

More specifically, Blocks 4, 12, and 14 would have a “Flex Residential or Commercial” land use designation, and Block 9/Unit 3 would have a “Flex Hotel or Residential” land use designation. Otherwise, blocks in the northwest and central interior portions of the project site would be designated “Residential,” and blocks along the project site’s north and south sides would be designated “Research & Development/Office.” In the central-west area of the project site, Block No. 5 would be designated...
“Residential and District Parking Garage.” Areas designated “Publicly Accessible Open Space” would be located along east-west and north-south axes within the interior of the project site and along the waterfront adjacent to the bay. Ground floor frontages along 23rd Street would host PDR use, and ground floors on blocks fronting the waterfront and open space areas would contain retail (e.g., outdoor cafes and dining). All other ground floors would contain active uses (e.g., neighborhood retail or residential units).

The Proposed Project would include transportation and circulation improvements, shoreline improvements, and utilities infrastructure improvements. Transportation and circulation improvements would include creating a continuous street network, connecting to the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project directly north of the project site, establishing a new bus stop and shuttle service that the project would provide, and installing traffic signals at the intersections of Illinois Street at 23rd and Humboldt streets. The roadway network would be designed to be accessible for all modes of transportation, including vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian improvements. In addition to waterfront parks, proposed shoreline improvements could (subject to regulatory approval by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission [BCDC] and the Port of San Francisco) include construction of a floating dock extending out and above the tidal zone to provide access from the site to the bay for fishing and recreational watercraft. The Proposed Project would construct infrastructure and utilities improvements, including potable and emergency water and recycled water distribution; wastewater and storm water collection; and natural gas and electricity distribution.

A Design for Development (D for D) would be adopted as part of the proposed Potrero Power Station SUD, which would articulate standards and guidelines for building design, open space character, and the public realm. The D for D would establish controls for bulk restriction, articulation, and modulation; building materials and treatment; building frontage utilization; design parameters for open space and streets; and parking and loading standards. Standards in the D for D would be mandatory, measurable, and quantitative design specifications. The design guidelines would be more qualitative and flexible.

Project design and construction would likely occur in seven overlapping phases, with each phase lasting approximately three to six years. The first phase of construction is anticipated to start on the southeast portion of the project site and the last phase of construction would end in the northwest portion of the project site. Total construction is estimated to occur over a 16-year period, from 2020 to 2036, but could occur over a somewhat longer or shorter period, depending on market conditions and permitting requirements.
SITE CONSTRAINTS FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The discussion below is based on information provided by the project sponsor and the project architect to describe the site constraints that influenced the development of the Proposed Project.

Grade Change
There is currently up to 14.5 feet of grade change between the Potrero Power Station and Pier 70 properties. The project at Pier 70 will be raising the grade along the property line seven to 10.5 feet. In order to match the future grade, the Potrero Power Station project intends to lower grades up to five feet along the property line. This will allow for a contiguous north-south connecting street at Maryland Street and a shared east-west alley along the property line shared by the two projects.

The highest point of the Potrero Power Station site is located in the vicinity of the northern walls of Station A’s Machine Shop Office and the Meter House on existing Humboldt Street. Approximately 90 feet of the north wall of the Meter House is serving as a five to 11-foot retaining wall in this area. This shortened north façade due to the raised street grade has been identified as a character-defining feature of the building. If the raised street grade is maintained (and not lowered to match Pier 70’s future street grade), the planned connectivity between the two projects would be limited, travel pathways compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) would be constrained, and the Proposed Project’s Georgia Lane connection to 23rd Street would not be possible.

The Proposed Project lowers the road in the area by three to four feet. If the Meter House was retained, it would effectively expose a portion of the building’s north façade that would likely need to be reconstructed. Similarly, if the grade is lowered along the north wall of Station A’s Machine Shop Office, the historic façades would appear to “float” approximately 7.5 feet above the lowered grade, as new façades would need to be constructed at the street level.

Unreinforced Masonry Construction
The unreinforced masonry buildings at the Potrero Power Station were constructed to serve as an electricity generating station, housing electrical and gas equipment. The buildings have few windows and limited access. In addition, the buildings lack proper roofs and have been exposed to the elements for an extended period.

Station A has been vacant for more than 30 years. In 1983, the Boiler House of Station A, nearly 40 percent of the complex, was demolished by PG&E in an effort to abate asbestos and lead. Later in 2001, PG&E further demolished 60 percent of the roof of the Turbine Hall at Station A. These demolitions left the majority of the property exposed to the elements. As a result, the building masonry has decayed and metal has corroded. The basement regularly floods from rain.

The interior of the Compressor House was designed for gas transmission equipment. The building has few access and egress points, no windows, and has a heavy, concrete roof that is structurally unsound, hampering the ability for the building to be reused.

The Meter House has few access and egress points, and like Station A, its roof was removed in 2001, leaving it exposed to the elements for more than 15 years. The building has been vacant and has not been maintained for many years.

Over the years, the buildings have been vandalized and stripped of anything with scrap value. In response, PG&E further demolished the interiors of the buildings, removing all copper, metal, and other interior features.
PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project sponsor has developed the following project objectives for the Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project:

▪ Redevelop former power plant site to provide a mix of residential, retail, office, Production, Distribution, and Repair (“PDR”), R&D space, a hotel, and activated waterfront open spaces to support a daytime population in a vibrant neighborhood retail district and to provide employment opportunities within walking distance to residents of the surrounding neighborhood.

▪ Provide access to San Francisco Bay and create a pedestrian- and bicycle- friendly environment along the waterfront, by opening the eastern shore of the site to the public and extending the Bay Trail and the Blue Greenway.

▪ Provide active open space uses such as playing fields and a playground to improve access to sports, recreational, and playground facilities in the Dogpatch, Potrero Hill, and Bayview neighborhoods and complement other nearby passive open space uses and parks in the Central Waterfront.

▪ Increase the City’s supply of housing to contribute to the City's General Plan Housing Element goals, and the Association of Bay Area Governments’ Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the City by maximizing the number of dwelling units, particularly housing near transit.

▪ Attract a diversity of household types by providing dense, mixed-income housing, including below-market rate units.

▪ Redevelop the PG&E sub-area in the northwest portion of the site with community facilities, PDR, and affordable housing.

▪ Build a neighborhood resilient to projected levels of sea level rise and earthquakes.

▪ Incorporate the Project and the anticipated adjacent Pier 70 project into a single neighborhood, by creating a network of streets and pedestrian pathways that connect to the street and pedestrian network.

▪ Create an iconic addition to the City’s skyline as part of the Dogpatch neighborhood and the Central Waterfront.

▪ Provide opportunities for outdoor dining and gathering and create an active waterfront in the evening hour by encouraging ground floor retail and restaurant uses with outdoor seating along the waterfront.

▪ Build adequate parking and vehicular and loading access to serve the needs of project residents, workers, and their visitors.

▪ Construct a significant increment of new Production, Distribution, and Repair (“PDR”) uses in order to provide a diverse array of commercial and industrial opportunities in a dynamic mixed use environment.

▪ Create a circulation and transportation system that emphasizes transit-oriented development, and promotes the use of public transportation and car-sharing through an innovative and comprehensive demand management program.
- Demonstrate leadership in sustainable development by constructing improvements intended to reduce the neighborhood’s per capita use of electrical, natural gas, water, and wastewater infrastructure.

- Create a development that is financially feasible, that allows for the delivery of the proposed level of infrastructure, public benefits, and affordable housing, and that can fund the Project’s capital costs and on-going operation and maintenance costs relating to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Property.

- Construct a waterfront hotel use in order to provide both daytime and nighttime activity on the waterfront promenade.
IV. SUMMARY OF PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

This section provides an overview of the process that the project sponsor team undertook to develop the preservation alternatives for the Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project, as well as a summary of the preservation alternatives that have been developed for analysis.

The project sponsor, Page & Turnbull, and San Francisco Planning Department staff aimed to develop a Full Preservation Alternative that reduced both individual resource impacts and district impacts to less than significant with mitigation, and proposes to rehabilitate to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards all historic buildings and structures on site. The aim of the Partial Preservation Alternatives was to develop a range of alternatives that reduced impacts with mitigation, for both district and individual impacts. The Partial Preservation alternatives aim to retain in full or in part the character-defining features of one or more of the identified individual resources on the site— the brick PG&E buildings— while reducing impacts to the district. A number of alternatives were considered but rejected and are described in Section VIII.

Parameters for developing the preservation alternatives included the following:

- No extra height. In order to maintain wide viewsheds to and from the waterfront, the preservation alternatives should not add extra height. However, proposed towers could be relocated, within some perimeters determined by the Planning Department and the project sponsor team;
- No towers east of Maryland Street. The overall concept for building heights on the site is driven by the desire to maintain wide viewsheds to and from the waterfront. As such, for both the Proposed Project and all the preservation alternatives, the greatest heights are focused in towers on the western half of the project site west of Maryland Street.
- Preserve open space. The percentage of open space for preservation alternatives needed to be the same as the proposed project;
- Meet basic project objectives. Preservation alternatives were developed to meet a majority of project objectives (see Appendix C);
- Retain Unit 3.

Table 1 (next page) presents a summary of square footage and unit counts for the Proposed Project (which rehabilitates the Boiler Stack and retains Unit 3) and the Full and Partial Preservation Alternatives, the latter of which are described in Section VI and Section VII of this report, respectively, and are illustrated in Appendix B. For all Partial Preservation Alternatives, the Boiler Stack would also be rehabilitated and Unit 3 would be retained. Note that for the purposes of the tables in this document, “rehab” is used to denote a project that would rehabilitate a historic building to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, while “retain” means that the building would not be completely demolished but the alterations may not meet the Standards.

Please note that the square footage numbers listed below represent the project sponsor’s preferred program, rather than the range that is being studied in the Environmental Impact Report to account for market uncertainty.
Table 1. Summary of Proposed Project and Preservation Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Full Preservation Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 1</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 2</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 3</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Rehabs Boiler Stack and retains Unit 3</td>
<td>Retains all six Historic Buildings</td>
<td>Rehabs all six Historic Buildings</td>
<td>Rehabs Station A (and the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
<td>Rehabs a Portion of Station A (and the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
<td>Rehabs Meter House and Compressor House (and the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
<td>Retains Facades of Meter House, Compressor House, and Station A (and rehabs the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office + Life Sciences</td>
<td>1,243,461</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,270,372</td>
<td>2,449,018</td>
<td>2,682,427</td>
<td>2,462,923</td>
<td>2,496,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>241,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>253,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>946,981</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>850,308</td>
<td>882,693</td>
<td>914,183</td>
<td>892,445</td>
<td>898,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Percentage</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Field</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Parking</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GSF</td>
<td>5,367,860</td>
<td>106,733</td>
<td>4,856,187</td>
<td>5,041,371</td>
<td>5,226,551</td>
<td>5,093,820</td>
<td>5,128,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>2,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>2,487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Rehab” is used to denote a project that would rehabilitate a historic building to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, while “retain” means that the building will not be completely demolished but the alterations may not meet the Standards. The parentheses include scope that part of the Proposed Project and would be included in each alternative.
V. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

DESCRIPTION

The No Project Alternative would involve no construction and no provision of new residential, commercial (retail, office, R&D), or recreational uses. As such, the existing buildings and structures, both historic and non-historic, would remain in place on the project site. Furthermore, no additional hazardous-materials remediation activities would occur at the project site. The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project sponsor’s objectives.

ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS TO HISTORIC RESOURCES UNDER CEQA

Since the No Project Alternative would not demolish or make any modifications to historic resources on the site, it would not cause a material impairment to the individual resources or to the historic district. Under the No Project Alternative, existing historic architectural resources on the project site would not be altered, rehabilitated, or demolished. Compared to the Proposed Project, which would result in a significant and unavoidable impact, the No Project Alternative would not result in any project-level impacts and would not contribute to any cumulative impact related to historic architectural resources.
VI. FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

DESCRIPTION

The Full Preservation Alternative is illustrated in a site plan in Appendix B. The Full Preservation Alternative would retain the majority of the exterior character-defining features of all individually eligible and the majority of the Third Street Industrial District contributing structures on-site, namely, the Compressor House, Meter House, Station A, Gate House, Unit 3, and the Boiler Stack. The significant features of the historic buildings would be rehabilitated to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Station A would be used as office space, while the Meter House, Compressor House, and Gate House would be used for retail. Unit 3 would be converted to a hotel.

This Alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- The 300’ residential tower proposed on Block 6 would be relocated to Block 7
- An 85’ tall office building would be added to Block 5 and the 180’ tall residential building on Block 5 would be redesigned, adjacent to the Meter House and Compressor House
- The central parking structure along with the rooftop playing field would be relocated to Block 1, possibly impacting the pedestrian character proposed for Humboldt and Louisiana Streets.

This alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -412,055 SF of Residential Uses, or -412 Dwelling Units
- -2,945 SF of Office & Life Science Uses
- -96,673 SF of Parking, or -268 stalls
- -511,673 GSF total

The Full Preservation Alternative meets or partially meets a majority of the basic project objectives (see matrix in Appendix C).

SUMMARY OF CEQA IMPACTS

The following sections discuss the potential advantages and impacts of the Full Preservation Alternative on individual resources and to the Third Street Industrial District (TSID). The Full Preservation Alternative is shown to cause a less than significant impact with mitigation to individual resources at the site. The impact of the Full Preservation Alternative on the Third Street Industrial District would also be less than significant with mitigation.

IMPACTS ON INDIVIDUAL RESOURCES AT THE SITE

The Full Preservation Alternative proposes to retain and rehabilitate all six historic resources on the Potrero Power Station site – the Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, Gate House, Unit 3, and the Boiler Stack – to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

The introduction of new buildings, structures, and landscaping would affect the historic buildings’ integrity of setting. Additionally, as with the Proposed Project, construction activities have the potential to damage character-defining features of the buildings. Both of these impacts could be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

Because the individually eligible historic resources would be rehabilitated, the overall impact on individual historic resources at Potrero Power Station would be less than significant with mitigation.
IMPACTS TO THIRD STREET INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

Since all six contributing resources to the Third Street Industrial District would be retained and rehabilitated to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in the Full Preservation Alternative, the relationship of the contributors on the site to each other and to the larger historic district would be largely maintained, despite new buildings that would be constructed between Station A and the area farther east where Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are located. The contributing buildings on the Potrero Power Station property are some of the oldest in the district—particularly Station A, which was built in 1901-02 (with an addition in 1930-31), the Meter House from ca. 1902, and the Gate House from ca. 1914. These buildings contribute to the character-defining typology of large brick industrial buildings in the district, which would be maintained.

The historic district would retain all 25 currently contributing properties, so the Full Preservation Alternative would not affect the district's ratio of contributing to non-contributing properties. The district would retain its integrity and ability to convey its significance, and consequently its eligibility for listing in the California Register under both Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 3 (Architecture).

Thus, the overall impact of the Full Preservation Alternative on the Third Street Industrial District would be less than significant with mitigation, instead of significant and unavoidable with mitigation for the Proposed Project.
VII. PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES ANALYSES

This Preservation Alternatives Report presents the descriptions of four Partial Preservation Alternatives and associated analysis. Table 1 in Section IV summarizes the square footage and unit counts for the Proposed Project and the Full and Partial Preservation Alternatives.

For all Partial Preservation Alternatives, the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated and Unit 3 would also be retained. Like the Proposed Project, the reuse of Unit 3 may not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The Partial Preservation Alternatives are each illustrated in site plans in Appendix B. Each Partial Preservation Alternative meets the majority of the sponsor’s basic project objectives (see matrix in Appendix C).

PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES DESCRIPTIONS

Partial Preservation Alternative 1: Rehabilitation of Station A
Partial Preservation Alternative 1 would retain and rehabilitate to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards the exterior character-defining features of Station A. This Alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights, and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- Station A would exist in place of a 125’ building on Block 10 and 300’ tower on Block 6
- The 300’ residential tower proposed on Block 6 would be relocated to Block 7

This alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -233,409 SF of Residential Uses, or -233 Dwelling Units
- -28,792 SF of Office & Life Science Uses
- -64,288 SF of Parking, or -178 stalls
- -326,489 GSF total

Compared to the Proposed Project, Partial Preservation Alternative 1 would maintain the integrity of location, design, materials, association, and feeling of Station A. The purpose of Partial Preservation Alternative 1 is to lessen impacts on individual resources by rehabilitating Station A, which will also reducing impacts on the historical district.

Partial Preservation Alternative 2: Rehabilitation of Southern Portion of Station A
Partial Preservation Alternative 2 would retain and rehabilitate all or a portion of the exterior character-defining features of the southern portion of Station A, nearest 23rd Street, which would be used as offices. The southern portion would be retained because there are more character-defining features at that end, it creates a unique southern entrance for the site, and it provides a backdrop to the proposed public open space. This alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- The south portion of Station A would replace a 125’ tall office building in the same location

This alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -108,511 SF of Office & Life Science Uses
- -32,798 SF of Parking, or -91 stalls
- -141,309 GSF total

Compared to the Proposed Project, Partial Preservation Alternative 2 aims to maintain the integrity of location, materials, and association of the southern portion of Station A. Partial Preservation Alternative 2
would preserve less of Station A than the Partial Preservation Alternative 1, but more than the Proposed Project.

**Partial Preservation Alternative 3: Rehabilitation of Compressor House & Meter House**

Partial Preservation Alternative 3 would retain and rehabilitate all or a portion of the exterior character-defining features of the Compressor House and Meter House, which would be converted to retail.

This Alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights, and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- A 180’ residential building would be redesigned on Block 5, adjacent to the Meter House and Compressor House
- The central parking structure along with the rooftop playing field would be relocated to Block 1, possibly impacting the pedestrian character proposed for Humboldt and Louisiana streets

This alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -219,504 SF of Residential Uses, or -219 Dwelling Units
- -54,536 SF of Parking, or -151 stalls
- -274,040 GSF total

Compared to the Proposed Project, Partial Preservation Alternative 3 would better maintain the integrity of location, design, materials, association, and feeling of the Meter House and Compressor House. Partial Preservation Alternative 3 would also lessen impacts on individual resources at the site while also reducing district impacts.

**Partial Preservation Alternative 4: Retention of Facades of Individual Resources**

Partial Preservation Alternative 4 would retain the facades (and exterior character-defining features) of the Compressor House, Meter House, and Station A while new construction would be built within and above. A 125’ office building would protrude from within the facades of the south portion of Station A and a 300’ residential tower would rise above the north portion of the historic building. The ground floors within the facades of the Meter House and Compressor House would be used for retail, while upper floors totaling 65’ above the Compressor House would contain offices.

This Alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights, and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- A 65’ and 180’ residential building would be redesigned on Block 5, adjacent to the Meter House and Compressor House
- The central parking structure along with the rooftop playing field would be relocated to Block 1

This alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -186,247 SF of Residential Uses, or -186 Dwelling Units
- -4,505 SF of Office and Life Sciences Uses
- -48,641 SF of Parking, or -133 stalls
- -238,393 GSF total
Compared to the Proposed Project, Partial Preservation Alternative 4 would better maintain some integrity of location, design, materials, feeling, and association of the Meter House, Compressor House, and Station A. Partial Preservation Alternative 4 would also lessen impacts on the Third Street Industrial District.

**SUMMARY OF CEQA IMPACTS**

This section discusses the potential advantages and impacts of the Partial Preservation Alternatives. Table 2 summarizes each Partial Preservation Alternative’s impacts on individual resources and impacts to the Third Street Industrial District (TSID). An analysis of each impact follows the table.

Table 2. Summary of Impacts for Partial Preservation Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Individual Resource Impact Summary Analysis</th>
<th>Third Street Industrial District (TSID) Impact Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial Preservation Alternative 1</td>
<td>Rehabs Station A (and the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Preservation Alternative 2</td>
<td>Rehabs a portion of Station A (and the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Preservation Alternative 3</td>
<td>Rehabs Meter House and Compressor House (and the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Preservation Alternative 4</td>
<td>Retains Facades of Meter House, Compressor House, and Station A (and rehabs the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: LSM = less than significant with mitigation; SUM = significant and unavoidable with mitigation. “Rehab” is used to denote a project that would rehabilitate a historic building to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, while “retain” means that the building would not be completely demolished but the alterations may not meet the Standards. The parentheses include scope that part of the Proposed Project and would be included in each alternative.

**IMPACTS ON INDIVIDUAL RESOURCES AT THE SITE**

Partial Preservation Alternatives 1 through 4 propose to retain and rehabilitate different individually eligible historic resources on the Potrero Power Station site and to different degrees. Partial Preservation Alternative 1 would retain and rehabilitate Station A, but would not retain the Meter House and Compressor House, which are also individual resources. Partial Preservation Alternative 2 would retain and rehabilitate the south portion of Station A, while redeveloping the northern portion of the site. Partial Preservation Alternative 3 would retain and rehabilitate the Meter House and the Compressor House, but would demolish Station A. Partial Preservation Alternative 4 would retain the facades of all three individually eligible buildings, but their integrity would be compromised. The introduction of new buildings, structures, and landscaping would affect the retained historic buildings’ integrity of setting.
Additionally, as with the Proposed Project, construction activities would have the potential to damage character-defining features of the buildings. Both of these impacts can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. On their own, each Partial Preservation Alternative would preserve more historical resources than the Proposed Project, which completely demolishes all three individual resources; nevertheless, Partial Preservation Alternatives 1 through 4 would have a significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation.

If the partial preservation alternatives are combined, the impacts to individual resources would be improved, depending on the combination selected. However, the feasibility of combined alternatives has not been determined.

**IMPECTS TO THIRD STREET INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT**

The Third Street Industrial District is primarily oriented linearly north-south along the Third Street corridor between 18th and 24th streets. The location of the industries on and near Third Street was dependent on the nearby waterfront and freight-hauling Santa Fe Railroad trains that ran along Illinois Street. The historic district contains a variety of heights and densities, as is typical with industrial land uses.

District contributors on the Potrero Power Station site are located east of the primary portion of the district, at the tail of the L-shaped district. Separated from the primary portion of the district by a PG&E substation, the Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, and the Gate House are east of other Third Street-facing contributors to the district. Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are located furthest east, at the edge of the San Francisco Bay. Station A is located immediately north of the western of the two Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses at 435 23rd Street, while Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are located immediately north of the eastern of the two warehouses.

This section discusses the effects of each Partial Preservation Alternative on the Third Street Industrial District’s other contributors on and near the Potrero Power Station site, as well as on the district’s overall integrity.

**Impact of Each Partial Preservation Alternative on Historic District**

**Partial Preservation Alternative 1**

Partial Preservation Alternative 1 would rehabilitate Station A and the Boiler Stack—two of six Third Street Industrial District contributors on the site. While Unit 3 would be retained, its reuse may not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and therefore it may be altered to the extent that it would no longer remain a contributor to the historic district. The demolition or significant alteration to four contributors (Unit 3, the Meter House, Compressor House, and Gate House) would reduce the association of the two remaining contributors to the main portion of the historic district along Third Street, though they would remain in proximity to the contributing Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses immediately to the south. The demolition of the other contributing buildings on the site, coupled with new mixed-use construction, would affect the overall industrial character of Potrero Power Station property. However, the physical prominence and unique building typologies of Station A and the Boiler Stack would allow them to communicate the Third Street Industrial District’s broader industrial themes.

Despite the loss of four of the existing 25 district contributors and changes to the historic district’s integrity of setting caused by new construction on the subject site, the unique and prominent qualities of Station A and the Boiler Stack would allow the Third Street Industrial District to retain its eligibility for listing in the California Register. Thus, with mitigation, Partial Preservation Alternative 1 would cause a less than significant impact on the historic district.
Partial Preservation Alternative 2
Partial Preservation Alternative 2 would retain and rehabilitate the south portion of Station A and the Boiler Stack while redeveloping the rest of the site. Unit 3 would be retained, but its reuse may not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and therefore it may be altered to the extent that it would no longer remain a contributor to the historic district. The demolition or significant alteration to four contributors (Unit 3, the Meter House, Compressor House, and Gate House) and the north portion of Station A would reduce the association of the remaining one and a half contributors to the main portion of the historic district along Third Street, though they would remain in proximity to the contributing Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses immediately to the south. The demolition of the other contributing buildings on the site, coupled with new mixed-use construction, would affect the overall industrial character of Potrero Power Station property. Station A would only partially be able to communicate its historic function and character, though the Boiler Stack would continue communicating the Third Street Industrial District’s broader industrial themes.

Due to the loss of four and a half of 25 total district contributors, as well as changes to the historic district’s integrity of setting caused by new construction on the subject site, the proposed project’s demolition of contributors would further compromise the district’s integrity and eligibility for listing in the California Register. However, many of the unique and prominent qualities of Station A would remain, allowing the building to partially convey its industrial history and to provide a link to the rest of the Third Street Industrial District from the Boiler Stack and Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses. Therefore, the Third Street Industrial District would retain its eligibility for listing in the California Register. With mitigation, Partial Preservation Alternative 2 would cause a less than significant impact on the historic district.

Partial Preservation Alternative 3
Partial Preservation Alternative 3 would retain and rehabilitate three of six historic district contributors on the site: the Meter House, Compressor House, and the Boiler Stack. Unit 3 would be retained, but its reuse may not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and therefore it may be altered to the extent that it would no longer remain a contributor to the historic district. The demolition or significant alteration to the other three contributors (Unit 3, Station A, and the Gate House) would reduce the association of the remaining three contributors to the main portion of the historic district along Third Street, though they would remain in proximity to the contributing Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses immediately to the south. The demolition of the other contributing buildings on the site, coupled with new mixed-use construction, would affect the overall industrial character of Potrero Power Station property. However, the physical prominence and unique building typologies of the Meter House, Compressor House, and Boiler Stack would allow them to communicate the Third Street Industrial District’s broader industrial themes.

Despite the loss of three of the 25 total district contributors, as well as changes to the historic district’s integrity of setting due to new construction on the subject site, the unique qualities of the Meter House, Compressor House, and Boiler Stack, would allow the Third Street Industrial District to retain its eligibility for listing in the California Register. Thus, with mitigation, Partial Preservation Alternative 3 would cause a less than significant impact on the historic district.

Partial Preservation Alternative 4
Partial Preservation Alternative 4 would retain the facades of three contributing resources (the Meter House, Compressor House, and Station A), as well as rehabilitate the Boiler Stack. Unit 3 would be retained, but its reuse may not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and therefore it may be altered to the extent that it would no longer remain a contributor to the historic district. Thus, four of the six contributors on the site would be retained in whole or in part, while only the Gate House would be completely demolished. While the integrity of the three buildings undergoing facadism would be affected, the retention of the facades would help the site communicate the character-
defining features of the historic district to an extent. The rehabilitation of the Boiler Stack would also contribute to the site’s ability to convey the historic district’s characteristics and significance. The historic buildings would remain in proximity and association to the contributing Wester Sugar Refinery Warehouses immediately to the south. The new mixed-use construction would affect the overall industrial character of Potrero Power Station property, but the preservation of five contributors in whole or in part would continue communicating the Third Street Industrial District’s industrial themes.

Despite the loss of the Gate House, the partial loss of the three buildings undergoing facadism, and changes to the historic district’s integrity of setting caused by new construction on the subject site, the retained character-defining features of the Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, and the Boiler Stack would allow the Third Street Industrial District to retain its eligibility for listing in the California Register. As a result, with mitigation, Partial Preservation Alternative 4 would cause a less than significant impact on the historic district.

If the partial preservation alternatives are combined, the impacts to the Third Street Industrial District would be improved, depending on the combination selected. However, the feasibility of combined alternatives has not been determined.
VIII. PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

In developing the preservation alternatives, a number of other proposed alternatives were considered regarding the full or partial retention or demolition of the various historic resources on the project site, but were rejected for the reasons set forth below. For these considered but rejected partial preservation alternatives, the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated and Unit 3 would be retained. Like the Proposed Project, the reuse of Unit 3 may not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The considered but rejected partial preservation alternatives are described in more detail following Table 4 and are illustrated in site plans in Appendix B.

Table 4. Summary of Proposed Project and Considered But Rejected Preservation Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Full Preservation Alternative A</th>
<th>Full Preservation Alternative B</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative A</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative B</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Rehabs Boiler Stack and Retains Unit 3</td>
<td>Rehabs all six Historic Buildings</td>
<td>Rehabs all six Historic Buildings</td>
<td>Rehabs Station A (and the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
<td>Rehabs Meter House and Compressor House (and the Boiler Stack; retains Unit 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,682,427</td>
<td>2,663,239</td>
<td>2,139,979</td>
<td>2,599,165</td>
<td>2,579,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,497,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office + Life Sciences</td>
<td>1,243,461</td>
<td>1,191,166</td>
<td>1,361,690</td>
<td>1,214,669</td>
<td>1,335,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,262,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>241,574</td>
<td>241,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>253,417</td>
<td>253,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>946,981</td>
<td>923,560</td>
<td>852,135</td>
<td>913,868</td>
<td>938,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>898,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Percentage</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Field</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Parking</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GSF</td>
<td>5,367,860</td>
<td>5,272,956</td>
<td>4,848,795</td>
<td>5,222,693</td>
<td>5,348,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,123,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>2,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: "Rehab" is used to denote a project that would rehabilitate a historic building to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, while “retain” means that the building would not be completely demolished but the alterations may not meet the Standards. The parentheses include scope that part of the Proposed Project and would be included in each alternative.

**Full Preservation Alternatives Considered**
The following full preservation alternatives were considered but rejected for further development.

**Full Preservation Alternative A**
Full Preservation Alternative A would retain all of the exterior character-defining features of all individually eligible historic resources and Third Street Industrial District contributing resources on-site, namely, the Compressor House, Meter House, Station A, Gate House, Unit 3, and the Stack. The significant features of the historic buildings would be rehabilitated to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Station A would be used as office space, while the Meter House, Compressor House, and Gate House would be used for retail. Unit 3 would be converted to a hotel. Compared to the Full Preservation Alternative analyzed previously in this report, the considered but rejected Full Preservation Alternative A would increase the heights of several new buildings.

This alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights, and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- The 300’ residential tower proposed on Block 6 would be relocated to Block 7 and increased to 350’
- A 240’ tall office building would be added to Block 5, adjacent to the Meter House and Compressor House
- The central parking structure along with the rooftop playing field would be relocated to Block 1
- A 240’ tower would be added to Block 1
- A 180’ tower would be added to the north end of Block 13A

This considered but rejected alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -19,188 SF of Residential Uses, or -19 Dwelling Units
- -52,295 SF of Office & Life Science Uses
- +64,974 SF of Hotel Use
- -23,421 SF of Parking, or -105 stalls
- -94,904 GSF total

The proposed heights for the project site are based on urban design studies that considered view sheds and compatibility with nearby features and structures (e.g. the Stack) as well as input from community stakeholders. Generally, a maximum tower height of 180’ was considered appropriate for the site with an exception for the allowance of a single 300’ tower. This alternative was rejected because it includes 240’ high towers on Blocks 1 and 5 and a 350’ high tower on Block 7.

**Full Preservation Alternative B**
Full Preservation Alternative B would retain all of the exterior character-defining features of all individually eligible historic resources and Third Street Industrial District contributing resources on-site, namely, the Compressor House, Meter House, Station A, Gate House, Unit 3, and the Stack. The significant features of the historic buildings would be rehabilitated to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Station A would be used as office space, while the Meter House, Compressor House, and Gate House would be used for retail. Unit 3 would be converted to a hotel.
Compared to the Full Preservation Alternative analyzed previously in this report, Full Preservation Alternative B would decrease the amount of open space at Power Station Park between Blocks 7 and 11.

This alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights, and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- The 300’ residential tower proposed on Block 6 would be relocated to Block 7
- A 125’ tall office building would be added to Block 5, adjacent to the Meter House and Compressor House
- The central parking structure along with the rooftop playing field would be relocated to Block 1

Full Preservation Alternative B results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -532,448 SF of Residential Uses, or -542 Dwelling Units
- -118,229 SF of Office & Life Science Uses
- +64,974 SF of Hotel Use
- -94,846 SF of Parking, or -266 stalls
- -4% of Open Space
- -519,065 GSF total

The Department did not support Full Preservation Alternative B, as compared to the Full Preservation Alternative, because it reduced the amount of public open space.

Partial Preservation Alternatives Considered but rejected
The following partial preservation alternatives were considered but rejected for further development. For all partial preservation alternatives, the Boiler Stack would be rehabilitated and Unit 3 may also be retained.

Partial Preservation Alternative A: Rehabilitation of Station A
Partial Preservation Alternative A would retain and rehabilitate to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards the exterior character-defining features of Station A, which would be used as offices.

Compared to the Partial Preservation Alternative 1 that is analyzed previously in this report, Partial Preservation Alternative A would vary the heights at the northeast corner of the site to include a 180’ tower at Block 13B, decrease the height of Block 13A from 125’ to 85’, and make Block 14 office use instead of residential.

This alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights, and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- The 300’ residential tower proposed on Block 6 would be relocated to Block 7
- Block 13B would include a 180’ tower
- Block 14 would be office use

This alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -123,262 SF of Residential Uses, or -83 Dwelling Units
- -28,792 SF of Office & Life Science Uses
- -33,113 SF of Parking, or -92 stalls
Partial Preservation Alternative A was rejected from further consideration because it includes a 180-foot tower on Block 13B. However, the maximum feasible height of buildings on Block 13 for both the Proposed Project and the proposed preservation alternatives that have been carried forward is determined to be 85 feet, as this block will likely include 100 percent affordable housing projects. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) has indicated that buildings taller than 85 feet are not generally feasible for affordable housing construction, as buildings taller than 85 feet require Type I (or “high rise”) construction, which cannot be financed for affordable housing under current market conditions due to construction costs. Thus, Partial Preservation Alternative A was rejected.

Partial Preservation Alternative B: Rehabilitation of Meter House and Compressor House

Partial Preservation Alternative B would retain and rehabilitate all or a portion of the exterior character-defining features of the Compressor House and Meter House, which would be converted to retail.

This alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights, and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- A 60’ office building would be added to Block 5, adjacent to the Meter House and Compressor House
- The central parking structure along with the rooftop playing field would be relocated to Block 1
- Block 13B would include a 240’ tower
- Block 13A would include a 180’ tower.

This alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -102,708 SF of Residential Uses, or -102 Dwelling Units
- -92,051 SF of Office & Life Science Uses
- -8,231 SF of Parking, or -23 stalls
- -18,888 GSF total

This alternative was not supported by the Planning Department as proposed heights for the project are based on urban design studies that considered view sheds and compatibility with nearby features and structures (e.g. the Boiler Stack) as well as input from community stakeholders. Generally, a maximum height of 180’ was considered appropriate for the site with an exception for the allowance of a single 300’ tower. This alternative was rejected because it includes a 240’ high tower on Block 13B in addition to a 300’ tower. A 240-foot tower on Block 13B is also infeasible for affordable housing development, as noted above.

Partial Preservation Alternative C: Retention of Facades of Individual Resources

Partial Preservation Alternative C would retain the facades (and exterior character-defining features) of the Compressor House and Meter House while new construction would be built within and above. Compared to the Partial Preservation Alternative 4 that is analyzed previously in this report, a glass wall of new construction would envelope the historic facades of Station A, with additions above at the south and north ends of the building. The encapsulating glass walls would provide more usable floor plates. A 125’ office building would protrude from the facades of the south portion of Station A and a 300’ residential
This alternative generally follows the same land use mixes, heights, and configurations as proposed under the Proposed Project with the following changes:

- A 65’ and 180’ residential building would be added to Block 5, adjacent to the Meter House and Compressor House
- The central parking structure along with the rooftop playing field would be relocated to Block 1
- Block 13A would include a 125’ building
- Block 13B would include a 125’ portion to the north

This alternative results in a net change of the following uses compared to the Proposed Project:

- -19,416 SF of Residential Uses, or -19 Dwelling Units
- -19,449 SF of Office and Life Sciences Uses
- +64,974 SF of Hotel Use
- -16,174 SF of Parking, or -45 stalls
- -16,141 GSF total

This Partial Preservation Alternative was rejected by the Planning Department because it would not avoid a significant impact to Station A, and it mitigates the significant impact to Station A to a lesser extent than Partial Preservation Alternative 4. In addition, Partial Preservation Alternative C would include 125 foot towers on Blocks 13A and 13B, which as noted above is infeasible for affordable housing construction.

**Additional Partial Preservation Concepts that were Considered but Rejected**

One partial preservation alternative concept was rejected that would only rehabilitate and/or relocate the Guard House. This alternative was not further explored because it would not avoid a significant impact to the historic resources on the project site, and it mitigates the significant impact to a lesser extent than Partial Preservation Alternatives 1 through 4.

A partial preservation alternative concept was also rejected that would retain the exterior character-defining features of the Compressor House and Meter House, but would relocate the buildings elsewhere on-site. Both buildings have been exposed to the elements and have not been maintained for many years. As described in the earlier “Site Constraints for Preservation” section, the Compressor House’s heavy concrete roof poses structural issues for rehabilitation and relocation. Also, approximately 90 feet of the north wall of the Meter House has a shortened north façade due to the raised street grade. If the Meter House was moved, the north façade would need to be reconstructed, and a new portion built at street level that was never exposed historically. Thus, relocating either of these masonry buildings would be very difficult due to site constraints and their condition.
IX. CONCLUSION

The Proposed Project includes the demolition of the historic Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. The Proposed Project may also demolish Unit 3 or retain it as a hotel. Demolition is considered a significant and unavoidable impact on a historic resource for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This report has found that a No Project Alternative would not cause any impacts to the historic resources under CEQA; the Full Preservation Alternative would cause a less than significant impact with mitigation to individual historic resources and the Third Street Industrial District; and Partial Preservation Alternatives 1 through 4 would cause a significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation to individual resources but a less than significant impact with mitigation to the Third Street Industrial District.
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APPENDIX A: NOTICE OF PREPARATION

San Francisco Planning Department, Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of a Public Scoping Meeting (November 1, 2017)
Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of a Public Scoping Meeting

**Date:** November 1, 2017  
**Case No.:** 2017-011878ENV  
**Project Title:** Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project  
**Zoning:** M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and PDR 1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair - General)  
40-X and 65-X Height District  
**Block/Lot:** Assessor’s Block 4175/Lot 002, Block 4175/Lot 017, Block 4175/Lot 018, Block 4232/Lot 001, Block 4232/Lot 006; and non-assessed Port and City/County of San Francisco properties  
**Lot Size:** Approximately 29.0 acres (1,262,300 square feet)  
**Project Sponsor** California Barrel Company LLC  
Erin Epperson - (415) 796-8945  
e2@associatecapital.com  
**Lead Agency:** San Francisco Planning Department  
**Staff Contact:** Melinda Hue – (415) 575-9041  
melinda.hue@sfgov.org

The San Francisco Planning Department has prepared this Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in connection with the project listed above. The purpose of the EIR is to provide information about the potential significant physical environmental effects of the proposed project, to identify possible ways to minimize the project’s significant adverse effects, and to describe and analyze possible alternatives to the proposed project. The San Francisco Planning Department is issuing this NOP to inform the public and responsible and interested agencies about the proposed project and the intent to prepare an EIR. This NOP is also available online at: http://sf-planning.org/environmental-impact-reports-negative-declarations. The Planning Department also hereby gives notice of a public scoping meeting on this project.

**PROJECT OVERVIEW**

The Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development project (proposed project) is located on an approximately 29.0-acre site along San Francisco’s central bayshore waterfront, encompassing the site of the former Potrero Power Plant that closed in 2011. California Barrel Company LLC, the project sponsor, seeks to redevelop the site for a proposed multi-phased, mixed-use development, and activate a new waterfront open space.

The proposed project would rezone the site, establish land use controls, develop design standards, and provide for development of residential, commercial [including office, research and development (R&D)/life science, retail, hotel, and production, distribution, and repair (PDR)], parking, community facilities, and open space land uses. Figure 1 shows the project location.
Figure 1
Project Location
The proposed project would include amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code, creating a new Potrero Power Station Special Use District (SUD). The proposed rezoning would modify the existing height limits of 40 and 65 feet to various heights ranging from 65 to 300 feet.

Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 5.3 million gross square feet (gsf), of uses, including between approximately 2.4 and 3.0 million gsf of residential uses (about 2,400 to 3,000 dwelling units), between approximately 1.2 and 1.9 million gsf of commercial uses (office, R&D/life science, retail, hotel, and PDR), approximately 925,000 gsf of parking, and approximately 100,000 gsf of community facilities. Most new buildings would range in height from 65 to 180 feet, with one building at 300 feet. Approximately 6.3 acres would be devoted to publicly accessible open space. A more detailed breakdown of proposed land uses is described below under Project Characteristics and Components.

The proposed project would include transportation and circulation improvements, shoreline improvements, and utilities infrastructure improvements. Transportation and circulation improvements include creating a continuous street network, connecting to the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project directly north of the project site, new bus stop and shuttle service that the project would provide, and installation of traffic signals at the intersections of Illinois Street at 23rd and Humboldt Streets. The roadway network would be designed to be accessible for all modes of transportation, including vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian improvements. In addition to waterfront parks, proposed shoreline improvements could include construction of a floating dock extending out and above the tidal zone to provide access from the site to the bay for fishing and recreational watercraft. The proposed project would construct infrastructure and utilities improvements, including potable and emergency water and recycled water distribution; wastewater and stormwater collection; and natural gas and electricity distribution.

Project construction would likely occur in seven overlapping phases, with each phase lasting approximately three to six years. The first phase of construction is anticipated to start on the southeast portion of the project site and the last phase of construction would end in the northwest portion of the project site. Total construction is estimated to occur over a 16-year period, from 2020 to 2036, but could occur over a somewhat longer or shorter period, depending on market conditions and permitting requirements.

**PROJECT LOCATION**

The project site is generally bounded by 22nd Street to the north, the San Francisco Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south, and Illinois Street to the west. The approximately 29.0-acre site is comprised of the following five sub-areas, shown in Figure 2 and described below:

- **Power Station sub-area**—approximately 21.0 acres, currently owned by the project sponsor. This site includes a large portion of the site of the former power station formerly owned and operated by the Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and by NRG Potrero LLC and their predecessors.

- **PG&E sub-area**—approximately 4.8 acres owned by PG&E, located in the northwest corner of the project site, and also a portion of the site of the former power station.

- **Port sub-area**—approximately 2.9 acres owned by the City and County of San Francisco (the City) through the Port of San Francisco (Port), consisting of three noncontiguous areas. The largest area is 1.6 acres located between the Power Station sub-area and the bay; the second largest is 1.3 acres along 23rd Street between the Power Station site and Illinois Street; and the smallest piece is less than one tenth of an acre on the northeast corner of the site next to the bay.
• **Southern sub-area**—approximately 0.2 acres owned by Harrigan Weidenmuller Company, located south of the Power Station sub-area along 23rd Street.

• **City sub-area**—The City owns a triangular-shaped area less than one tenth of an acre between the Power Station and Port sub-areas along 23rd Street.

The project sponsor has received letters of authorization from the City, Port, PG&E and Harrigan Weidenmuller Company to study the project on their respective properties.

**EXISTING LAND USES AND SITE HISTORY**

**Existing Site Characteristics and Adjacent Uses**

Existing structures at the project site consist primarily of vacant buildings and facilities, as shown in Figure 3. The project site currently has little vegetation other than occasional ruderal weeds and unmaintained landscaping. Current uses on the Power Station sub-area include warehouses, parking, vehicle storage, and office space. Twenty-four structures remain on the site associated with the former power plant. The most prominent structures on the project site are the Unit 3 power block (including a 120-foot tall steel frame boiler structure and 40-foot tall turbine-generator-condenser structure, see Figure 3, Building Key No. 25) and the four-story concrete control room building (Key No. 22); the adjacent 300-foot tall concrete boiler exhaust stack (the “Stack” – Key No. 23); and the Station A buildings (including the four-story unreinforced masonry turbine hall building, see Key No. 16) and adjoining concrete with brick façade switching center building (see Key No. 15).

Although shown on Figure 3, the three large fuel oil storage tanks in the Power Station sub-area (see Key No. 6) were demolished in mid-2017 and are no longer present. PG&E is currently performing remediation of contaminants at the Power Station sub-area, as discussed further below under **Summary of Site Conditions**.

The PG&E sub-area is currently used by PG&E for storage and construction staging. It also houses power transmission equipment. The sections of the Port sub-area on the east side of the project site consist primarily of vacant land with unmaintained landscaping surrounded by a fence, rip rap, and some shoreline improvements. The sections of the Port and City sub-areas in the south portion of the project site, and privately-owned Southern sub-area, are currently part of 23rd Street and are paved.

The project site is located within the Central Waterfront neighborhood.\(^1\) Adjacent land uses in the general vicinity of the project site consist primarily of industrial, warehouse, and vacant uses. Directly to the north of the project site is the 35-acre Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project, which is currently proposed for rehabilitation and redevelopment. This area consists of historic shipyard property that is now used for a variety of temporary uses, including event venues, artist studios, storage, warehouse, parking, recycling yard, and office space. The Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project has been approved for development of up to approximately 5.3 million gsf of residential, commercial, retail/arts/light-industrial, and open space uses and improvements to existing structures; construction is planned to occur over several development phases from 2018 through 2029. San Francisco Bay lies directly east of the project site, with the site located along the central waterfront between

---

\(^1\) The Central Waterfront neighborhood includes all of the Dogpatch neighborhood and the eastern portion of the Potrero Hill neighborhood.
Figure 3
Existing Structures on Project Site

SOURCE: Perkins+Will, 2017
Piers 70 and 80. To the south of the project site, across 23rd Street, are commercial warehouse uses, including DHL Express and SF Storage, and the PG&E Transbay Cable converter station. Farther to the south, and along the bay shore is Warm Water Cove Park. To the west of the project site, across Illinois Street from the PG&E sub-area, is the American Industrial Center, a large, multi-tenant light industrial building. Adjacent to the project site to the west of the Power Station sub-area is PG&E’s Potrero Substation, a functioning high-voltage transmission substation serving San Francisco. Farther west beyond the American Industrial Center are the residential areas of the Potrero Hill and Dogpatch neighborhoods. The nearest existing residential uses are located on Third Street west of the project site.

**Zoning and Land Use Designations**

**Zoning and Height and Bulk Districts.** The Power Station sub-area is zoned M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Port sub-area is zoned M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair – General) and is located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The PG&E sub-area is zoned M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and located in the 40-X and 65-X Height and Bulk Districts. Figure 4 shows the existing zoning at the project site.

**General Plan Land Use Designations.** The project site is located within the southeastern portion of the Central Waterfront Area Plan (shown on Figure 1), which is one of the four plan areas covered by the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan that was adopted in 2009. Goals for the Central Waterfront include: “encourage development that builds on the Central Waterfront’s established character as a mixed-use working neighborhood;” “establish a land use pattern that supports and encourages transit use, walking, and biking;” and “better integrate the Central Waterfront with the surrounding neighborhoods and improve its connections to the Port land and the water’s edge.”

**Port Waterfront Land Use Plan.** The waterfront parts of the Port sub-area are located within the southern waterfront portion of the Port’s Waterfront Land Use Plan, which was adopted in 1997 and is being updated. Objectives for the Port’s southern waterfront include: “enhance public access and open space.”

**Summary of Site Conditions**

The project site has been used for various power producing and industrial activities since the mid-1800s. Starting in the 1870s and continuing until the 1930s, PG&E and its predecessors used the northeastern portion of the site for manufactured gas plant operations. Around 1910, PG&E began operating a power plant on the site, which continued to be operated by NRG Potrero LLC and its predecessors after PG&E sold the site in 1999. The power plant ceased operations in 2011. Hazardous materials from these and other industrial operations have been identified in the soils and groundwater at the site. When it sold the property, PG&E retained the responsibility to characterize and remediate soil, soil gas, and groundwater, and remediation of the site is currently underway under the oversight of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (regional board), irrespective of the proposed project.

---

Figure 4
Existing Zoning on Project Site
For the purposes of remediation, the project site is divided into five remediation areas, with one additional offshore remediation area for a total of six, as depicted on Figure 5. The remediation process for each of these areas includes conducting sampling; preparing a risk assessment; implementing appropriate remediation measures; preparing a risk management plan; and executing deed restrictions for current and future land owners. In general, PG&E's remediation plans involve removal of affected soils in some areas, in-place stabilization of areas with cement mix where affected soils are deeper, and installation of a durable cover across the entire site.

Remediation is complete at two of these six areas, comprising 60 percent of the site (i.e., the Station A remediation area, and North Switchyard and General Construction Yard remediation area), the other four are currently in various stages of the remediation decision-making process, as summarized below.

- **Station A remediation area (approximately 13 acres)** — Chemicals of concern have been identified in the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in this area, and naturally-occurring asbestos is also present in the soil. In 2015, the regional board approved a risk management plan for the Station A area that includes leaving the soil and groundwater in place and installing a durable cover to prevent contact with site soils. On February 13, 2017, the regional board issued a no further action letter for the Station A area. The regional board recorded a land use covenant that restricts future uses of the Station A area to industrial and commercial uses and requires compliance with the risk management plan. Other more sensitive land uses, such as residential, parks or playgrounds, are permitted in this area if the pre-agreed procedures specified in the risk management plan are completed and the regional board provides written approval. The project sponsor plans to submit a request to the regional board for approval for residential use in the area, and anticipates approval of the request, after the regional board reviews a risk assessment and determines what, if any, additional remedial measures must be implemented to ensure site conditions are protective of future residents. In some instances, it is anticipated that the findings of the risk assessment will show that the cover remedy imposed for commercial/industrial use is also protective for residential use so no additional remedial actions would be required. In many instances, it may be necessary to install vapor barriers or vapor recovery systems in residential buildings, and it is also possible targeted removal of contaminants may be necessary to allow residential use.

- **Unit 3 remediation area (approximately 1.5 acres)** — This remediation area includes the Unit 3 power generation facility, which was shut down in 2011. Chemicals of concern have been identified in the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in this area, and naturally-occurring asbestos is also present. On September 15, 2017, the regional board approved the site investigation report and human health risk assessment for the Unit 3 area. Based on similarities between this area and the Station A area, the regional board anticipates that the appropriate remedy for this area will include installation of a durable cover as well as preparation of a risk management plan and deed restriction, and PG&E is now in the process of updating

---

4 San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, No Further Action, Station A Area, Former Potrero Power Plant, 1201 Illinois Street, City and County of San Francisco. February 13, 2017.  
Figure 5
Remediation Areas
the plan for the Station A area to cover this area as well. PG&E anticipates that the final remedy could be in place by the end of 2017. It is expected that the same land use restrictions that apply to the Station A area for commercial and industrial uses will apply to the Unit 3 area, including the potential for a written variance by the regional board for a change in land use.

• **Northeast remediation area** *(approximately 3.5 acres)—* This area has been affected by releases from a former manufactured gas plant that was located on the Power Station sub area. Chemicals of concern have been identified in the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in this area, and naturally-occurring asbestos is also present. The Northeast Area is covered by a durable cover consisting of building foundations, pavement, or hardscape. The human health risk assessment for this area concluded that vapor intrusion mitigation measures may be required if new structures for human occupancy are constructed. PG&E prepared a draft remedial action plan for this area in January 2016, and the regional board approved the plan in July 2016.\(^7\) Durable covers will be placed over the entire remediation area to prevent human contact with the soil, and long-term groundwater monitoring will be required. Remediation is expected to begin in 2018. As part of the final remedy, it is anticipated that land uses in this area will be restricted to industrial or commercial uses and that the regional board will require compliance with a remedial action plan similar to the one for the Station A area, described above, including the specified provisions for changing future land uses to more sensitive uses. As with Station A, the project sponsor plans to submit a request to the regional board for approval for residential use in the area, and anticipates approval of the request, after the regional board reviews a risk assessment, and determines what, if any, additional remedial measures must be implemented to ensure site conditions are protective of future residents. The same process and potential additional remedial measures described for the Station A area would apply in this area.

• **Tank Farm remediation area** *(approximately 4 acres)—* This area included three large above-ground fuel tanks formerly used to house fuel oil and blended mixtures of distillate fuels consisting of Jet A, kerosene, and diesel.\(^8\) The tanks were removed in the spring of 2017, and PG&E is currently developing a work plan to investigate and characterize chemicals of concern in the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater. It is anticipated that PG&E will complete investigation of the Tank Farm Area and develop a remedy consisting of a durable cover, risk management plan, and deed restriction that allows use of the property for commercial/industrial uses. PG&E projects that the remedial action plan will be completed by the end of 2019. The final remedy is expected to include a risk management plan that will likely contain procedures for seeking regional board approval for changes in land uses to more sensitive uses, similar to that described above for the Station A area. As with Station A, the project sponsor plans to submit a request to the regional board for approval for residential use in the area, and anticipates approval of the request, after the regional board reviews a risk assessment, and determines what, if any, additional remedial measures must be implemented to ensure site conditions are protective of future residents. The same process and potential additional remedial measures described for the Station A area would apply in this area.

• **North Switchyard and General Construction Yard remediation area** *(approximately 4.8 acres, within the PG&E sub-area)—* Chemicals of concern have been identified in the soil and groundwater in this area, and

---


\(^8\) Geosyntec Consultants, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Former Potrero Power Plant, San Francisco, California. August 19, 2016
naturally-occurring asbestos is also present; no information is available on chemicals in soil vapors. In 2012, the regional board issued a no further action letter for this portion of the PG&E property; at that time, the regional board observed that this area was expected to remain in operation into the foreseeable future. PG&E prepared a site management plan that specifies requirements for the protection of human health and the environment during construction or maintenance activities such as soil excavation that could penetrate the durable cover or otherwise result in exposure to the site soil. The regional board and PG&E recorded a deed restriction for the North Switchyard and General Construction Yard in January 2012. The deed restriction requires maintenance of the site cap and compliance with the site management plan. The deed restriction also limits future land uses of the site to commercial and industrial purposes and specifies notification requirements for any excavation work greater than 50 cubic yards of soil. The site management plan provides that the plan be updated if there are changes in land use, and any updates to the plan must be approved by the regional board. As with Station A, the project sponsor plans to submit a request to the regional board for approval for residential use in the area, and anticipates approval of the request, after the regional board reviews a risk assessment, and determines what, if any, additional remedial measures must be implemented to ensure site conditions are protective of future residents. The same process and potential additional remedial measures described for the Station A area would apply in this area.

• Offshore remediation area (adjacent to the project site)— PG&E prepared a remediation plan for the Offshore Sediment Area in February 2017. The planned remedial approach for the offshore sediments includes dredging up to several feet of sediment from near the bay shoreline to remove those sediments with the highest concentration of hazardous substances. An engineered erosion protection cap or revetment will be placed over the affected area. PG&E’s remedial action will also include replacement of the revetment constructed as part of an interim remedial measure in 2010, described above for the Northeast Area. Additional remediation is planned in the transition zone, 100 to 150 feet offshore. PG&E anticipates implementing the offshore sediment remediation in the spring of 2019.

Historic Resources

A large portion of the project site is located within the Third Street Industrial District, which is eligible as an historic district on the California Register of Historical Resources, as identified as part of the Central Waterfront Historic Resources Survey Summary Report in 2008. This district, shown on Figure 1, encompasses the highest concentration of light industrial and processing properties remaining in the Central Waterfront District. The district includes good examples of the late 19th and early 20th century American industrial design.9

The project site contains four extant properties previously determined to be contributors to the Third Street Industrial District. The Meter House (ca. 1902) and the Compressor House (ca. 1924) were determined to be individually eligible for the California Register based on their associations with the PG&E gas manufacturing facility and their significance in the history of gas manufacturing in Northern California. Station A (ca. 1901) and the Gate House (ca. 1901) were also determined to be contributors to the Third Street Industrial District,

but these two buildings were found not to be individual resources due to impacted integrity. These buildings were primarily constructed of brick in the American Commercial style.

No buildings on the project site are listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

**PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS AND COMPONENTS**

The Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development project would rezone and establish development controls for a multi-phased, mixed-use development at the project site. The project would include amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code, and create a new Potrero Power Station SUD. The SUD would establish land use controls for the project site and incorporate design standards and guidelines in a new Potrero Power Station Design for Development document (D for D). The Zoning Maps would be amended to show changes from the current zoning to the proposed SUD zoning. The Zoning Map amendments would also modify the existing height limits on the portions of the project site not owned by the Port. The proposed project would include market-rate and affordable residential uses, commercial mixed uses (including office and R&D/life science uses), hotel use, PDR uses, retail uses, community facilities uses and other active uses, and parking. The proposed project would also include public access areas and open space, playing fields and other active open space uses, shoreline improvements, an internal grid of public streets, shared public ways, and utilities infrastructure. Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 5.3 million gsf of development.

**Table 1** summarizes the project’s characteristics, including a description of the types and amounts of proposed land uses, details regarding proposed dwelling units, building height limits, vehicle and bicycle parking, and other descriptors. It should be noted that the proposed project incorporates a flexible land use program, in which certain blocks on the project site may be designated for either residential or commercial uses (referred to as “flex blocks”), depending on market conditions, and could affect the type and amount of land uses on those blocks. Accordingly, the proposed project could include between approximately 2.4 and 3.0 million gsf of residential uses (between about 2,400 and 3,000 dwelling units), and between approximately 1.2 and 1.9 million gsf of commercial uses. The proposed project would also include over 925,000 gsf parking, approximately 100,000 gsf of community facilities, and approximately 6.3 acres of open space.

The proposed project would demolish about 20 existing structures on the project site, including the two historic buildings in the Power Station sub-area—the Meter House and the Compressor House—which have been identified as eligible for the California Register. Two other historic properties in the Power Station sub-area—Station A and the Gate House—would also be demolished as part of the proposed project; these two properties have been identified as contributors to the historic Third Street Industrial District, but neither are considered individual resources because of their current lack of integrity. Under the proposed land use program, the project would rehabilitate Unit 3 power block, and convert the Unit 3 power block into a hotel. However, under the proposed flexible land use program, residential land use could be developed on Block 9 instead of a hotel, in which case, the Unit 3 power block would be demolished.
### TABLE 1

**POTRERO POWER STATION MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Characteristic</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Site Size and Shape</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>29.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Length and Width</td>
<td>Approximately 1,650 feet by 950 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Land Use Program</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>Area (gsf)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,682,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Retail)</td>
<td>107,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Office)</td>
<td>597,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (R&amp;D/life science)</td>
<td>645,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Hotel)</td>
<td>241,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (PDR)</td>
<td>45,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>100,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>946,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Area</strong></td>
<td>5,367,860 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Dwelling Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bedroom</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Dwelling Units</strong></td>
<td>2,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Parking</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Parking Spaces&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Spaces</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>Area (gsf)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Class 1</td>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Class 2</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bicycle Parking</strong></td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area (gsf)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly Accessible Open Space</td>
<td>Approximately 6.3 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Open Space</td>
<td>36 square feet per unit if located on balcony, or 48 square feet per unit if commonly accessible to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Characteristics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area (gsf)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>5 to 30 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>65 to 180 feet; one building at 300 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td>All blocks would include ground floor active/retail/production space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basements</td>
<td>All development blocks would allow but not require one below-grade level of vehicle parking spaces&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

POTRERO POWER STATION MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gsf = gross square feet; R&amp;D = research and development; PDR = production, distribution, and repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a All numbers in this table are approximate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b The proposed project includes a number of Flex Blocks, for which either residential or certain commercial uses may ultimately be selected. The numbers shown in this table show the anticipated development of the flex blocks, assuming either residential or commercial development at each flex block. The EIR will discuss the potential for variation in the total amount of residential and commercial development on the Flex Blocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0.6 space per residential unit; one space per 1,500 square feet of commercial office, R&amp;D/life science, or PDR uses; 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet of grocery store use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d The number of bicycle parking spaces reflects Planning Code requirements, as follows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential: One Class 1 bicycle parking space for each dwelling unit up to 100 plus one space for every four units in excess of 100; one Class 2 bicycle parking space for every 20 dwelling units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Office: One Class 1 bicycle parking space for every 5,000 square feet of occupied floor area; two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces up to 5,000 square feet of OFA plus one for each 50,000 square feet of OFA in excess of 5,000 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Laboratory and PDR: One Class 1 bicycle parking space for every 12,000 square feet of OFA; two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces up to 50,000 square feet of OFA, and an additional two for laboratory spaces in excess of 50,000 square feet of OFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retail: One Class 1 bicycle parking space per 7,500 square feet of OFA; two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces plus one per 2,500 square feet up to 50,000 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hotel: One Class 1 space per 30 rooms; one Class 2 space per 30 rooms and one Class 1 space per 5,000 square feet of conference space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Basement parking is accounted for in the above line item for parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: California Barrel Company, EEA PPA Application Package, Potrero Power Station Mixed Use Development, October 2017

Proposed Land Use Plan

Figure 6 presents the proposed land use plan. As shown in Figure 6, Blocks Nos. 4, 12, and 14 would have a “Flex Residential or Commercial” land use designations, and Block No. 9/Unit 3 would have a “Flex Hotel or Residential” land use designation. Otherwise, blocks in the northwest and central interior portions of the project site would be designated “Residential,” and blocks along the project site’s north and south sides would be designated “Research & Development/Office.” In the central-west area of the project site, Block No. 5 would be designated “Residential and District Parking Garage.” Areas designated “Publicly Accessible Open Space” would be located along east-west and north-south axes within the interior of the project site and along the waterfront adjacent to the bay. Ground floor frontages along 23rd Street would host PDR use, and ground floors on blocks fronting the waterfront and open space areas would contain retail (e.g., outdoor cafes and dining). All other ground floors would contain active uses (e.g., neighborhood retail or residential units).

Under the proposed project, the existing Unit 3 power block is proposed to be rehabilitated and converted into a hotel, with public access at the ground floor and a rooftop bar. In addition, the 300-foot tall Stack would be seismically stabilized and preserved. A plaza in front of Unit 3 and at the base of the Stack would connect the structure to a proposed Power Station Park. However, as noted above, if residential land use is developed on Block 9 instead of a hotel, then the Unit 3 power block would be demolished.

The proposed project could include the construction of a dock to be used for fishing and to allow people to access the water from the project site. The facility would have a pile-supported fixed pier structure that extends out over and above the tidal zone. An approximately three-foot-wide, 80-foot-long gangway would extend from the fixed pier to a floating dock, which would be held in place by guide piles. The floating dock would be approximately 15 feet wide and 120 feet long, and composed of composite boxes with foam infill or reinforced concrete. The elevation of the pier structure is proposed to be slightly higher than current elevations of the shoreline to account for sea level rise in the future.
Unit 3 would be demolished if Block 9 is developed with Residential land use and not Hotel land use.

SOURCE: Perkins+Will, 2017

Figure 6
Proposed Land Use Plan
Height and Bulk

Figure 7 presents the proposed height district plan. The proposed project would include amendments to the Zoning Map on the portions of the project site not owned by the Port to modify the existing height limits of 40 and 65 feet to heights ranging from 65 up to 300 feet. As shown in Figure 7, proposed height limits would generally step up from east to west across the project site and then step down again towards Illinois Street. Block 9 and the eastern portion of Block 4 would have proposed height limits of 65 feet facing the bay. Blocks 1, 5 and 7 would contain up to 180-foot height limits, and Block 6 would have a 300-foot height limit. Several of the project site blocks (No. 1, 6, 7 and 8) would allow for podium structures with height limits (65 to 85 feet) lower than the upper level heights; and other blocks (4 and 5) would have split zoning heights.

Design for Development

The Design for Development (D for D) would be adopted as part of the proposed SUD. The D for D would articulate standards and guidelines for building design, open space character, and the public realm. Standards in the D for D would be mandatory, measurable, and quantitative design specifications. The design guidelines would be more qualitative and flexible. The proposed Planning Code amendments (included in the SUD) and the D for D would, together, guide and control all development within the SUD after project entitlements are obtained. Subsequent submittals of proposed building designs would be evaluated for consistency with both the SUD and the D for D.

The D for D would establish controls for bulk restriction, articulation and modulation, building materials and treatment, building frontage utilization, design parameters for open space, streets, and parking and loading standards.

Open Space Improvements

As shown in Figure 8, the proposed project would provide approximately 6.3 acres of publically accessible open space. These improvements are intended to complement the planned adjacent Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project waterfront improvements; extend the Blue Greenway and Bay Trail through the project site; and create an urban waterfront space, activated by the proposed uses in the buildings adjacent to the waterfront-facing open spaces. Key components of the open space program area are described below:

- **Waterfront Park and Potrero Nuevo Point Park.** This proposed approximately 2.8-acre waterfront park would extend the Blue Greenway and Bay Trail from the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project through the project site, and provide spill-out spaces for retail, quiet spaces, waterfront viewing terraces, and a waterfront playground. The adjacent proposed Potrero Point Park on the Port sub-area would contain a 1.2-acre park that would extend as a bulb-shaped area into the bay.

- **Louisiana Paseo.** This proposed 0.7-acre plaza-type open space adjacent to Blocks 6 and 10 would have spill out space for outdoor dining, and a path to the proposed Power Station Park.

- **Power Station Park.** This proposed 1.2-acre central green space would extend east-west through the interior of the project site and connect the Louisiana Paseo to the waterfront. This park would contain
Figure 7
Proposed Height District Plan

SOURCE: Perkins+Will, 2017
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flexible lawn spaces suitable to accommodate two adjacent U-6 soccer fields. 10 The portion of the proposed Power Station Park between the Louisiana Paseo and Maryland Street would be intended for community building activities such as an outdoor game room.

- **Rooftop Soccer Field.** A public open space is proposed on a portion of the roof of the parking structure on Block 5. This rooftop open space would include a 0.7-acre U-10 soccer field. 11

**Vehicle Parking**

As shown in Table 1, the proposed project would provide between 2,622 and 2,690 vehicle off-street parking spaces, depending on the final use of each flex block. No off-street parking would be provided for proposed retail uses on the project site. The proposed centralized parking facility to be located at the intersection of Humboldt Street and Georgia Street would contain approximately 756 parking spaces. All parking would be accessory to principal uses. Approximately 35 on-street passenger loading spaces would be provided along the internal streets and approximately 34 commercial delivery spaces would be provided, either through in-building loading docks or on-street loading zones along the internal streets. Additionally, the project would be designed with about 179 on-street parking spaces.

All development blocks would allow—but not require—parking one level below-grade or parking within above-grade podium levels wrapped with active uses. The proposed project would include 50 car-share parking spaces located in a limited number of on-street parking spaces, as well as in buildings with podium/underground parking and in the proposed centralized parking facility.

**Bicycle Parking**

At least 1,417 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces would be located either on the ground floor of each building or in the first sub-grade level of each building, and in all events in the locations compliant with the Planning Code. The proposed project would include 259 to 262 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, all of which would be located in the right-of-way adjacent to each building or in the publicly accessible open space. 12, 13

**Transportation and Circulation Plan**

Figure 9 shows the proposed street plan. The north-south streets include Michigan, Georgia, Maryland, and Delaware Streets, which would connect the project site to 22nd Street; Georgia, Maryland, and Delaware Streets would connect to 23rd Street, although Georgia Street would be slightly offset at Humboldt Street before connecting to 23rd Street. East-west streets include Humboldt and 23rd Streets, which would connect

---

10 U-6 soccer fields refer to soccer fields for children under six years old, and generally measure approximately 20 yards in width by 30 yards in length.
11 U-10 soccer fields refer to soccer fields for children under ten years old, and generally measure approximately 40 yards in width by 60 yards in length.
12 Average number presented; the actual number of bicycle parking spaces will vary based on the selected use of each Flex Block.
13 Section 155.1(a) of the planning code defines class 1 bicycle spaces as “spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, nonresidential occupants, and employees” and defines class 2 bicycle spaces as “spaces located in a publicly-accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use.”
Proposed Street Type Plan
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Proposed Signalization

Note: Terminology is according to San Francisco Better Streets.
to Illinois Street on the west and Delaware Street on the east. The proposed interior neighborhood streets are Georgia Street, Maryland Street, and Delaware Street, each in a north-south alignment. Delaware Street, north of Humboldt Street, would become a shared public way with the street and pedestrian walking surface at the same grade as it enters the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project. A service lane would be added at the northern boundary of the project site, straddling the property line with the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project.

As shown on Figure 9, the project includes a Humboldt Street alternate condition, which applies only to the westernmost segment of Humboldt Street located on PG&E property. The proposed project would expand the width of Humboldt Street along its entire extent across the project site, but this alternate condition would occur only if PG&E does not agree to the proposed street width on its property, in which case the roadway would be narrower along this segment.

The proposed street improvements would connect to the planned development in the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project to create a continuous street network in the project vicinity, and similarly, the planned extended Blue Greenway and Bay Trail would provide pedestrian access along the waterfront between the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project and the project site. Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, and Delaware Streets would connect the project site to the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project.

The proposed project would include vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements to 23rd and Humboldt Streets to accommodate the anticipated increase in on-site activity.

The proposed new streets would provide access for emergency vehicles, on-street parking, and off-street passenger and freight loading. Humboldt, Maryland, and Delaware Streets would be designed as primary on-street loading corridors. The project site would be accessible for all modes of transportation via 23rd Street, Humboldt Street, Georgia Street, and Maryland Street, Michigan Street, Louisiana Street, and Delaware Street.

The proposed project would include the installation of traffic signals at the intersections of Illinois Street with both 23rd and Humboldt Streets.

**Transit.** A bus stop would be built on the project site to accommodate the proposed SFMTA “XX” bus route at the intersection of Maryland Street and 23rd Street. The proposed XX bus route would enter the project site on Maryland Street from the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project, and a bus layover would be located on 23rd Street between Maryland and Delaware Streets. The proposed bus layover would accommodate two, 40-foot-long buses and would provide a bathroom facility nearby for drivers.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Network.** The proposed project would include a pedestrian and bicycle network. It would allocate space for bike share dock(s) onsite and include a network of new pedestrian pathways and Class I and II bicycle facilities to contribute to the continuous Blue Greenway/Bay Trail that provides continuous waterfront access from the Embarcadero, including Crane Cove Park, Slipways Commons, and Warm Water Cove.

---

14 The connection on Delaware Street would be for pedestrians only.
Transportation Demand Management. The proposed project would include a Transportation Demand Management program (TDM). With a goal of achieving a sustainable land use development, the TDM would prioritize pedestrian and bicycle access and implement measures to encourage alternative modes of transportation. Alternative modes of transportation would be encouraged through building a dense, walkable, mixed-use, transit-oriented development, encouraging bicycling and walking and prioritizing safety, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Key strategies in the TDM would be bike sharing stations and other means to encourage bicycle use, unbundled parking, car-sharing services, and other approaches to discourage use of single-occupant private vehicles. The proposed project would implement amenities and education strategies regarding transportation choices, including real-time occupancy data for shared parking facilities and production of brochures and newsletters.

The TDM would also include a shuttle service program, anticipated to provide service at 15-minute intervals during peak times, and provide access to the BART 16th Street station and Caltrain station at Fourth and King Streets.

Infrastructure and Utilities

In addition to transportation and circulation improvements, the proposed project would develop other infrastructure and utilities systems to support the proposed uses. This would include the following:

- **Potable Water.** The project would construct potable water distribution pipelines within the planned streets that would connect to existing water lines in 23rd and Illinois Streets. To reduce potable water demand, high-efficiency fixtures and appliances would be installed in new buildings.

- **Recycled Water.** The project site is located within a designated recycled water use area, and the project would provide the piping needed to distribute recycled water when it becomes available, as required under San Francisco’s Recycled Water Use Ordinance.

- **Non-potable Water.** Similarly, the project would comply with San Francisco’s Non-potable Water Ordinance and would include the diversion and reuse of graywater and rainwater for toilet and urinal flushing and irrigation.

- **High Pressure Water.** The proposed project would include the extension of the high pressure auxiliary water supply system (AWSS) distribution line to the project site by connecting to the existing 14-inch line in Third Street at its intersection with 23rd Street. The line would be installed in 23rd Street to the intersection with Maryland Street, and then extend through the site, northerly in Maryland Street, and connect to the AWSS system proposed to be constructed under the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project.

- **Wastewater.** Wastewater from the project site is currently collected and conveyed in the existing combined sewer system within Illinois Street and treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. The project would extend wastewater collection lines throughout the project site. The wastewater within the Power Station sub-area would be collected and conveyed to a pump station on the eastern portion of the site. From the pump station a force main would convey the wastewater to the existing combined sewer system.
• **Stormwater.** The proposed project would include a stormwater management system that would meet the City’s stormwater management ordinance. The system would be designed with low-impact design concepts and stormwater management systems, designed to retain and reuse some of the stormwater captured on site. The proposed project also may treat and discharge stormwater via outfalls to the bay, adhering to San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

• **Electricity.** The project site has electrical service from existing overhead power lines adjacent to the site. The proposed project would extend underground electrical distribution lines to serve each proposed building. Other existing electrical facilities within the site will either be maintained or relocated.

• **Natural Gas.** There is existing natural gas service to the project site in Humboldt Street. The proposed project would extend natural gas distribution lines throughout the project site, connecting to the existing facilities on Illinois Street and 23rd Street.

**Sustainability Plan**

The proposed project would establish a Sustainability Plan that outlines performance and monitoring criteria for its operation. To address the potential hazard of future sea level rise in combination with storm and high tide conditions, the proposed project would make physical improvements to the shoreline, such as berms, seawalls, or rip rap replacement. As part of the first construction phase, elevations at the shoreline would be increased by approximately 3 to 7 feet to address sea level rise risk and wave run-up, and the finished floor elevations for the ground floors of buildings on Blocks 3, 4, 8, 9, and 12 would be increased to take into account the potential 100-year flood with future sea level rise of up to 66 inches.

The proposed project would comply with the state’s Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, the San Francisco Green Building Requirements for renewable energy, and the Better Roof Requirements for Renewable Energy Standards. At least 15 percent of the roof area of residential and commercial buildings would be equipped with roof-mounted or building integrated solar photovoltaic systems and/or roof-mounted solar thermal hot water systems. Different approaches to the energy system, including a district energy system distribution loop or capturing heat from the district’s wastewater system, will be explored as part of the Sustainability Plan to be included in the proposed project.

**PROJECT CONSTRUCTION**

**Construction Schedule**

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to occur in phases over the course of 16 years, from 2020 to 2036. The initial phase of construction (Phase 0), from 2020 to approximately 2022, would include demolition, site preparation and rough grading for the entire project site, including construction of interim surface parking improvements for use by construction vehicles as well as site users prior to the construction of permanent parking facilities.

After the initial construction phase (Phase 0), there would be seven construction phases corresponding to seven areas, each consisting of two to three blocks and associated areas for streets and open spaces. Construction duration in each area would range from five to six years, with construction activities occurring
up to six days a week. Nighttime construction activity would likely occur during Phase 1, before there is residential occupancy in the project site. Throughout the project site, construction activities in each area would commence following completion of remediation activities in that area, and all construction would be conducted consistent with requirements of the applicable regional board-approved risk management plan.

Figure 10 shows the proposed seven areas for the construction phasing, and Table 2 presents the anticipated construction schedule for each phase. However, Phases 6 and 7 would be within the PG&E sub-area, and construction of these areas and the adjacent street improvements would only occur when and if PG&E authorizes construction of these phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 0</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demolition, Soil Excavation and Grading

As noted above, the project would require demolishing about 20 structures, encompassing about 100,000 square feet.

The proposed grading plan would maintain the existing drainage patterns of the project site, with elevations sloping gently west to east toward the waterfront. The proposed elevations of the public access areas and proposed buildings along the waterfront, and as noted above, would include protection from sea level rise.

Although PG&E’s environmental remediation activities are independent of the project, the project may include excavation by the project sponsor of contaminated soil and other remedial measures to the extent the regional board requires such activities to allow residential use or to address previously unknown contaminants discovered during the course of project construction. Soil excavation would also occur during construction of the proposed project, including, for example, to allow construction of subterranean parking garages.

All dates in Table 2 are approximate estimates and could be affected by market conditions, PG&E’s remediation process, the City’s permitting process, among other factors.
Figure 10
Proposed Project Phasing Plan
Building Foundations

Construction of the proposed project would require deep foundations for moderately to heavily loaded structures built in areas outside (bayward) of the historic 1851 shoreline (shown on Figure 1), but shallow foundations made with spread footings with slab-on-grade or a structural mat foundation could be used inland of the historic 1851 shoreline. Structures in the vicinity of the historic 1851 shoreline may be founded on intermediate foundations using spread footings or a structural mat foundation, underlain by improved soil. Shallow foundations are currently anticipated for Phases 2, 4, 6, and 7. Deep foundations are anticipated during Phases 1 and 3. Phases 1, 3, and 4 may involve intermediate foundations.

Deep foundations would be comprised of steel pipe-piles driven to bedrock. Pile driving operations would likely be performed over a maximum duration of six weeks per building, with about two piles installed per hour, on average, and approximately 400 to 500 piles per structure. The maximum pile length for the project is anticipated to be 70 feet, and pile diameters are anticipated to range from 14 to 16 inches in diameter. The project would include controlled rock fragmentation on the project site as an alternative to blasting, where appropriate.

REQUIRED PROJECT APPROVALS

The proposed project is subject to review and approvals by several local, regional, state, and federal agencies. Certification of the Final EIR by the San Francisco Planning Commission, which would be appealable to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, is required before any other discretionary approval or permits would be issued for the proposed project. The proposed project may require major project approvals and/or plan amendments from the following:

Federal Agencies

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
  • Possible Clean Water Act section 404/Rivers and Harbors Act section 10 Permit

U.S. Fish and Wildlife
  • Approval and/or permits for potential impacts to federally listed species under the federal Endangered Species Act

National Marine Fisheries Service
  • Possible Essential Fish Habitat Consultation
  • Possible Federal Endangered Species Act Consultation

State and Regional Agencies

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
  • Approval of permits for improvements and activities within the commission’s jurisdictions

Regional Water Quality Control Board - San Francisco Bay Region
  • Approval of Section 401 water quality certification
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- Approval of requests for residential or other sensitive uses in areas with a land use covenant restricting such uses without regional board approval
- Site-specific approval of soil disturbance activities under the applicable Risk Management Plan
- General Construction Stormwater Permit

Bay Area Air Quality Management District
- Approval of any necessary air quality permits (e.g., Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate) for individual air pollution sources, such as boilers and emergency diesel generators

California Public Utilities Commission
- Approval of any relocated PG&E operations, if applicable

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Approval and/or permits for potential impacts to state-listed and California Department of Fish and Wildlife managed species under the California Endangered Species Act.

Local Agencies
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
- Approval of general plan amendments
- Approval of planning code amendments and associated zoning map amendments
- Approval of a Development Agreement
- Approval of Final Subdivision Map
- Approval of street vacations, dedications and easements for public improvements, and acceptance (or delegation to Public Works Director to accept) of public improvements, as necessary

San Francisco Planning Commission
- Certification of the Final EIR
- Approval of Proposition M Office Allocation per Planning Code section 321, to the extent applicable
- Approval of Special Use District Design for Development
- Initiation and recommendation to board to approve amendments to the general plan
- Initiation and recommendation to the board to approve planning code amendments adopting a Special Use District and associated zoning map amendments
- Recommendation to board to approve a Development Agreement

San Francisco Port Commission
- Adoption of findings regarding Public Trust consistency, if applicable
- Consent to a Development Agreement and recommendation to the board to approve, if applicable
- Approval of project construction-related permits for property within Port jurisdiction
- Approval of Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control Permit

San Francisco Department of Building Inspection
- Issue demolition, grading, and site construction permits

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
- Consent to Development Agreement
San Francisco Department of Public Works
- Review of subdivision maps and presentation to the board for approval
- Consent to Development Agreement
- Issuance of public works street vacation order, if applicable

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Approval of transit improvements, public improvements and infrastructure, including certain roadway improvements, bicycle infrastructure and loading zones, to the extent included in the project, if any.
- Consent to Development Agreement.

San Francisco Fire Department
- Consent to Development Agreement

San Francisco Department of Public Health
- Oversee compliance with San Francisco Health Code Article 22A (Maher Ordinance)

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The San Francisco Planning Department is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed project on the environment. The EIR will be prepared in compliance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, sections 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, and will address project-specific construction and operational impacts. The EIR is an informational document for use by governmental agencies and the public to aid in the planning and decision-making process. The EIR will disclose any physical environmental effects of the project and identify possible ways of reducing or avoiding its potentially significant impacts.

The EIR will address all environmental issue topics required under CEQA. The EIR will evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project resulting from construction and operation activities, and will propose mitigation measures for impacts determined to be significant. The EIR will also identify potential cumulative impacts that consider impacts of the project in combination with impacts of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects. The EIR will address all environmental topics in the San Francisco Planning Department’s CEQA environmental checklist. Key environmental topics that will be addressed in the EIR are listed below.

- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Cultural Resources
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Wind and Shadow
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Biological Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources
- Hydrology, Water Quality, and Sea Level Rise
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral and Energy Resources
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
In addition, the EIR will include an analysis of the comparative environmental impacts of feasible alternatives to the proposed project that would reduce or avoid significant impacts of the project while still meeting most of the project objectives. Alternatives to be considered include a no project alternative, which considers reasonably foreseeable conditions at the project site if the proposed project is not implemented, as well as partial and full historic preservation alternatives, which consider alternative project scenarios that would partially and/or fully preserve the historic resources that would be demolished under the proposed project. Other alternatives will be evaluated as necessary, depending on the results of the impact analyses of the various environmental topics listed above.

**FINDING**

This project may have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report is required. This determination is based upon the criteria of the state CEQA Guidelines, sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effects) and 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and upon the magnitude and nature of proposed project construction and operations as described in the above project description.

**PUBLIC SCOPE PROCESS**

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code section 21083.9 and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines section 15206, a public scoping meeting will be held to receive oral comments concerning the scope of the EIR. The meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 15, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. at the project site located at 420 23rd Street, San Francisco, California. To request a language interpreter or to accommodate persons with disabilities at the scoping meeting, please contact the staff contact listed above at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Written comments will also be accepted at this meeting and until 5:00 p.m. on December 1, 2017. Written comments should be sent to Melinda Hue, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103; by fax to 415-558-6409 (Attn: Melinda Hue); or by email to melinda.hue@sfgov.org.

If you work for a responsible state agency, we need to know the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering a permit or other approval for this project. Please include the name of a contact person in your agency.

Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Planning Commission or the Planning Department. All written or oral communications, including submitted personal contact information, may be made available to the public for inspection and copying upon request and may appear on the department’s website or in other public documents.

Date: 10/30/17

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer

SAN FRANCISCO
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APPENDIX B: PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES GRAPHICS

Associate Capital and Perkins + Will, Potrero Power Station Preservation Alternatives Graphics (February 21, 2018)
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APPENDIX C: ABILITY OF PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES TO MEET PROJECT SPONSOR’S OBJECTIVES- MATRIX

The table is for high-level comparison purposes of the preservation alternatives only. Explanations will only be included if further elaboration is needed to compare the alternative to the Proposed Project. The table assumes that the Proposed Project was designed to meet all of the project sponsors’ objectives and that the No Project Alternative does not meet any of the objectives.
## Matrix: Ability of Alternatives to Meet Project Sponsor's Project Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsors’ Objectives</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Full Preservation Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 1</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 2</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 3</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redevelop former power plant site to provide a mix of residential, retail, office, Production, Distribution, and Repair (“PDR”), R&amp;D space, a hotel, and activate waterfront open spaces to support a daytime population in a vibrant neighborhood retail district and to provide employment opportunities within walking distance to residents of the surrounding neighborhood.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to San Francisco Bay and create a pedestrian- and bicycle- friendly environment along the waterfront, by opening the eastern shore of the site to the public and extending the Bay Trail and the Blue Greenway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsors’ Objectives</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>Full Preservation Alternative</td>
<td>Partial Preservation Alternative 1</td>
<td>Partial Preservation Alternative 2</td>
<td>Partial Preservation Alternative 3</td>
<td>Partial Preservation Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide active open space uses such as playing fields and a playground to improve access to sports, recreational, and playground facilities in the Dogpatch, Potrero Hill, and Bayview neighborhoods and complement other nearby passive open space uses and parks in the Central Waterfront.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides equal amount of playing fields and playground but in different configuration or locations.</td>
<td>Provides equal amount of playing fields and playground but in different configuration or locations.</td>
<td>Provides equal amount of playing fields and playground but in different configuration or locations.</td>
<td>Provides equal amount of playing fields and playground but in different configuration or locations.</td>
<td>Provides equal amount of playing fields and playground but in different configuration or locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the City’s supply of housing to contribute to the City’s General Plan Housing Element goals, and the Association of Bay Area Governments’ Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the City by maximizing the number of dwelling units, particularly housing near transit.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes 412 fewer dwelling units (84% of the Proposed Project).</td>
<td>Includes 233 fewer dwelling units (91% of the Proposed Project).</td>
<td>Includes same number of units as the Proposed Project.</td>
<td>Includes 219 fewer dwelling units (92% of the Proposed Project).</td>
<td>Includes 186 fewer dwelling units (93% of the Proposed Project).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract a diversity of household types by providing dense, mixed-income housing, including below-market rate units.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 9, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsors’ Objectives</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Full Preservation Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 1</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 2</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 3</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redevelop the PG&amp;E sub-area with community facilities, PDR, and affordable housing.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a neighborhood resilient to projected levels of sea level rise and earthquakes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate the Project and the anticipated adjacent Pier 70 project into a single neighborhood, by creating a network of streets and pedestrian pathways that connect to the street and pedestrian network.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an iconic addition to the City’s skyline as part of the Dogpatch neighborhood and the Central Waterfront.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Creates a network of streets and pedestrian pathways to connect Pier 70 project. Grade challenges at Meter House and Compressor House would affect some connecting pathways.
- Preserves the Boiler Stack and proposes iconic 300-foot tower.
### Project Sponsors’ Objectives

<p>| Provide opportunities for outdoor dining and gathering and create an active waterfront in the evening hour by encouraging ground floor retail and restaurant uses with outdoor seating along the waterfront. | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Build adequate parking and vehicular and loading access to serve the needs of project residents, workers, and their visitors. | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Construct a significant increment of new Production, Distribution, and Repair (“PDR”) uses in order to provide a diverse array of commercial and industrial opportunities in a dynamic mixed use environment. | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Create a circulation and transportation system that emphasizes transit-oriented development, and promotes the use of public transportation and car-sharing through an innovative and comprehensive demand management program. | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsors’ Objectives</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Full Preservation Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 1</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 2</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 3</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate leadership in sustainable development by constructing improvements intended to reduce the neighborhood’s per capita use of electrical, natural gas, water, and wastewater infrastructure.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a development that is financially feasible, that allows for the delivery of the proposed level of infrastructure, public benefits, and affordable housing, and that can fund the Project’s capital costs and on-going operation and maintenance costs relating to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Property.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct a waterfront hotel use in order to provide both daytime and nighttime activity on the waterfront promenade.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. INTRODUCTION

This Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) has been prepared at the request of Associate Capital for the Potrero Power Station.¹ The irregularly shaped industrial site is bordered by 22nd Street to the north, the San Francisco Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south and Illinois Street to the west; the semi-circular terminus of 23rd Street is also included in the subject site. The subject site sits within San Francisco’s Central Waterfront neighborhood, south of the Pier 70 mixed-use project (Figure 1-Figure 2). The subject site is addressed as 1201 Illinois Street and encompasses the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 4232/006; 4232/001; 4175/002, 4175/017 and 4175/018. Historically, the site was utilized for gunpowder production and then as part of California Barrel Company operations. It functioned as a sugar refinery from 1881 to 1951 and as a power plant from 1902 to 2011.² The site sits within a PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution & Repair -1- General) and M-2 (Heavy Industrial) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.³

The first part of this report outlines a general site history, provides a reconnaissance survey, and evaluates extant buildings, structures, and features for eligibility to the California Register as individual resources and/or contributors to a cultural landscape or historic district. Four extant buildings on the subject property have already been determined to be contributors to the Third Street Industrial District, which was identified in the Central Waterfront Cultural Resources Survey (2008) and is a recognized historic resource in San Francisco for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Additionally, the Meter House (ca.1902), Compressor House (ca.1924), and Station A (1901-02; 1930-31) were found individually eligible for listing in the California Register. The Gate House (ca.1914) and the Pump House (1930) were determined not to be individually eligible based on lack of integrity.

This report includes an analysis of additional buildings, structures and other features within the subject areas that have not previously been documented or evaluated for listing in the California Register.

---

¹ The subject site has also been referenced in prior documentation as the “Potrero Power Plant.”
² Power plant operations on the site were first conducted by Claus Spreckels’ Independent Gas & Power Company beginning in 1901-02, followed by the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company in 1903, followed by the Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG & E) in 1905. PG & E operated on the site until 1999 when was purchased by The Southern Company. The power station ceased operations in 2011 under the ownership of NRG.
³ Per the San Francisco Property Information Map, all subject parcels sit within a 40-X Height and Bulk District except for the northwest parcel (APN 4175/018) which is both 40-X and 65-X.
As of July 2017, the three large fuel storage tanks located between 22nd and Humboldt streets were demolished.
A proposed project seeks to create a new San Francisco neighborhood at the subject site, involving the construction of multiple new buildings, transportation and circulation improvements, new and upgraded utilities and infrastructure, and new public open space. New multi-modal streets would be constructed and off-street parking facilities would be provided. Pedestrian pathways would be constructed throughout the project site as well as transit facilities including one or more bus stops. The proposed project would create new bicycle pathways and facilities and bicycle parking.

**METHODOLOGY**

This report follows the outline provided by the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department) for Historic Resource Evaluation reports, in combination with guidelines for cultural landscape evaluation derived from *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques* and *National Register Bulletin No. 18: How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes* and guidelines for district analysis derived from the *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.*

Page & Turnbull prepared this report using research collected at various local repositories, including the San Francisco Planning Department (Address File Records), San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco Office of the Assessor-Recorder, and the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, along with various other online sources. Additional sources informed this report, including but not limited to: “Historical Assessment of Fuel Storage Tanks 3, 4 and 5” authored by Jonathan Lammers in 2016; “Historical Assessment of Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses” authored by Jonathan Lammers in 2017; “Phase 1 Environmental Assessment: Former Potrero Power Plant” authored by Geosyntec Consultants in 2016; “State of California State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, In the Matter of: Mirant’s (Formerly Southern Energy) Potrero Power Plant Unit 7, Docket No. 00-AFC-4, Prepared Testimony of Regarding Cultural Resources,” by Christopher VerPlanck, Charles Chase, and Paul Groth in 2002; “Historic Architecture Report, Station A, Potrero Power Plant” authored by Dames & Moore in 1999; the “Central Waterfront Survey and Summary Report Draft Context Statement” authored by The San Francisco Planning Department in 2001; “Historic Architecture Report for 435 23rd Street City and County of San Francisco,” including a DPR 523B form for the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses by Michael Corbett in 2001; and the “State of California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record: Potrero Point Historic District” authored by Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull in 2008. Page & Turnbull conducted a site visit in June 2017 to review the existing conditions of the property and formulate the descriptions and assessments included in this report. Page & Turnbull attended a second site visit in July 2017 with members of the San Francisco Planning Department and ESA, the project’s environmental consultant. All photographs were taken by Page & Turnbull in June-July 2017 and all maps are oriented north unless otherwise noted.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The subject site includes three extant and previously documented individually eligible properties to the California Register: the Meter House (ca.1902), the Compressor House (ca.1924), and Station A (1901-02; 1930-31). Page & Turnbull believes the construction date of the Meter House to be ca.1902, rather than the 1914 date recorded on the DPR 523 form, due to the fact that the building is depicted on the 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. Ward Hill of Dames & Moore determined the period of significance for both the Meter House and Compressor House to span from their dates of construction to 1930, at which point the supply of cleaner and less expensive natural gas increased and reliance on manufactured gas diminished. These buildings were determined individually eligible based on their association with the Pacific Gas & Electric’s (PG&E) gas manufacturing facility and their significance in the history of gas manufacturing in Northern California.
Though Station A (1901-02; 1930-31) was evaluated and found not to be an individual resource due to impacted integrity in the Dames & Moore report, it was subsequently identified as individually significant and eligible for listing in the California Register under Criteria 1 and 3 as part of expert testimony in 2002 in a case regarding the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Application for Certification.\textsuperscript{7} The expert testimony was on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco. While there has been disagreement regarding the integrity of Station A among professional architectural historians, for the purposes of CEQA review, this report takes the position that Station A is an individual historic resource.

The Gate House (ca.1914) was previously evaluated and found not to be individual resources due to impacted integrity.

In addition, the Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, and the Gate House were all previously determined as contributors to the Third Street Industrial District. Page & Turnbull believes the construction date of the Gate House to be ca.1914, rather than the 1901 date recorded on the Third Street Industrial District documentation, due to the fact that the building is not depicted on the 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map but is depicted on the 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The Pump House (1930) was also determined to be a contributor but was demolished in 2010 due to the Transbay Cable Installation.

Page & Turnbull evaluated buildings, structures and landscape features that had not previously been individually evaluated for the California Register. Page & Turnbull found remaining buildings, structures and landscape features not eligible for the California Register individually or as part of a historic district or cultural landscape in association with either Spreckels’ sugar refineries or the Pacific Gas & Electric power station. Additionally, Page & Turnbull evaluated a possible expansion of the Third Street Industrial District period of significance (1872 to 1958) and found potential to expand to 1965 and include Unit 3 (and the boiler stack) as a contributor to that historic district.

\textsuperscript{7} Station A includes: the Boiler Hall (1901-02; demolished in 1983); the Turbine Hall (1901-02); the Switching Center (1930-31); the Machine Shop Office (ca.1911); and the Machine Shop (ca.1915).
II. CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS

The following section examines the national, state, and local historical ratings currently assigned to buildings or structures within the subject property areas.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the nation’s most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level.

None of the buildings on the subject sites have been formally listed in the National Register.9

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places.

Individual Evaluations

Evaluated by historian Ward Hill for Dames & Moore in 1999, the Meter House (ca.1902) and the Compressor House (ca.1924) were both found eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events) based on their association with PG&E’s gas manufacturing facility and their significance in the history of gas manufacturing in Northern California. The Gate House (ca.1914), Station A (1901-02; 1930-31), and the Pump House (1930), were recorded by Mr. Hill on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523A forms and determined to be ineligible based on lack of integrity due to the demolition of a large portion of Station A in 1983.

Dames & Moore’s findings were contested in subsequent testimony in 2002 to the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission regarding the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Application for Certification (the Unit 7 project ultimately did not move forward). Christopher VerPlanck, Charles Chase, and Paul Groth testified on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, and stated that Station A should be considered an individually eligible historic resource. Christopher VerPlanck stated, “It is my opinion that the Compressor House, Meter House, Machine Shop and Station A are each individually eligible for listing under California Register Criteria 1 and 3. I also disagree with URS/Dames & Moore’s finding that much of Station A does not retain historic integrity. As Dr. Groth noted in his testimony, Station A, which predates the 1906 San Francisco earthquake and was originally built by Claus Spreckels, is nationally significant because it has survived.”10

9 The warehouses directly south of the project site have also not been formally listed in the National Register. These former Western Sugar Refinery warehouses were found eligible for listing in the National Register and are considered historic resources by the San Francisco Planning Department. Their historic status is based on a 2001 survey completed by architectural historian Michael Corbett, who found them eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A and California Register of Historical Resources Criterion 1 (Events) for their significant association with the growth of the sugar industry in San Francisco.

Central Waterfront: Third Street Industrial District

A Central Waterfront Historic District was first identified in the Central Waterfront Historic Resources Survey Summary Report and Context Statement by the San Francisco Planning Department in 2001. It was renamed the Potrero Point Historic District and fully documented in 2008, comprising three sub-districts: the Dogpatch Historic District; Pier 70; and the Third Street Industrial District. The district appears significant under Criterion 1 (Events) for association with the industrial development of the City of San Francisco from 1872 to 1958. The year 1872 signifies the construction of the earliest known building in the area (the Thompson House at 718 Twenty-Second Street) and 1958 marked 50 years before 2008, the year in which the updated context and district record was authored. The district also appears significant under Criterion 3 (Architecture) based on its collection of late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century American industrial buildings and structures that remain substantially intact.

The Third Street Industrial District is a primarily narrow, linear district bounded by 18th Street to the north, Illinois Street to the east, 24th Street to the south, Third Street to the west, and the parcels that once constituted PG&E’s Potrero Power Station and the remnants of the Western Sugar Refinery (Figure 3). The district also includes several properties on the west side of Third Street between 20th and 22nd Street and the contiguous block bound by 19th, 20th, and Tennessee streets. The following description is excerpted from the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record for the Potrero Point Historic District, which was authored prior to adoption by the Board of Supervisors.

The boundaries of the proposed Third Street Industrial District encompass the highest concentration of significant light industrial and processing properties remaining in the Central Waterfront district. The linear character of the district boundaries is dictated by the separation of heavy maritime industrial uses along the waterfront from the residential enclave of Dogpatch. The intermediate zone between the two areas gradually developed with light industrial, repair, warehousing and food processing businesses, as well as some wholesale businesses, such as oil distribution companies, that needed to have proximity to rail lines along Third Street as well as a local labor force of blue collar workers. Historically, the blocks between Third and Illinois have been occupied by manufacturing operations and warehouses, most notable of which is the vast American Can Company plant. The proposed Third Street Industrial Historic District links Pier 70 and Dogpatch and provides a sense of historical and geographical continuity between the two areas. Potentially, these three districts could be conceived as a single entity, San Francisco’s only historic district that recognizes the remaining infrastructure of a mixed-use industrial and residential community, once the most important industrial zone on the West Coast. Many are good examples of late-19th and early 20th-century American industrial design, justifying the district’s eligibility for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction).

The subject property includes four extant previously determined contributors to the Third Street Industrial District: Station A (1901-02; 1930-31), the Meter House (ca.1902), the Gate House (ca.1914) and the Compressor House (ca.1924). These buildings are primarily constructed of unreinforced brick in the Classical style and have a similar history and significance as the other

11 Former Western Sugar Refinery warehouses located south of the subject site were determined eligible for listing in the National Register.
properties found within the Third Street Industrial District. A fifth previously determined contributor, the Pump House, was demolished in 2010. Table 1 that follows is derived from the Third Street Industrial District contributors table that was included in the 2008 DPR 523D form. Page & Turnbull reviewed all contributors in order to identify demolitions and major alterations since the district was adopted and has provide additional comments on their current status in the “Remain Contributor” column below.

Table 1. Updated Third Street Industrial District Contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Remain Contributor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>20th Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20th and Illinois streets paving</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3994 002</td>
<td>2085 3rd Street</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Gilmore Oil Co. Office Bldg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4045 002</td>
<td>2121 3rd Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Seaside Oil Co. Plant</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058 005</td>
<td>2289-2295 3rd Street</td>
<td>Pre-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058 009</td>
<td>2201-2203 3rd Street</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Alberta Candy Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058 010</td>
<td>2225 3rd Street</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>M. Levin and Sons Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058 010</td>
<td>2255 3rd Street</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Jos. Levin and Sons Warehouse</td>
<td>Demolished except for part of facade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059 001A-001B</td>
<td>815-825 Tennessee Street</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Bowie Switch Co.</td>
<td>Demolished except for facade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059 008</td>
<td>2250 3rd Street</td>
<td>Post-1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059 009</td>
<td>2290-2298 3rd Street</td>
<td>1917; 1940</td>
<td>Anglo California Trust Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059 011</td>
<td>724-728 20th Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Dr. Frank M. Close Medical Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 003</td>
<td>2350 3rd Street</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 003J</td>
<td>2440 3rd Street</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Bertsch Machine Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 003R</td>
<td>2360-2364 3rd Street</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Pellegrini Bros. Winery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 030</td>
<td>2400 3rd Street</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Goodyear Rubber Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4109 001</td>
<td>2301 3rd Street</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>American Can Co. Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4172 005</td>
<td>2530 3rd Street</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>(1516-1510 Kentucky Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4172 007</td>
<td>2542-2544 3rd Street</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>(1522 Kentucky Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4173 001</td>
<td>2501 3rd Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>American Can Co. Southern Ext.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4175 006</td>
<td>1201 Illinois Street</td>
<td>1901-02; 1930-31</td>
<td>PG&amp;E, Station A Power Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4175 006</td>
<td>1201 Illinois Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PG&amp;E, Pump House, Station A</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4175 006</td>
<td>1201 Illinois Street</td>
<td>Ca. 1902</td>
<td>PG&amp;E, Meter House, Station A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4175 006</td>
<td>1201 Illinois Street</td>
<td>Ca. 1924</td>
<td>PG&amp;E, Compressor House, Station A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4175 006</td>
<td>1201 Illinois Street</td>
<td>Ca. 1914</td>
<td>PG&amp;E, Gate House, Station A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 “Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull.” p.4.
Thus, of 27 contributors that were documented in 2008, 23 remain contributors. Based upon the map in the DPR 523D form (Figure 3), there were 24 non-contributors in 2008; now there are 28 (Figures 4-6).

The Third Street Industrial District does not encompass the full subject site. The northwest portion of the subject site (between 22nd and Humboldt streets) is excluded from the district.

Figure 3: Third Street Industrial District, as documented in the DPR 523D form. Red arrow pointing to subject site. This map is incorrect because it does not include the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses at 435 23rd Street as within the district boundary and contributing. Source: Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull, “State of California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record: Potrero Point Historic District,” (March 2008), p.8.
Figure 4: Map of Third Street Industrial District boundaries, showing correct boundary that includes the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses at 435 23rd Street. Detailed maps follow in Figures 5 and 6. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map, edited by Page & Turnbull, January 2018.
Figure 5: Detail view of the north portion of the Third Street Industrial District, showing lot numbers. Contributing properties are shaded red. Contributors that have been demolished since 2008 are not colored. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map; edited by Page & Turnbull, January 2018.
Figure 6: Detail view of the south portion of the Third Street Industrial District, showing lot numbers. Contributing properties are shaded red. Contributors that have been demolished since 2008 are not colored. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map, edited by Page & Turnbull, January 2018.
CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCE STATUS CODE

Properties listed by, or under review by, the State of California Office of Historic Preservation are assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code (Status Code) between “1” and “7” to establish their historical significance in relation to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register or NR) or California Register of Historical Resources (California Register or CR). Properties with a Status Code of “1” or “2” are either eligible for listing in the California Register or the National Register, or are already listed in one or both of the registers. Properties assigned Status Codes of “3” or “4” appear to be eligible for listing in either register, but normally require more research to support this rating. Properties assigned a Status Code of “5” have typically been determined to be locally significant or to have contextual importance. Properties with a Status Code of “6” are not eligible for listing in either register. Finally, a Status Code of “7” means that the resource either has not been evaluated for the National Register or the California Register, or needs reevaluation.

The following buildings are listed with an NRS code of “7R,” assigned May 6, 2002, in the California Historical Resource Information System (CHRIS) directory: Station A, Station A Buildings, Gate House, Meter House, and Compressor House. “7R” means the buildings were “identified in a reconnaissance level survey but were not evaluated.” All buildings on the detached subject parcels were assigned an NRS code of “5N,” meaning they “are not eligible for anything but need special consideration for other reasons.”

The Central Waterfront Survey results were not delivered to the Office of Historic Preservation, and therefore the updated status codes are not included in the CHRIS directory.

1976 DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING ARCHITECTURAL QUALITY SURVEY

The 1976 Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey (1976 DCP Survey) is what is referred to in preservation parlance as a “reconnaissance” or “windshield” survey. The survey looked at the entire City and County of San Francisco to identify and rate architecturally significant buildings and structures on a scale of “-2” (detrimental) to “+5” (extraordinary). No research was performed and the potential historical significance of a resource was not considered when a rating was assigned. Buildings rated “3” or higher in the survey represent approximately the top two percent of San Francisco’s building stock in terms of architectural significance. However, it should be noted that the 1976 DCP Survey has come under increasing scrutiny over the past decade due to the fact that it has not been updated in over 25 years. As a result, the 1976 DCP Survey has not been officially recognized by the Planning Department as a valid local register of historic resources for the purposes of CEQA.

No buildings within the subject areas are listed in the 1976 DCP Survey.

SAN FRANCISCO CITY LANDMARKS

San Francisco City Landmarks are buildings, properties, structures, sites, districts and objects of “special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value and are an important part of the City’s historical and architectural heritage.” Adopted in 1967 as Article 10 of the City Planning Code, the San Francisco City Landmark program protects listed buildings from inappropriate alterations and demolitions through review by the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission.

National Register of Historic Places Codes were converted to California Historical Resource Status Codes in 2003. “5N” was converted to “6L,” with the same definition; “7R” remained “7R.”

No buildings within the project areas have been evaluated for their eligibility as San Francisco Landmarks under Article 10.
III. SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject site sits within San Francisco’s Central Waterfront neighborhood and is bordered by 22nd Street to the north, the San Francisco Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south and Illinois Street to the west; the semi-circular terminus of 23rd Street is also included. In order to capture the site’s features and spatial relationships, the following descriptions employ categories outlined in the National Park Service publication: A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques.

Ex tant buildings, structures and features are labeled on the site map on the following page (Figure 5). The site map is color-coded to show which buildings, structures and features have already been determined as contributors (or non-contributors) to the Third Street Industrial District, and which have been previously determined as individual historic resources. The numerical identifiers of the site map correspond to the accompanying Tables 2 - 4, which outline buildings, structures, and features located throughout the subject site. Each table is ordered chronologically based on date of construction.
Figure 5: Site map with buildings, structures and features at Potrero Power Station showing Third Street Industrial District contributors and non-contributors. Map is not drawn to scale. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map, edited by Page & Turnbull.
### TABLE 2: BUILDINGS

| Name: Station A Turbine Hall |
| Engineer: A.M. Hunt |
| Builder: Reid Brothers |
| Date of Construction: 1901-02 |
| APN: 4175/017 |

**Brief Description:** Rectangular-plan, four-story unreinforced masonry building; one story of the north façade is below grade. Classical decorative brick quoin patterning. The north façade features arched boarded windows, and the south façade features multi-lite steel-sash windows, some of which are boarded. The east façade (formerly adjacent to the demolished Station A Boiler Hall) features irregular openings. The west façade contains no visible openings and is only partially visible due to the adjacent Switching Center Building, Machine Shop, and Machine Shop Office. A slightly-pitched gable roof covers the northern portion of the building; due to asbestos concerns, the southern portion of the roof was removed with only the steel trussing remaining. The building spans the width of the block (433 feet) between 23rd and Humboldt streets.

The building interior contains scrap pipe, valves, connections, switch box housings, crane works, and an inoperable cable-elevated elevator. Tanks, turbine machinery and miscellaneous industrial parts are also present.

The building historically housed electric generating turbines associated with Power Generating Units 1 and 2. It was expanded south in 1903 to span the full length between Humboldt and 23rd Streets.
Partial west façade of Turbine Hall, with the pedimented Machine Shop Office and Machine Shop in the foreground and the Switching Center at the far right.

West façade of Meter House

Name: Meter House; Gas Meter Shop
Date of Construction: ca. 1902
APN: 4175/017

Brief Description: Rectangular-plan, single-story unreinforced masonry building, designed in the Classical style, and featuring arched multi-lite wood-sash windows, brick quoin patterning, dentil cornice, and a steel truss gable roof with a raised central monitor. The west and east facades feature lunette windows beneath the gable peaks. The west facade features a roll-up metal loading door. The south façade features two partially-glazed metal pedestrian doors. The north façade is partially below grade and features no fenestration.

The building historically housed natural gas/manufactured gas metering equipment and measured the quantity of gas being...
The Meter House was part of the complex that manufactured gas just north of Station A that was demolished in the 1960s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Station A Machine Shop Office</th>
<th>Date of Construction: ca.1911</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/017</td>
<td>Brief Description: Rectangular-plan, multi-level reinforced concrete building with a flat roof. The pedimented portion of the building’s north façade is designed in a Greek Revival style. It features a central entrance flanked by two boarded windows, each with a pedimented hood and separated by pilasters. The entrance is accessed via a concrete stair. The building historically functioned as the Machine Shop Office. The south façade of the Machine Shop Office is adjacent to the Machine Shop. The east façade is adjacent to the Turbine Hall. A one-story concrete addition is located to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Gate House</th>
<th>Date of Construction: ca.1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East façade of Gate House

North façade of Gate House

South façade of Gate House

**Brief Description:** Rectangular-plan, single-story unreinforced masonry building with a flat roof, decorative brick cornice, and rectangular wood-sash windows. East façade features a door with glazed transom. South façade features a boarded door opening.

The building was historically used as a gate house and later housed telecommunications equipment. Originally adjacent to the southeast portion of the Boiler Hall, which was demolished in 1983.

| 5 | **Name:** Station A Machine Shop |
|  | **Date of Construction:** ca.1915 |
|  | **APN:** 4175/017 |
**Brief Description:** The Machine Shop is concrete construction with brick cladding and decorative quoin patterning. The east façade of the Machine Shop is adjacent to the Turbine Building. The south façade is adjacent to the Switching Center. The north façade is adjacent to the Machine Shop Office.

**Name:** Compressor House  
**Date of Construction:** ca.1924  
**APN:** 4175/017

**Brief Description:** L-plan, single-story unreinforced masonry building, designed in the Classical style, and featuring multi-lite steel-sash windows, decorative brick quoin patterning, and a low-pitched gable roof of thick concrete. All façades feature metal roll-up loading doors. There are two raised monitor roof skylights and a thick concrete roof.

The building historically contained compressors that maintained pressure in the gas lines, as well as electrical switching and distribution equipment. It was not associated with Station A. The Compressor House was part of the complex that manufactured gas just north of Station A that was demolished in the 1960s.
| 7 | **Name:** Station A Switching Center  
**Date of Construction:** 1930-31  
**APN:** 4175/017  
**Brief Description:** Rectangular-plan, four-story concrete building with a flat roof. Brick cladding with decorative quoin patterning in the Classical style. Adjacent to the south portion of the west façade of the Turbine Building. Entrance located at the south end of the building’s west façade, with door signage reading “Station A” and two multi-lite steel-sash windows above. 
16 Signage is also located near the roofline of the west façade, reading “Pacific Gas and Electric Company.” The south façade features multi-lite steel-sash windows.  
The building historically housed electric switching and electric distribution equipment. |
|---|---|
| 8 | **Name:** Abrasive Blast Building  
**Date of Construction:** Between 1982 and 1993.  
**APN:** 4232/006  
**Brief Description:** Irregularly-shaped, single-story with a taller portion on the north side and a shorter portion to the south. The building has a flat roof, aluminum siding, metal roll-up doors, small horizontally oriented clerestory window openings, and  
16 Entrance area not accessible during site visit. |
West (left) and south (right) facades of Abrasive Blast Building

metal pedestrian doors sheltered by metal awnings.

The building originally housed the abrasive blasting booth used to remove scale, rust and other surface impurities from piping, valves, and other metal parts used in the plant. The building now houses solar panels.

---

Name: Electric Shop

Date of Construction: Between 1946 and 1956.

APN: 4232/006

Brief Description: Rectangular-plan, single-story, concrete block construction, flat roof and multi-lite steel-sash windows. Two west-facing metal roll-up doors, three east-facing wood-paneled roll-up doors. Partially glazed pedestrian doors.

The building originally housed electrician's offices and shop space. Contains locker and shower rooms, and telecommunications equipment.

---

Name: Station A Group Office/Warehouse

Date of Construction: Between 1956 and 1958.

APN: 4232/006

Brief Description: Rectangular-plan, single-story, gable-roof building with aluminum siding. The east façade features a multi-lite steel-sash full-height window. The south façade features glazed paired entry doors. The west façade features a single glazed pedestrian door, a small window opening and signage reading “Station A.”
The building was historically used as a storage warehouse for electrical equipment and as a welding school. Currently used as office space.

---

**Name:** Maintenance/Machine Shop

**Date of Construction:** Between 1958 and 1968.

**APN:** 4232/006

**Brief Description:** Rectangular-plan, gable-roof, single-story building. Central high bay with a flat roof, metal roll-up doors and clerestory windows. The flanking gable roof wings feature minimal openings.

The building was remodeled in the late 1980s.

---

**Name:** Boat House Butler Storage Building

**Date of Construction:** Between 1958 and 1968.

**APN:** 4232/006

---

Please note that this photograph depicts a different (newer) Machine Shop than the Station A Machine Shop.
South (left) and east (right) facades of Boat House Butler Building

West (left) and south (right) façades of Boat House Butler Building

13

Name: Electrical Load Center

Date of Construction: Between 1968 and 1974.

APN: 4175/017

Brief Description: Rectangular-plan, single-story, aluminum siding, gable roof. Metal roll-up garage doors, partially glazed metal pedestrian doors, steel-sash multi-lit windows and vented gable-peak openings.

Building formerly used as a boathouse containing three boats. Also formerly used as storage for electrical supplies.

West (left) and south (right) facades

14

Name: Steam Heat Shop Building; Old Shop

Date of Construction: Between 1968 and 1974.

APN: 4175/017

Brief Description: Rectangular-plan single-story building with standing seam metal siding and an open-sided shed roof projection at the southwest corner. The building features a standing seam metal gable roof, small window openings, metal roll-up garage doors and metal pedestrian doors.

The building was originally used for carpentry and mechanics.

North (left) and west (right) façades of Steam Heat Shop Building
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Fire Pump House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Construction:</strong> Between 1974 and 1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APN:</strong> 4175/017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Description:</strong> Single-story building with aluminum siding and a very slightly gabled roof. The south, east and west facades contain no windows. The west façade features one door. The north façade was not accessible. A gate shack is located at the south façade. The building historically contained diesel driven fire water pumps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Lube Oil Room/Storage Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Construction:</strong> Between 1975 and 1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APN:</strong> 4232/006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Fire Pump House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Construction:</strong> Between 1974 and 1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APN:</strong> 4175/017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Description:</strong> Single-story building with aluminum siding and a very slightly gabled roof. The south, east and west facades contain no windows. The west façade features one door. The north façade was not accessible. A gate shack is located at the south façade. The building historically contained diesel driven fire water pumps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Lube Oil Room/Storage Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Construction:</strong> Between 1975 and 1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APN:</strong> 4232/006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic Resource Evaluation - Part 1

**Potrero Power Station**

**San Francisco, California**

**South façade of Oil Room**

**Brief Description:** Rectangular-plan, single-story building with aluminum siding, paired flush metal doors and a flat roof. Two vented openings are located on the north façade.

Building formerly used to store lube oil drums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Hazardous Waste Storage Building</th>
<th>Date of Construction: Between 1982 and 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APN:</strong> 4175/017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Description:</strong> Rectangular-plan, steel-frame, single-story building with slightly pitched metal roof. The building is currently gutted without walls or doors, with only temporary coverings (pictured). A chain link fence surrounds the building footprint.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building used to store hazardous waste prior to offsite disposal. Formerly called Building H.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: PG&amp;E Switchyard Warehouse</th>
<th>Date of Construction: Between 1982-1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APN:</strong> 4175/018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Description:</strong> Butler warehouse with aluminum siding, a slightly pitched metal gable roof and two metal roll-up doors at the southwest facade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 1</td>
<td>Date of Construction: Between 1982- 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/018</td>
<td>Brief Description: Square-plan, aluminum-clad building with a flat metal roof, three pedestrian doors, a metal roll-up door, and six vinyl-sash windows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 2</th>
<th>Date of Construction: Between 1998- 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/018</td>
<td>Brief Description: Rectangular-plan, aluminum-clad building with a slightly pitched metal gable roof, two pedestrian doors at the south façade, and multiple window openings. The south façade features a porch protected by a metal overhang.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 3</th>
<th>Date of Construction: Between 1998- 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4175/018</td>
<td>Brief Description: Rectangular-plan, aluminum-clad building with a slightly pitched metal gable roof, two pedestrian doors at the south façade, and multiple window openings. The southwest façade features a porch protected by a metal overhang.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Sugar House Sewer Lift Station</th>
<th>Date of Construction: Between 1998- 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4232/006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Brief Description:** Industrial prefabricated shed with aluminum siding a flat roof.

Shed encloses an onsite pump station that conveys black and gray sewage water from the subject site to the City’s combined sewer system connection at 23rd Street.

**Name:** Little House Demonstration Building; Small Office

**Date of Construction:** 2013

**APN:** 4232/006

**Brief Description:** Modular, rectangular-plan, single-story building with full-height glazing and horizontal wood cladding. Building contains office space, shower and restroom facilities. The building is surrounded on the north and east sides by the gray water treatment demonstration project.

**Name:** Unit 3 Power Block: Generator, Turbine, Boiler, and Unit 3 Office

**Date of Construction:** 1965

**APN:** 4232/006

### TABLE 3: STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24</th>
<th>Name: Unit 3 Power Block: Generator, Turbine, Boiler, and Unit 3 Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of Construction: 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APN: 4232/006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief Description: Eight-story steel frame structure with a concrete bay. Consists of a control room, offices, Lube oil system, fuel-oil fired boiler, fuel booster pumps, steam compressor, turbine generator, supporting piping valves, and appurtenances. The generator, designed to run on either natural gas or fuel oil, has been decommissioned and idle since 2011.

An office, three stories tall with a penthouse, is located at the east facade. It features concrete construction, glazed south- and north-facing entrances, green metal panel cladding and large aluminum-frame full-height windows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boiler Stack</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4232/006</td>
<td>Tapered reinforced concrete boiler exhaust stack. Stack is hollow with a flue, is 300 feet high. Crow's nest walkway located at the top of the boiler stack. Exterior metal ladder at the west side ascends the full height of the boiler stack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Tank</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4232/006</td>
<td>Cylindrical metal water tank located near the boiler stack and Unit 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Tank</td>
<td>ca.1965</td>
<td>4175/017</td>
<td>Steel horizontal cylindrical tank that is part of an oily water separator system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Panel Closet</td>
<td>Between 1968 and 1974</td>
<td>4175/017</td>
<td>Small metal electrical panel closet with flat roof and paired doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Shelter</td>
<td>Between 1982-93</td>
<td>4232/006</td>
<td>Open-sided utility shelter with steel support poles and a gabled metal roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanks</td>
<td>ca. 1993</td>
<td>4175/017</td>
<td>Pair of large steel cylindrical holding tanks. Metal ladder and safety chute located at the west side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and controls panel for ammonia storage tank system for Unit 3</td>
<td>ca. 2005</td>
<td>4232/006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Brief Description:** Open-sided equipment shelter with a concrete pad foundation, steel structure, and flat corrugated metal roof.

---

**Name:** Structure with Photovoltaic Panels  
**Date of Construction:** ca.2013  
**APN:** 4232/006  
**Brief Description:** Open-sided structure with steel support poles and a flat metal roof covered with PV panels.

---

**TABLE 4: FEATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Former Station A Boiler Building: gate, partial facades and foundation area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>4175/017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Description:</strong></td>
<td>Unreinforced brick masonry partial south and north façades (single-story). The south façade features a two-door metal gate. The former foundation area (now paved) is located directly east of the Station A Turbine Building. The Boiler Building was demolished in 1983.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Fuel Oil Pipeline</td>
<td>Date of Construction: 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brief Description: Fuel oil pipeline that formerly conveyed oil from the fuel storage tanks to Unit 3. Multiple metal pipes run north-south through the site. Metal stairs bridge the pipeline at two locations.

<p>| Name: Paved Surface/Parking Lots | Date of Construction: Incremental; site largely paved by 1965 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View Looking</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>southeast</td>
<td>Salt Water Cooling System</td>
<td>Between 1968 and 1974</td>
<td>4175/017</td>
<td>Metal structure with three tanks located near water’s edge. A once-through salt water cooling system with water screens that filter out seaweed, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>Salt-water Circulating Pumps</td>
<td>Between 1968 and 1974</td>
<td>4175/017</td>
<td>Two cylindrical pumps and motors that brought salt water to the Unit 3 condenser for condensing turbine exhaust steam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>Peaker Plant Unit 4 Foundation</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4232/006</td>
<td>Raised concrete pad foundation; site of former combustion turbine generator Unit 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Construction</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Peaker Plant Unit 5 Foundation</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4232/006</td>
<td>Raised concrete pad foundation; site of former combustion turbine generator Unit 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Peaker Plant Unit 6 Foundation</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4232/006</td>
<td>Raised concrete pad foundation; site of former combustion turbine generator Unit 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste Storage Pad</td>
<td>Between 1982-93</td>
<td>4175/017</td>
<td>Rectangular-shaped concrete foundation pad bound by chain-link fence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>ca. 1993</td>
<td>4232/006</td>
<td>Concrete pad foundation with raised rectilinear blocks. Located west of Unit 4. Original use unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic Resource Evaluation - Part 1

**Potrero Power Station**

**San Francisco, California**

**Name:** Ammonia Tank Pad

**Date of Construction:** Between 1998 and 2005.

**APN:** 4232/006

**Brief Description:** Concrete pad and foundation located east of Station A Office Building.

Site of the former J Building. The Ammonia tank pad contains a sump that collected oily water drippings from beneath the ammonia tank; the oily water was routed to the oily water treatment system. The sump now collects rainwater routed to the oily water system.

---

**SPATIAL ORGANIZATION, CIRCULATION, TOPOGRAPHY, VEGETATION, VIEWS, VISTAS**

Buildings, structures and features are distributed throughout the primary subject site, amongst large expanses of asphalt paving/parking. There is a distinguishable cluster arrangement of unreinforced brick masonry buildings at the west portion of APN 4175/017. These visually cohesive buildings include: Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. Remaining utilitarian buildings and structures are generally dispersed. Humboldt Street (located east of Illinois Street, between 22nd Street and 23rd Street) is the only through-road at the primary subject site and runs west-east. Humboldt Street is substantially graded at the west portion of the primary site; the paved road peaks at the Meter House and Station A before descending towards the San Francisco Bay (Figure 6). Due to Humboldt Street’s degree of gradation, most of the north façade of the Meter House sits below grade. Apart from Humboldt Street, site topography is mostly flat. The site does not contain any remnants of former cable tramways or electric car systems used for carrying freight. The site contains very little in the way of vegetation; that which grows on the site consists of volunteer weeds. These weeds are generally found near the San Francisco Bay, which forms the east boundary of the primary subject site (Figure 7). Two former Spreckels sugar refinery warehouses are located directly south of the primary subject site (across 23rd Street); the operational PG&E substation is located to the south and west; and Pier 70 is located to the north (Figure 8- Figure 11).

The detached parcels to the south of the primary subject site are flat with no vegetation. APN 4244/003 is more densely developed than APN 4244/004. A PG&E facility is located north of the detached parcels, one and two-story utilitarian buildings sit to the west and east, and a Muni service station is located to the south (Figure 12- Figure 13).
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Figure 6: Graded Humboldt Street. View looking east.

Figure 7: San Francisco Bay directly east of subject site. View looking northeast.

Figure 8: Former Spreckels sugar refinery (addressed 435 23rd Street, constructed 1929). View looking southwest.

Figure 9: Former Spreckels sugar refinery (addressed 401 23rd Street, constructed in 1923). View looking south.

Figure 10: Humboldt Street and operational PG&E power station. View looking west.

Figure 11: Foundation of fuel storage tank in foreground; Pier 70 in background. View looking north.

Figure 12: East block face of Illinois, directly west of detached subject parcels. View looking northwest. Source: Google Maps, 2017.

Figure 13: Muni Metro East station (not public), directly south of detached subject parcels. View looking southeast. Source: Google Maps, 2017.
PERMIT HISTORY

The following Table 5 provides a timeline of permitted construction activities at the subject site based on building permit applications on file with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection. Permits are attached to this report as an appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Filed (or approved, if “Filed” date is illegible)</th>
<th>Permit #</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Building (if known)</th>
<th>Architect/Builder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/27/1946</td>
<td>80997</td>
<td>Rearrangement of ventilating system in locker room of station “A” and all incidental work connected therewith. Total Cost $2500.</td>
<td>Station A Turbine Building or Switching Center</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/29/1946</td>
<td>85015</td>
<td>Application for building permit, frame building. Total Cost $6,000.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/5/1961 (approved)</td>
<td>223141</td>
<td>Constructing a new door opening and subsequently furnishing and installing an overhead aluminum sectional door thereafter. Total Cost $2,000.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/6/1961 (approved)</td>
<td>225338</td>
<td>Application details illegible. Total Cost $79,000.</td>
<td>Station A Switching Center Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/1967</td>
<td>307337</td>
<td>Remodel existing metering building/welding shop. Total Cost $30,000.</td>
<td>Meter House</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/1968 (approved)</td>
<td>327400</td>
<td>Permit to build a temporary guard shack. Est. Total Cost $1,400.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/1971</td>
<td>9102</td>
<td>No description of work. Application for demolition.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/1973</td>
<td>379063</td>
<td>Grading evacuation and tank [word illegible] and wall footing construction. Total Cost $60,000.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/19/1973</td>
<td>380252</td>
<td>To erect a 250,000 BBL fuel oil storage tank and containment wall. Est. Total Cost $600,000.</td>
<td>PG&amp;E fuel storage tank 4</td>
<td>LH Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/14/1973</td>
<td>381412</td>
<td>Existing building consists of 10 bays of steel framing construction. It is proposed to retain the 4 bays of office use and remove the remainder 6 bays of shop use. There is presently an existing wall at the 4th bay; no work is to be done to this wall except closing up two small wall openings with construction to match existing. Utilities to be re-routed to provide continued service to remaining building. Est. Total Cost $22,000.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>RV Bettinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/14/1973</td>
<td>381413</td>
<td>It is proposed to remodel portion of existing warehouse for shop &amp; tool storage use. Existing buildings: 6400 sq. Ft., Portion to be remodeled: 2400 sq. ft. Total Cost $22,000.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>RV Bettinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/1973</td>
<td>382345</td>
<td>Install thermal insulation on four fuel oil storage tanks. Est. Total Cost $307,000.</td>
<td>General Site</td>
<td>T.E. Hinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/1973</td>
<td>382134</td>
<td>Modify boiler on Unit 3, Potrero Power Plant, to reduce NOx (oxides of nitrogen) emissions by installing a system for two-storage combustion and flue gas recirculation to the burners. Work includes (1) relocating some existing piping, (2) installing gas recirculation for foundation and for, (3) installing structural steel foundations and structural steel, (4) installing recirculation gas ductwork and (5) installing</td>
<td>Unit 3 Power Block: Generator, Turbine, and Boiler</td>
<td>Ruey Stoker Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Contractor/Engineer</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/1973</td>
<td>383749</td>
<td>Enlarge (9) fuel oil pump bases. Est. Total Cost $9,000.</td>
<td>General Site Erwin P. Wollak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/1973</td>
<td>81693</td>
<td>No description of work.</td>
<td>Unknown N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/1974</td>
<td>387194</td>
<td>Construct fire water tank. Est. Total Cost $52,000.</td>
<td>Unknown Michael D. Hugh and Richard V. Bettinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/1974</td>
<td>395234</td>
<td>Construction of gas turbine and related equipment including foundations. This work to be done in conjunction with Application #418869 site permit #375682, addendum one (1), which was approved on April 27, 1973.</td>
<td>Est. Total Cost $300,000. R.V. Bettinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/9/1975</td>
<td>402053</td>
<td>No description of work. Total Cost $12,000.</td>
<td>Unknown N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/1979</td>
<td>446478</td>
<td>Install effluent piping. Est. Total Cost $20,000.</td>
<td>General Site R.V. Bettinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/1982</td>
<td>4801217</td>
<td>Construct equipment foundations on grade in open area. Foundations are for water treatment system and associated water storage tanks. Capacity of 60,000 gallons - (2 @ 30,000 gals.). Est. Total Cost $500,000.</td>
<td>General Site R.V. Bettinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/1984</td>
<td>511759</td>
<td>Construct women’s restroom in 2nd floor adjoining control room. Est. Total Cost $35,000.</td>
<td>Unit 3 Power Block: Generator, Turbine, and Boiler R.V. Bettinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/1984</td>
<td>516201</td>
<td>Construct equipment foundations on grade in open area. Foundations are for water treatment system and associated water storage tanks capacity of 60,000 gallons (2 at 30,000 gals). Est Total Cost $500,000.</td>
<td>Unknown R.V. Bettinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/1987</td>
<td>579104</td>
<td>No description of work. Est. Total Cost $200,000.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/1988 (approved)</td>
<td>397738</td>
<td>Construct crane loft; upgrade bathroom area in pre-fab building; add office space to pre-fab building; upgrade</td>
<td>General Site Orlando Malone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Engineer/Architect</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/1988</td>
<td>599097</td>
<td>Upgrade electrical to accommodate electric [word illegible] and [word illegible] shop. Est. Total Cost $60,000.</td>
<td>Orlando Malone</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/1988</td>
<td>603805</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete oil containment basin for sludge tank. Est. Total Cost $8,000.</td>
<td>General Site</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/23/1990</td>
<td>650264</td>
<td>Permit to erect sign. No description of work. Est Total Cost $2,500.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/1990</td>
<td>661900</td>
<td>Demolish existing toilet; construct new handicap toilet and shower; partially demolish existing small office, build new locker room, upgrade electrical, mechanical and plumbing. Est. Total Cost $25,000.</td>
<td>Electric Shop</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/1991</td>
<td>667665</td>
<td>Permit to erect sign. No description of work. Est Total Cost $1,000.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/1991</td>
<td>673510</td>
<td>Replace exhaust fans, repair siding, add air louvers. Est. Total Cost $12,000.</td>
<td>Gez Architects Engineers</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/1991</td>
<td>673513</td>
<td>Add insulation (walls &amp; roof), replace exhaust fans, repair siding, replace gas heaters, replace lights, add exterior lights, add air louvers. Est Total Cost $73,000.</td>
<td>Gez Architects Engineers</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/1991</td>
<td>673515</td>
<td>Add insulation (walls &amp; roof), replace exhaust fans, repair siding, replace gas heaters, add air louvers, add plastic thermal curtains to overhead doors (2).</td>
<td>Machine Shop</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/1994</td>
<td>752689</td>
<td>Reinforce brick parapets. Fence areas below parapets. (Ref DWGS 364229 &amp; 364230). Est. Total Cost $12,000.</td>
<td>Donald F. Willoughby</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/1994</td>
<td>752687</td>
<td>Reinforce brick parapets. Remove portion of parapet &amp; brick wall. (Ref DWGS Gate House</td>
<td>Donald F. Willoughby</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Job No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Engineer/Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/94</td>
<td>752688</td>
<td>Demolish parapets of both end walls to roof level. Fence area below side wall parapet. (Ref DNGS 354229, 364232 &amp; 364233). All above works are required per parapet safety program. Est. Total Cost $40,000.</td>
<td>Station A Turbine Building</td>
<td>Donald F. Willoughby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/18/94</td>
<td>769239</td>
<td>Application for demolition permit for “1986 storage.”</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Douglas B. Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/95</td>
<td>779746</td>
<td>Sprinkle system [word illegible] – Adding 22 sprinklers. Est. Total Cost $5,100.</td>
<td>General Site</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/95</td>
<td>784678</td>
<td>No description of work. Est. Total Cost $65,000.</td>
<td>Pump House Parking Lot</td>
<td>Gez Architects Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/01</td>
<td>941861</td>
<td>PG &amp; E is proposing a lot line adjustment at the above ref. site. A portion of the (E) roof overhang will be removed to meet the 6’8” set back req. at the new lot line under this permit only. Est. Cost: $3,500.</td>
<td>Unknown (one of the Storage Units)</td>
<td>RPR Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/19/04</td>
<td>1029480</td>
<td>Installation of an aqueous ammonia storage area. (Tank installation under separate permit). Removal of existing pavement; partial excavation &amp; removal of existing earth &amp; concrete for new ammonia storage area &amp; sump; excavation of remaining soil within sump area; installation of H-piles for support of containment sump &amp; ammonia storage tank; installation of reinforced concrete-mat foundation, walls &amp; support piers for the sump &amp; ammonia storage tank; backfilling as required; installation of drain from truck unloading drive to stump; installation of reinforced concrete for diked area slab, walls, footings, equipment pads &amp; truck unloading drive; installation</td>
<td>Ammonia Tank Pad</td>
<td>Thomas R. Payne, P.E., C.E.; Louis Perry &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Contractor/Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/4/2004</td>
<td>1029307</td>
<td>SCR Structural Steel – Structural work involved in the alteration of the existing power plant structure for the installation of selective catalytic reduction (SCR) equipment for NOx removal. Installation of new steel and catwalks within existing structure and reinforcement of existing steel for the revised flues and new piping, skids and manifold valve stations. Total Cost $950,000.</td>
<td>(likely) Unit 3 Thomas R. Payne, P.E., C.E.; Louis Perry &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/2004</td>
<td>1039082</td>
<td>Construct a wheel wash system to trap sand &amp; mud from trucks before enters into public street from Hoe Down Yard. Total Cost $40,000.</td>
<td>Unknown Andy Tsao/PG&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/2007</td>
<td>1130141</td>
<td>To supply and install a fire alarm system per PG&amp;E’s proposed performance based engineering evaluation for smoke detection [word illegible]. This is an unmanned site. All battery calculations are at 60 hr. This system will be monitored by PG&amp;E’s Scada System. Total Cost $35,000.</td>
<td>General Site Engineer: Cosco Fire Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2008</td>
<td>1167811</td>
<td>Excavate for and construct electric power transmission ductbanks. Backfill, repave over trenches. Approximate quantity 600 Lf &amp; 6’ wide x 5’ deep. Total Cost $500,000.</td>
<td>Unknown Black &amp; Veatch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/24/2012</td>
<td>1265380</td>
<td>Remove &amp; relocate a beam detector (in storage building). Total Cost $1,000.</td>
<td>Unknown N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Permits relating to the new PG&E substation on APN 4175/018 (outside of subject area boundaries) have been excluded from this table.
IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT

SAN FRANCISCO HISTORY

European settlement of what is now San Francisco took place in 1776, with the simultaneous establishment of the Presidio of San Francisco by representatives of the Spanish Viceroy and the founding of Mission San Francisco de Asis (Mission Dolores) by Franciscan missionaries. The Spanish colonial era lasted until 1821, when Mexico earned its independence from Spain, taking with it the former Spanish colony of Alta California. During the Mexican period, the region’s economy was based primarily on cattle ranching, and a small trading village known as Yerba Buena grew up around a plaza (today known as Portsmouth Square) located above a cove in San Francisco Bay. In 1839, a few streets were laid out around the Plaza, and settlement expanded up the slopes of Nob Hill.

During the Mexican-American War in 1846, the village of Yerba Buena was occupied by U.S. military forces and was renamed San Francisco the following year. Around the same time, a surveyor named Jasper O’Farrell extended the original street grid, while also laying out Market Street from what is now the Ferry Building to Twin Peaks. Blocks north of this line were laid out in small 50-vara square blocks, whereas blocks south of Market were laid out in larger 100-vara blocks.\(^{18}\)

The discovery of gold at Sutter’s Mill in 1848 brought explosive growth to San Francisco, with thousands of would-be gold-seekers making their way to the isolated outpost on the edge of the North American continent. Between 1846 and 1852, the population of San Francisco mushroomed from less than one thousand people to almost 35,000. The lack of level land for development around Portsmouth Square soon pushed development south to Market Street, eastward onto filled tidal lands, and westward toward Nob Hill. At this time, most buildings in San Francisco were concentrated downtown, and the outlying portions of the peninsula remained unsettled throughout much of the late nineteenth century.

With the decline of gold production in 1855, San Francisco’s economy diversified to include agriculture, manufacturing, shipping, construction, and banking.\(^{19}\) Prospering from these industries, a new elite class of merchants, bankers, and industrialists arose to shape the development of the city as the foremost financial, industrial and shipping center of the West.

CENTRAL WATERFRONT/ POTRERO POINT

San Francisco’s Central Waterfront consists of approximately 500 acres at the east edge of San Francisco, adjacent to the San Francisco Bay (Figure 14–Figure 15).

---

\(^{18}\) Vará is derived from an antiquated Spanish unit of measurement

Figure 14: City and County of San Francisco and the Central Waterfront Survey Area. Source: San Francisco Planning Department, “Central Waterfront Context” (2001).

Figure 15: The Central Waterfront Survey Area with boundaries, major street names and boundaries of the Dogpatch Neighborhood, the PG&E area and Pier 70/The Bethlehem Steel San Francisco Yard. Source: San Francisco Planning Department, “Central Waterfront Context,” (2001).
Potrero Point originally served as cattle grazing land for the Mission San Francisco de Asis (Mission Dolores), established by Junipero Serra in 1776. The area was known as Potrero Nuevo, or “new pasture.” When the mission was secularized in 1833, Potrero Hill was incorporated as part of the Rancho de San Francisco, granted by the Mexican government to the sons of Francisco de Haro, the first alcalde, or mayor, of San Francisco. The California Gold Rush and California’s admission to the Union in 1850 dramatically changed the rural Central Waterfront/Potrero landscape to a heavy industrial site. In 1866 Potrero Point became the site of the Pacific Rolling Mills, a vast iron smelting and rolling plant. By the end of the 1880s over 1,000 men were employed there. Potrero Point also saw the construction of gas manufacturing plants, originally operated by the City Gas Company and the San Francisco Gas Company (which merged in 1873 to form the San Francisco Gas Light Company). The Union Iron Works – considered the pioneer foundry and machine-making company of California – arrived at Potrero Point in the 1880s (Figure 16). They constructed one of the largest shipbuilding facilities on the west coast, a plant that later became part of the Bethlehem Steel Company.

![Union Iron Works Plant at Potrero (1880s). Source: San Francisco Maritime Museum Library.](image)

Utilized for industrial purposes since the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Potrero Point area of San Francisco’s Central Waterfront grew into one of the most important zones of heavy industry on the West Coast. Amongst the varied industrial functions of Potrero Point, the subject site itself supported four industries: gunpowder production; barrel production; sugar refining; and power production.

**SITE HISTORY: GUNPOWDER PRODUCTION**

Early coastal maps depict a history of gunpowder production at the subject site. The following is directly excerpted from historian Christopher VerPlanck’s “Dogpatch Historical Context.”

Increased population pressures in San Francisco, combined with a new city ordinance forbidding dangerous industries from being located anywhere near settled areas,

---

22 Christopher VerPlanck, “Dogpatch Historical Context.” http://www.pier70sf.org/dogpatch/DogHistSig.htm
compelled certain industries such as gunpowder manufacturers, to move beyond the city limits. Due to its remoteness and abundant deep-water anchorages, Potrero Point was earmarked as the ideal location for relocating essential gunpowder manufacturing operations... In 1854, E.I. du Pont de Nemours Company, one of the largest manufacturers of black gunpowder in the United States, constructed their first powder magazine on the West Coast on the south shore of Potrero Point near the corner of Maryland and Humboldt streets, now the site of PG&E’s Potrero Power Plant.

The 1859 USGS Coastal Survey Map shows the Potrero Nuevo area with the subject site labeled “powder magazine” (Figure 17). Black gunpowder was needed at the time for hard rock mining in the Sierras as well as for street grading in San Francisco. The 1873 Bancroft Map of San Francisco shows developed (shaded) blocks at and near the subject site (Figure 18). This development reflects the presence of both the E.I. du Pont de Nemours Company and the Hazard Powder Company. Both gunpowder manufacturers operated at Potrero Point until 1881, when they sold their plants to sugar industrialist Claus Spreckels and moved to rural Contra Costa County. The subject site continued to be developed and the shoreline dramatically altered to accommodate various industrial activities (Figure 19 – Figure 20).

Figure 17: 1859 USGS Coastal Survey Map showing Potrero Nuevo. Arrow pointing to labeled “Powder Magazine” site and approximate subject site. Source: David Rumsey Map Collection. Edited by Page & Turnbull.
Figure 18: 1873 Bancroft Map of San Francisco, Potrero Hill and surroundings. Blue line shows original shoreline. Red arrow pointing to approximate subject site. Source: David Rumsey Map Collection. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Figure 19: 1889 U.S. Coast Survey Map. Red arrow pointing to approximate subject site. Source: FoundSF. Edited by Page & Turnbull.
SITE HISTORY: BARREL PRODUCTION

The American Barrel Company (later, the California Barrel Company) was first established in 1883-84 on Louisiana Street, between Humboldt and Nevada Streets. The company was one of the very first barrel manufacturers in San Francisco; their barrels were used to store cider, pork, olives, oil, lard, fish, milk, sugar, grapes, pickles, butter, and other goods. The Sanborn Fire Insurance Map from 1900 depicts the California Barrel Company at the west portion of the subject site (the future site of Station A, discussed below) (Figure 21). The 1900 Sanborn map depicts a brick wall running north-south along Louisiana Street, separating the California Barrel Company and the Western Sugar Refinery to the east. The California Barrel Company site appears to have included four warehouses (1 and 1 ½ or 2 stories in height) a wagon shed, and an unspecified shed. These buildings were demolished in 1901, when the California Barrel Company site was purchased by Claus Spreckels. Spreckels aimed to expand his sugar refinery operations already underway on the subject site to the east of the California Barrel Company buildings, next to the San Francisco Bay. The California Barrel

---

24 The California Barrel Company site was surrounded by: the Potrero Hotel, stores and residential dwellings to the north (between Sierra and Humboldt streets); the western part of the San Francisco Gas Light’s Potrero Gas Plant to the south; a large reservoir used by Spreckels’ sugar refinery to the south; and Spreckels’ sugar refinery buildings and wharf to the east.
Company was relocated to nearby Illinois and Sierra (22nd) streets (the northwest corner of the subject site), where it remained in operation until 1956. The site included four warehouses, stave storage sheds, auto sheds, steamers, an office, and a machine shop (Figure 23).25

Figure 21: Detail of the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 5, sheet 546) depicting the California Barrel Company buildings (demolished in 1901) located at the future site of Station A. Source: San Francisco Public Library.

Figure 22: 1938 aerial photograph by Harrison Ryker of northwest corner of subject site (22nd Street to the north, Illinois Street to the west, and Humboldt Street to the south), developed and occupied by the California Barrel Company. Source: David Rumsey Map Collection.

Figure 23: Detail of the 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 6, sheet 609) depicting the California Barrel Company buildings (demolished in 1901) at the northwest corner of the subject site. Source: San Francisco Public Library.
SITE HISTORY: SUGAR REFINERY

German-born Adolph Claus Spreckels (1828-1908) immigrated to the United States in 1846 (Figure 24). He married Anna Christina Mangels and lived for periods of time in South Carolina and New York City before settling in San Francisco. Spreckels founded a variety of successful businesses— including a grocery store, a brewery and a hotel— and became involved in the ranching, timber and railroad industries. However, Spreckels is perhaps best known as a sugar baron of the West Coast.

Spreckels began growing sugar beets in Aptos, California, and built a small refinery in nearby Capitola in 1874. He then established the Western Beet Sugar Company in Wastsonville, which was the largest sugar beet factory in the U.S. at the time. As his operations grew, Spreckels constructed a 42-mile railroad to transport sugar beets from fields near Salinas to Watsonville. A larger factory was built in the Salinas Valley, resulting in the creation of the company town of Spreckels, California. Additionally, Spreckels founded Spreckelsville, a company town in Maui; by 1892 it was the largest sugarcane plantation in the world.

In San Francisco, Spreckels began refining sugar in the South of Market area in 1863. By 1881, Spreckels’ California Sugar Refinery had outgrown its facilities at Eighth and Brannan streets, requiring a relocation to a five-block area at Potrero Point inclusive of the primary subject site (Figure 25- Figure 26). This southern point of Potrero Point provided deep water access for Spreckels’ ships filled with sugar cane arriving from Hawaii. The new California Sugar Refinery was designed by a New York architect by the name of Hepworth, and was constructed at a cost of one million dollars. The sugar refinery was, at the time of its construction, the only such operation on the West Coast, and one of fewer than twenty-five refineries in the United States. The context below is directly excerpted from the “State of California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record: Potrero Point Historic District” authored by Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull in 2008.

The pioneer sugar industry in California owes a huge debt to German immigrant Claus Spreckels. He established his first refinery in the South of Market in 1863. In 1881, he purchased a five-block site on the south shore of Potrero Point from gunpowder manufacturers and commenced construction of the California Sugar Refinery. The massive brick buildings which comprised the plant included a “melt/filter house,” a “wash house,” and a “char house.” All were designed in 1881 by a New York architect named Hepworth. By 1884, these huge works were described as “the most complete concern of the kind in the world, and in size ranks with the great refineries of Brooklyn, New York, and St. Louis.” The 1886 Sanborn Map shows the layout of the facility (no longer extant), including a ten-story brick filter house and refinery, machine shop/blacksmith’s shop, a row of one-story frame shops along the western edge of the property, a two-story melting house and three massive timber-frame warehouses- one of which sat atop a large wharf.

---

26 Dames & Moore, p.2
27 Bancroft Library, University of California-Berkeley, documents and materials pertaining to the Western Sugar Refinery collected by Dan Gutleben.
29 Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull, p.16.
The following is directly excerpted from the “Historical Assessment of the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses” authored by Jonathan Lammers in March 2017.

The [California] Sugar Refinery was supplied by raw sugar grown in Hawaii. During the 1870s, Spreckels had secured land and water rights on the island of Maui. He then hired Herman Schussler, chief engineer of the Spring Valley Water Company, to design a massive irrigation system that included sixty-five miles of canals which brought water from the wetter side of the island to drier land owned by Spreckels. Labor for growing the sugar cane was supplied under the contract labor system, whereby Spreckels advanced funds to transport Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, Filipino and other immigrants to Hawaii where they contracted to work for a specified amount of time. Once the sugar cane was harvested, it was processed at mills in Hawaii. During this initial process, the cane was pressed to extract the sap, which in turn was boiled down to make sugar crystals. At this stage the sugar was brown in color and contained various “impurities.” The milled sugar was then transported to San Francisco on the ships of the Oceanic Steamship Company, which was founded in 1881 by Spreckels and his brothers. Once the raw sugar arrived at the [California] Sugar Refinery, it went through a multi-stage process to dissolve and filter the sugar before being re-crystallized into “pure” sugar.30

Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull described the conveyance of the sugar from Hawaii to the California Sugar Refinery in documentation for the Third Street Industrial District:

The Potrero plant [played] a major role as a refiner of imported Hawaiian sugar […] Raw Hawaiian sugar was delivered by ship to the massive east wharf and then moved into adjoining warehouses. The sugar would then be moved from the warehouses to the melt wash house, and from there through the melt filter house where refining would take place. The refined sugar was then transported via conveyors to a large warehouse located south of Twenty-Third Street where it would be stored in bags prior to shipment via rail or ship.31

30 Jonathan Lammers, Historical Assessment of the Former Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses (March 8, 2017) p.2.
31 Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull, p.16-17; 20.
Ca.1891, the California Sugar Refinery was renamed the Western Sugar Refining Company. In 1901, Spreckels purchased the California Barrel Company site directly west of his Western Sugar Refinery site and hired engineer A.M. Hunt to draw up plans for a new, state-of-the-art steam-powered electric plant. Spreckels’ power station was constructed in 1901-02. The Central Station plant consisted of adjacent Turbine and Boiler Halls and was operated until 1903 by Spreckels’ own fledgling Independent Gas and Power Company.\textsuperscript{32} Spreckels’ Central Station was later named “Station A” (and is referenced as Station A throughout this report). The extended historic context of the site as a power station is discussed in the context below, titled “Power Station.”

Throughout the early twentieth century, much of the primary subject site was built out with buildings and structures that supported Spreckels’ sugar operations (and the adjacent power station operations). Maps dating from 1900, 1903, 1905 and 1914 depict a Boiler building (with asbestos-

\textsuperscript{32} Dames & Moore, p.4.
covered boilers and two economizers joined by a central smokestack); Raw Sugar Warehouses; Coal Bunkers; a Coal Hoist House; a Melt House; Spreckels’ Private Car House; Acid Tanks; a Char House; a Pipe Storage building; a Machine and Carpenter Shop; a Refinery building; and a Reservoir at the northwest corner of the primary subject site (Figure 27- Figure 34). Additional sugar refinery buildings, structures and features located outside of the boundaries of the subject site included: an East Wharf/Sugar Receiving wharf building; a Sack House; Stock Corrals; a South Wharf; a Refined Sugar Warehouse; Crude Petroleum Tanks; an Office/Laboratory; and a warehouse containing paints, oils and supplies. Sanborn maps show there were no substantive alterations to the refinery between 1905 and 1914. Upon Claus Spreckels’ death in 1908, the Western Sugar Refining Company continued under the leadership of his second son, Adolf Spreckels.

Figure 27: 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 5, sheets 545 and 546) depicting the Western Sugar Refining buildings located on the central portion and northwest corner of the primary subject site. Source: San Francisco Public Library.
Figure 28: Detail of the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 5, sheets 545 and 546) depicting the Western Sugar Refining buildings at the east portion of the subject site (between Humboldt and 23rd Streets). Source: San Francisco Public Library.

Figure 29: Detail of *Pictorial Map of San Francisco* by August Chevalier (1903). Red arrow pointing to subject site. Source: David Rumsey Historical Map Collection. Edited by Page & Turnbull.
Figure 30: 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 5, sheets 545 and 546) depicting the subject site and surrounding areas. Source: David Rumsey Map Collection.

Figure 31: Detail of the 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 5, sheets 545 and 546) depicting the Western Sugar Refining buildings located at the eastern portion of the subject site (between Humboldt and 23rd Streets). Source: David Rumsey Map Collection.
Figure 32: Subject site, ca. 1914. Red arrow pointing to the sugar refinery (directly east of the future Sugar House constructed ca.1915), with roof of Station A in the foreground. View looking east. Source: Associate Capital. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Figure 33: 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 6, sheets 609 and 610) depicting the Western Sugar Refining buildings at the central portion of the subject site (the east portion of the subject site is depicted in the image below). Station A is located directly to the west of the Western Sugar Refinery. Not pictured is the Western Sugar Refinery Reservoir at the northwest corner of the subject site. Source: San Francisco Public Library.
In 1915, a second sugar refinery building was constructed west of the existing refinery building, in place of the previous Machine and Carpenter shop. This new ten-story refinery building was designed by the engineer W.E. Murray and would later be called the Sugar House (and is referred to as the Sugar House throughout this report). New Machine and Carpenter shop buildings were constructed adjacent to the west façade of the boiler/coal bunker building with the economizers and smokestack (Figure 35–Figure 39). The densely developed subject site was captured in an aerial photograph taken by Harrison Ryker in 1938 (Figure 40–Figure 41).
Figure 35: 1919 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 6, sheet 609) depicting the Western Sugar Refining buildings between Humboldt and 23rd Streets, with Station A located directly to the west. Red arrow pointing to new Sugar House refinery building. Pacific Gas & Electric sites are located directly north (part of the subject site) and southwest (outside the boundaries of the subject site).
Source: San Francisco Planning Department. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Figure 36: 1919 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 6, sheet 610) depicting the Western Sugar Refining buildings located at the east portion of the subject site. Not pictured is the Western Sugar Refinery Reservoir at the northwest corner of the site. Source: San Francisco Planning Department.
Figure 37: View looking northeast from 25th and Illinois (1920). Red arrow pointing to Sugar House, with Station A to its west (left). Source: History Pin. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Figure 38: View looking northwest (ca.1925). Red arrow pointing to Sugar House, with Station A to its west (left). Source: Ravens Gallery Antiques “Western Sugar Refinery San Francisco.” Edited by Page & Turnbull.
Figure 39: Western Sugar Refinery South Wharf (left) and East Wharf/Sugar Receiving House (right) (20 June 1930). Red arrow pointing to Sugar House. Source: San Francisco Public Library, Photo # AAC-7616. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Figure 40: 1938 aerial photograph by Harrison Ryker of subject site and surrounding area. Red arrow pointing to Sugar House. The Western Sugar Refinery Reservoir at the northwest corner of the subject site has been demolished and developed by the California Barrel Company. Source: David Rumsey Map Collection. Edited by Page & Turnbull.
Spreckels had established dominance in the sugar industry by securing control over the Hawaiian sugar trade. However, marginalized Hawaiian planters in competition with Spreckels and his associates established their own cooperative refinery in 1906 in Crockett, California: the California & Hawaiian Sugar Company (C&H) (Figure 42).33

---

33 The C&H factory remains operational today.
The construction of the C&H factory in Crockett broke Spreckels’ monopoly on sugar refining, but his Potrero plant remained in operation throughout the first half of the twentieth century. Census data referenced in the “Central Waterfront Cultural Resources Survey Summary Report and Draft Context Statement” authored by the Planning Department in 2001 reveals that “the refinery remained one of the top five employers in the Central Waterfront until the early 1950s, employing 1,000 men and between 10 and 15 percent of local residents.”

However, the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation bought out Spreckels’ plant for $3,780,000 in April 1949. C&H quickly concluded that the Potrero plant was too antiquated to be profitably modernized. When the refinery was shut down ca.1950, PG&E purchased the site for expansion of their various steam electric operations. The 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps reflect the change in ownership to C&H and depict the site just prior to its near-complete demolition in the 1950s (Figure 43- Figure 44).

Figure 43: 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 6, sheet 609). Source: San Francisco Public Library.

---

35 Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull, p.16-17.
Significant change occurred at the subject site in the latter half of the twentieth century. Beginning in 1951, antiquated sugar refinery plant buildings on the subject site were demolished and machinery parts were sold for scrap (Figure 45). PG&E demolished Spreckels' sugar refinery buildings and constructed new buildings and structures necessary for their expanding power station. PG&E continued to utilize Station A as they expanded eastward. Demolished sugar refinery buildings include (but are not limited to): a Boiler building (with asbestos-covered boilers and two economizers joined by a central smokestack); Raw Sugar Warehouses; Coal Bunkers; a Coal Hoist House; an East Wharf/Sugar Receiving wharf building; a Melt House; Spreckels’ Private Car House; Acid Tanks; a Char House; a Pipe Storage building; and a Refinery building. The East Wharf/Sugar Receiving wharf building was not demolished until the late 1960s/early 1970s. Most new PG&E buildings were constructed on the site between the 1950s and the 1990s.\(^{36}\)

\(^{36}\) New PG&E buildings include (but are not limited to): Steam Heat Shop Building; Fire Pump House; Unit 3; Boat House Butler Storage Building; Lube Oil Room/Storage Building; Station A Group Office/Warehouse; Abrasive Blast Building; Electric Shop; Maintenance/Machine Shop; Hazardous Waste Storage Building; PG&E Warehouse; and PG&E Buildings 1, 2, and 3. These buildings are discussed in more detail in the section to follow, titled “Power Plant.”
Figure 45: Demolition of two brick smokestacks at the Spreckels Sugar Refinery (9 August 1951). Sugar House at left. Source: San Francisco Public Library, Photo # AAC-7473.

Although PG&E demolished all other sugar refinery buildings on the site, they retained the Sugar House building (constructed 1915) and used it throughout the latter half of the twentieth century for office space and records storage (Figure 46–Figure 49).

Figure 47: Sugar House (left) with Station A in background (no date, estimated 1980s). PG&E Station A Group Office/Warehouse at left. Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 48: Tanks, a Peaker Plant (Unit 6), and the northwest corner of Sugar House (between ca.1993 and 1995). Spreckels’ warehouse on 23rd Street at left. Source: Associate Capital.
The ten-story Sugar House was demolished in 1995, following damage sustained during the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. The building had a 16,300 square-foot footprint, and had a basement below grade. Documentary photographs of the Sugar House were taken by Lewis Watts in 1995, in an archival manner according to the Historical American Building Survey standards (Figure 50–Figure 55).
The late-1990s Sanborn map shows all sugar refinery-associated buildings on the subject site having been demolished and replaced with PG&E buildings and structures (Figure 56). Spreckels’ power station buildings, which supplied the city, and other PG&E buildings and structures will be discussed in the context to follow, titled “Power Station.”
Today, the only extant sugar refinery buildings are two warehouses located at the terminus of 23rd Street, just outside of the subject site’s south boundary (Figure 57). The easternmost warehouse is addressed as 401 23rd Street and was constructed in 1923. The westernmost warehouse is addressed as 435 23rd Street and was constructed in 1929. According to the “Historic Assessment of the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses” authored in 2017 by Jonathan Lammers, the warehouses were constructed to ensure clean and dry conditions for storing both raw and processed sugar.\footnote{Jonathan Lammers, \textit{Historical Assessment of the Former Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses} (March 8, 2017) p.2.}
Figure 57: Red arrows pointing to former sugar refinery warehouses on 23rd Street, constructed by Spreckels’ sons in 1923 (east, left warehouse) and 1929 (right, west warehouse). Subject site at right (showing Abrasive Blast Building). Warm Water Cove is located south of the warehouses. View looking southwest. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Although the warehouses are the only extant buildings associated with Spreckels’ sugar refining operations, there is an extant partial foundation of the East Wharf/Sugar Receiving building located at the east boundary of the subject site, abutting the San Francisco Bay (Figure 58–Figure 59). The deteriorated partial foundation does not reflect the original (longer) footprint of the East Wharf/Sugar Receiving building.

Figure 58: Foundation of former Spreckels East Wharf/Sugar Receiving building in foreground. View looking northeast.

---

38 The East Wharf/Sugar Receiving building foundation was not accessible during Page & Turnbull’s site visit.
SITE HISTORY: POWER STATION

The subject site is most closely associated with its history as a former power station. Manufactured gas had served as the main source of light for urban Californians through the 1890s. However, experimentation with electricity showed great promise to replace manufactured gas. The pioneer electric plant of the west coast was constructed by the California Electric Light Company in 1879 at Fourth and Market streets in San Francisco. In these early years, the electricity industry saw new competitors enter the market. Multiple mergers occurred throughout the late nineteenth century; after years of direct competition, a merger between the two biggest gas and electric companies—the San Francisco Gaslight Company and the Edison Company—resulted in the creation of the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company in 1896. The 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depict the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company Potrero Station located at the northwest corner and northern portion of the primary subject site (Figure 60-Figure 61). Primary site features included: two massive gas holders; an office building; coal sheds; a wharf building; a petroleum tank; a coke room; two retort houses; tar wells; ammonia liquid wells and tanks; an engine room; a blacksmith shop; and an experimental room.
Figure 60: Detail of the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 5, sheet 546) depicting the San Francisco Gas and Electric Potrero Station between 22nd and Humboldt streets (the northwest corner of the subject site). Also pictured is residential housing, a Western Sugar Refining Reservoir, and the Potrero Hotel. Source: San Francisco Public Library.

Figure 61: Detail of the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 5, sheet 545) depicting the San Francisco Gas and Electric Potrero Station between 22nd and Humboldt streets (the north portion of the subject site). Source: San Francisco Public Library.
Despite the grand merger between the San Francisco Gaslight Company and the Edison Company—resulting in the creation of the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company—competition to provide San Francisco with gas and electric service remained intense. Yet another competitor remained on the scene: the Independent Electric Light & Power Company and the Independent Gas & Power Company, owned by sugar baron Claus Spreckels and his sons. Spreckels hired engineer A.M. Hunt and plans were prepared for a state-of-the-art power station, completed in 1902 (Figure 62–Figure 64).

Figure 62: Announcement of Spreckels’ plans to build a plant and mains (26 February 1901). Source: San Francisco Chronicle.

Figure 63: Transverse section of the Independent Electric Light and Power Company power house (Station A Turbine Hall and Boiler Hall) (December 1901). Source: The Journal of Electricity, Power and Gas, p.277.
The steam-powered Central Station power station (later to be called “Station A”) consisted of adjacent Turbine and Boiler Halls and accessory shops and offices. Station A was constructed on the western portion of the subject site, at the former location of the California Barrel Company buildings. By the end of 1903, purchase and consolidation of various corporations, including Spreckels’ Independent companies, resulted in the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company owning the region’s biggest steam plants and Potrero Point’s Station A (Figure 65).

**Figure 64:** Announcement of construction progress (3 January 1902). Source: *San Francisco Chronicle*.

**Figure 65:** Announcement of sale of Spreckels’ Independent companies (2 July 1903). Source: *San Francisco Chronicle*. 
In October 1905, a merger between the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company and the California Gas & Electric Company resulted in the formation of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company. That same year, Station A was expanded south to 23rd Street (plans not available). The relatively new Station A was the biggest steam plant in the PG&E system. It survived the 1906 earthquake and become part of a larger system of electrical generation, transmission and distribution. Station A provided most of the electrical power for the City of San Francisco from 1902 to 1915. Until 1913, Station A was the largest steam plant west of the Rocky Mountains. Over the decades Station A was photographed, documented in technical journals and depicted on Sanborn maps (Figure 66–Figure 69).

Figure 66: 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol.5, sheets 546 and 545) depicting the subject site. Red arrow pointing to Station A, with sugar refinery buildings to the right (east). Source: David Rumsey Map Collection.

40 Although Station A would be decommissioned and partially demolished in 1983 (with power generating operations ceased in 1979), PG&E would continue to operate throughout the subject site until 1998.
41 Dames & Moore, p.5.
Figure 67: Detail of San Francisco’s Gas & Electric Company’s Potrero Electric Station (Station A), depicted on the 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol.5, sheets 546 and 545). Source: David Rumsey Map Collection.

Figure 68: Station A Turbine Hall (left) and Boiler Hall (right) with shops and offices along the east façade of the Boiler Hall (ca.1910). Source: San Francisco Public Library.
Figure 69: Station A Machine Shop Office, Turbine Hall and Boiler Hall (ca.1911). Source: Pacific, Gas & Electric- Historical and Descriptive, ca.1911.

Figure 70: Subject site, ca. 1920s. View looking northeast. Red arrows pointing to Station A Turbine Hall (left) and Boiler Hall (right). Pier 70 in the background. Source: Associate Capital. Edited by Page & Turnbull.
A big change in the operation (and design) of Station A came after the arrival of natural gas from Southern California in ca.1930.\textsuperscript{42} Inexpensive natural gas made steam power relatively more important than hydroelectric power; the result was an increase in steam plant expansions.\textsuperscript{43} Station A itself was subsequently remodeled in 1930. The west and south facades were rebuilt; the windows of the south façade were altered in shape. The reconstruction project also included a four-story, steel and concrete addition to the west side of the building, called the Switching Center (\textbf{Figure 72} – \textbf{Figure 77}). The renovation of Station A and the construction of the Switching Center reportedly cost $7,000,000. The power station’s capacity expanded to 130,000 kilowatts.

\textsuperscript{42} PG&E’s Hunter’s Point Station P electrical plant began operating in 1929.
\textsuperscript{43} Dames & Moore, p.6.
Figure 72: South elevation of Station A showing (from left to right): Switching Center, Turbine Hall and Boiler Hall (1930). Drawings by the PG&E Department of Engineering. Source: San Francisco Planning Department.

Figure 73: West elevation of Station A Switching Center (1930). Drawings by the PG&E Department of Engineering. Source: San Francisco Planning Department.
Figure 74: Sectional (north) elevation of Station A showing (from left to right): Boiler Hall, Turbine Hall, and Switching Center. Drawing by PG&E Engineering Department. Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 75: Subject site with arrow pointing to Station A Switching Center (ca.1931). Source: Associate Capital. Edited by Page & Turnbull.
Figure 76: Station A (Switching Center, Turbine Hall, Boiler Hall, Gate House and shops/offices along the east façade of the Boiler Hall) (1932). View looking northwest. Source: PG&E Unit Cost Report on the Reconstruction of Station A, 1932.

Figure 77: Interior of Station A Turbine Hall, view looking north (1932). Source: PG&E Unit Cost Report on the Reconstruction of Station A, 1932.
The next phase of PG&E’s expansion on the site occurred when the C&H refinery was shut down ca.1950. PG&E purchased the sugar refinery site (directly east of Station A) for the expansion of their steam electric operations.44 A new steam plant designed by the PG&E Department of Engineering was completed in 1965.

Steam generating units were selected based on the waterfront location of the site and a new preference for steam over other electrical generating sources. Even before 1965, steam turbine units were based on well-established and proven technologies. British designer Sir Charles Parsons built the first steam turbine generator in 1884, and soon after others improved his original concept. By the beginning of the twentieth century, steam turbines began replacing the original steam engine power plants. Aegidius Elling of Norway is credited with creating the first applied method of injecting steam into the combustion chambers of a gas turbine engine in 1903-04; the technology and capacity of these engines to supply power and electricity quickly grew. Further improvements in steam turbine engines were developed throughout the 1920s and 1930s, leading to a generation of more efficient turbine power plants by the 1950s.45 In 1950, PG&E operated 15 steam electric plants in California. Several new plants were constructed and others were expanded during the 1950s, including: Kern (1948-50); Contra Costa (1951-53); Moss Landing (1950-52), Pittsburg (1953-54); Morro Bay (1955); Hunters Point (addition 1958), and Humboldt Bay (1956-58). Further construction by PG&E and other power companies during the 1960s and 1970s resulted in twenty fossil fuel steam-generating plants throughout the state.46

In 1965, PG&E constructed a new steam plant at the subject site that included Power Building Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack near the water’s edge (Figure 78–Figure 91). The eight-story Unit 3 operated with natural gas and steam and contained a significantly more efficient boiler than the one located in Station A. The natural gas-powered boiler produced superheated high-pressure steam using purified and heated San Francisco Bay water. The steam was run through a turbine that subsequently turned a Westinghouse generator. The open-air design of Unit 3 allowed for the boiler to cool more efficiently. Three distillate-fueled peaking generators (Units 4, 5 and 6), located between Station A and Unit 3, were added to the site in 1976 (and demolished in 2011).47

---

44 PG&E’s expansion eastward was also sparked by the demolition of their gas manufacturing buildings located north of Station A in the 1960s (of which only the Meter House and Compressor House were retained) and the subsequent abandonment of manufactured gas production.
45 JRP Historical Consulting, “Mitigation Plan, Humboldt Bay Power Plant” (2013). p.10
46 JRP Historical Consulting, “Historic American Engineering Record: Humboldt Bay Power Plant” (March 2012).
Figure 78: Unit 3 under construction (16 June, 1964). Spreckels’ East Wharf/Sugar Receiving building in the background. Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 79: Unit 3 under construction (August 1965). Source: PG&E Progress, vol. xiii no.8.
Figure 80: Unit 3 (ca.1963-65). View looking southeast. Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 81: Boiler Stack without ducting (2 October 1964). Spreckels' East Wharf/Sugar Receiving building in the background. Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 82: Steam drum being lifted into place (22 June 1964). Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 83: Unit 3 boiler drum and hangers (no date). Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 84: Unit 3 east air preheater (no date). Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 85: Unit 3 east air preheater (16 October 1964). Source: Associate Capital.
Figure 86: Unit 3 generator arriving (7 June 1965). Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 87: Unit 3 generator on blocks ready for placement (25 June 1965). Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 88: Unit 3 Control Room and Generator Board (15 March 1965). Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 89: Drawing of Unit 3 (no date). View looking southwest. Source: Associate Capital.
Figure 90: Southeast corner of Unit 3 in foreground (no date). Spreckels’ East Wharf/Sugar Receiving building in the background. View looking southeast. Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 91: Drawing of Boiler Stack by PG&E Department of Engineering. Source: Associate Capital.
Although Unit 3 was the most prominent addition to the subject site, PG&E constructed several secondary buildings and structures throughout the latter half of the twentieth century (Figure 92). These utilitarian buildings and structures include the extant Steam Heat Shop Building; the Fire Pump House; the Boat House Butler Storage Building; the Lube Oil Room/Storage Building; the Station A Group Office/Warehouse; the Abrasive Blast Building; the Electric Shop; the Maintenance/Machine Shop; and the Hazardous Waste Storage Building. Most of these industrial buildings are aluminum-clad with flat or gabled roofs and simple openings. Additional structures constructed during the latter half of the twentieth century include: Fuel Storage Tanks; other miscellaneous oil and water tanks; and the Fuel Oil Pipeline. In addition to extant buildings and structures, three Peaker Plant foundations (of Units 4, 5 and 6), an Ammonia Tank Pad, a Hazardous Waste Storage Pad, and an unknown concrete pad foundation reflect previously existing structures that have since been demolished.48

With the construction of Unit 3, the Potrero Plant held the capacity to provide up to a third of the City's peak electrical power needs. Although Unit 3 was one of California’s early natural gas-fired steam power plants, it appears to have been one of dozens by the time it was decommissioned in 2011. Plants that preceded Unit 3 included: Kern (1948-50); Contra Costa (1951-53); Moss Landing (1950-52), Pittsburg (1953-54); Morro Bay (1955); Hunters Point (addition 1958), and Humboldt Bay (1956-58) (Figure 93- Figure 95). Today, the nearest extant and operational natural gas-fired power stations are located in Pittsburg, San Jose, and Hayward; these facilities were all constructed in the early 2000s and are similar in design to the Potrero Plant (Figure 96– Figure 98).

48 A “Peaker Plant” is a power plant that generally runs only when there is a high demand, known as peak demand, for electricity.
Figure 93: Kern Power Plant in Bakersfield, CA, constructed in 1948-50. Source: http://www.bakersfield.com/archives/p g-e-begins-removing-soil-from-former-power-plant/article_8562f25c-47fd-5fa1- 81d8-dba39a48a248.html

Figure 94: Moss Landing Power Plant in Monterey Bay, CA, constructed in 1950-52. Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moss_Landing_Power_Plant

Figure 95: Humboldt Bay Power Plant in Eureka, CA, constructed in 1956-58. Source: http://lcweb2.loc.gov/master/pnp/habshaer/ca/ca3800/ca3878/data/ca3878data.pdf

Figure 96: Los Medanos Energy Center in Pittsburg, CA, constructed in 2001. Source: http://www.calpine.com/los-medanos-energy-center
At PG&E’s Potrero Point plant, Station A operated alongside Unit 3 until 1983, when it was removed from service. That same year, the Station A Boiler Hall, formerly attached to the east side of the Station A Turbine Hall, was demolished (Figure 99–Figure 105). The demolition of the Boiler Hall removed over 50% of the original Station A plant.

---

49 Station A power generating operations ceased in 1979; the Switching Center remained in use until 1983.
Figure 100: Boiler Hall demolition (1983). Source: Associate Capital.

Figure 101: Photograph showing peaker plants in front of the Sugar House at rear left (east) and Station A Turbine Hall at right (west) (between 1983 and 1995). Station A Boiler Hall has been demolished by this time. Source: Associate Capital.
Figure 102: Mid-1990s Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (vol. 5, sheet 608). Left arrow pointing to demolished Boiler Hall. Source: San Francisco Planning Information Map.


Figure 105: Aerial photograph of Station A (Turbine Hall, Switching Center, Machine Shop, and Machine Shop Office) (ca.2010). The Boiler Hall (demolished) would have been located east (right) of the Turbine Hall. Source: Associate Capital.
Station A’s generating units were operated for the last time in 1979 and the Boiler Hall was demolished in 1983. PG&E continued to utilize the Switching Center building until 1983. The entirety of Station A has been vacant since the late 1980s. PG&E sold the central and eastern portions of the Potrero Power Station to The Southern Company in 1999. PG&E continued operations on the western portion of the subject site, where a switchyard remains operational. Unit 3 was finally shut down in 2011, under the ownership of NRG. In 2011 the three Peaker Plants (Units 4, 5 and 6) were demolished (their concrete foundation pads remain).50

The following Table 6 includes extant buildings on the subject site associated with PG&E; only the Turbine Hall at Station A is associated with Claus Spreckels’ Independent Gas & Power Company.51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extant PG&amp;E-associated Building</th>
<th>Construction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station A (Turbine Hall, Machine Shop Office, Machine Shop, Switching Center)</td>
<td>1901-02; ca.1911; ca.1915; 1930-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate House</td>
<td>ca.1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter House</td>
<td>ca.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressor House</td>
<td>ca.1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Shop</td>
<td>Between 1946 and 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A Group Office/Warehouse</td>
<td>Between 1956 and 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat House Butler Storage Building</td>
<td>Between 1958 and 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Machine Shop</td>
<td>Between 1958 and 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3 Power Block (Generator, Turbine, Office, Boiler Stack)</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Heat Shop Building</td>
<td>Between 1968 and 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Pump House</td>
<td>Between 1974 and 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lube Oil Room/Storage Building</td>
<td>Between 1975 and 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrasive Blast Building</td>
<td>Between 1982 and 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Storage Building</td>
<td>Between 1982 and 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Switchyard Warehouse</td>
<td>Between 1982 and 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 1</td>
<td>Between 1982 and 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 2</td>
<td>Between 1998-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 3</td>
<td>Between 1998-2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 An Ammonia Tank, an unknown building, and a Hazardous Waste-related building/structure/feature were all demolished at unknown dates; their concrete foundation pads remain.

51 This table does not include sheds with unknown construction dates, or features such as tanks, foundations, gas lines, etc.
V. EVALUATION

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The California Register of Historical Resources follows nearly identical guidelines to those used by the National Register, but identifies the Criteria for Evaluation numerically.

In order for a property to be eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found significant under one or more of the following criteria.

- **Criterion 1 (Events):** Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

- **Criterion 2 (Persons):** Resources that are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

- **Criterion 3 (Architecture):** Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values.

- **Criterion 4 (Information Potential):** Resources or sites that have yielded or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

Different from the National Register, the California Register does not have a strict 50-year age threshold to qualify for eligibility. Rather, a “resource less than fifty years old may be considered for listing in the California Register if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance.”

The following section includes a summary of previous findings as well as Page & Turnbull’s examination of buildings, structures and landscape features not previously evaluated for listing in the California Register. This includes Unit 3 (1965), as well as all other secondary buildings, structures and landscape features described in this report. The following analysis does not include discussions of eligibility under Criterion 4 (Information Potential), as this criterion applies to properties that may contain archeological resources and is beyond the scope of this report.

The following section additionally includes separate evaluations for two potential historic districts or cultural landscapes based on the themes of the Sugar Refinery and PG&E uses. An assessment of potential expansion of the period of significance for the Third Street Industrial District is also included.

---

EVALUATIONS OF INDIVIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE

No buildings or structures on the subject site remain extant from the gunpowder production, barrel production, or sugar refinery eras.\(^{53}\)

Criterion 1 (Events)
Evaluated by historian Ward Hill for Dames & Moore in 1999, the Meter House (ca.1902) and the Compressor House (ca.1924) were both found eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events) based on their association with PG&E’s gas manufacturing facility and their significance in the history of gas manufacturing in Northern California.\(^{54}\) Hill found the buildings to retain a sufficient level of integrity. They are the only extant buildings remaining in the PG&E system associated with the pre-1930 gas manufacturing.

Station A (including the Turbine Hall, Boiler Hall, Switching Center, Machine Shop and Machine Shop Office) (1901-02; 1930-31) was identified as individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events) in expert testimony at a California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission hearing on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco. Station A was identified as individually significant because it predates the 1906 San Francisco earthquake and was originally built by Claus Spreckels.\(^{56}\)

The Gate House (ca.1914) and the Pump House (1930) were recorded by Mr. Hill on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523A forms and determined to be ineligible for listing in the California Register, based on lack of integrity.

Page & Turnbull did not find any remaining buildings, structures or landscape features individually significant under Criterion 1. PG&E developed parts of the subject site from 1905 to 1951, and then developed the entire subject site following the 1951 demolition of most Spreckels’ sugar refinery buildings. Despite a large collection of extant PG&E buildings, structures and features, research did not uncover PG&E Potrero Plant’s natural gas boiler to be the first of its kind. Previously constructed plants included: Kern (1948-50); Contra Costa (1951-53); Moss Landing (1950-52), Pittsburg (1953-54); Morro Bay (1955); Hunters Point (addition 1958), and Humboldt Bay (1956-58). Additionally, the Potrero Plant was not the sole provider of electricity to the City of San Francisco during its decades of operation.

Criterion 2 (Persons)
Station A was previously evaluated and found not to have strong associations with Claus Spreckels, due to his very brief period of ownership and the alterations to Station A subsequent to his ownership. The Gate House was constructed following Spreckels’ period of ownership and is not eligible under Criterion 2. The Meter House and Compressor House had no association with Spreckels and are not eligible under Criterion 2. Other buildings that were associated with Spreckels (such as the Sugar House or the Wharf Building) have been demolished. Foundations of demolished sugar refinery buildings are not distinguishable. The extant sugar refinery warehouses adjacent to but outside of the project site (south, across 23rd Street) were found eligible for listing in the National Register and are considered historic resources by the San Francisco Planning Department (and are

\(^{53}\) Two of Spreckels’ sugar warehouses are located directly south of the subject site on 23rd Street.


\(^{55}\) Deterioration has occurred since the Meter House and Compressor House were evaluated in 1999. The roof of the Meter House has been removed and the interiors of both buildings completely gutted.
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discussed further in the evaluation to follow, titled “Sugar Refinery Historic District/Cultural Landscape Evaluation”).

Furthermore, no individuals were identified as being significant to the function of the PG&E Power Station throughout its ownership and use of the subject site. Therefore, no persons appear significant and directly associated with any buildings or structures on the site such that the buildings or structures would be considered individually significant under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3 (Architecture/Design)

Station A was (including the Turbine Hall, Boiler Hall, Switching Center, Machine Shop and Machine Shop Office) was identified as individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture) in expert testimony at a California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission hearing on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco. Station A was identified as individually significant because it predates the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. It is an important example of an early twentieth-century steam-powered electrical plant in Northern California. The Meter House and the Compressor House were not found to be exceptional examples of early twentieth-century San Francisco industrial architecture and thus are not individually significant under Criterion 3. The freestanding Gate House was also found ineligible under Criterion 3.

Page & Turnbull evaluated the extant buildings listed in the table below, as well as various sheds, tanks, concrete foundation pads, utility closets, and fuel lines that had not been previously evaluated for historic significance. None of them appear individually significant under Criterion 3. They are also further evaluated within the context of potential Sugar Refinery or PG&E historic districts in the evaluations that follow. These buildings, structures and landscape features were constructed either by the PG&E Department of Engineering or unknown builders; thus, they cannot be considered the work of a master architect or builder at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extant PG&amp;E-associated Building</th>
<th>Construction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Shop</td>
<td>Between 1946 and 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A Group Office/Warehouse</td>
<td>Between 1956 and 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat House Butler Storage Building</td>
<td>Between 1958 and 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Machine Shop</td>
<td>Between 1958 and 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3 Power Block (Generator, Turbine, Office, Boiler Stack)</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Heat Shop Building</td>
<td>Between 1968 and 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Pump House</td>
<td>Between 1974 and 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lube Oil Room/Storage Building</td>
<td>Between 1975 and 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrasive Blast Building</td>
<td>Between 1982 and 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Storage Building</td>
<td>Between 1982 and 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Switchyard Warehouse</td>
<td>Between 1982 and 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 1</td>
<td>Between 1982 and 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 2</td>
<td>Between 1998-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Switchyard Building 3</td>
<td>Between 1998-2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although many of the buildings above are age-eligible and appear to retain a high level of integrity, they do not exemplify a building type or possess high artistic style. As a primary building on the site, Unit 3 consists of a steel-frame structure with an adjacent concrete building and boiler stack. The

design and construction of Unit 3 does not appear to be unique; it was not the first natural gas power plant of its kind that PG&E constructed and operated in the state. Dozens of additional power plants of similar design were constructed in the latter half of the twentieth century and early 2000s. Secondary buildings on the subject site are universally prefabricated and/or utilitarian in design and devoid of ornamentation. Most feature aluminum cladding, flat or gable roofs, and simple openings. Many are garages or storage sheds. Thus, no buildings or structures on the site appear individually significant under Criterion 3.

SUGAR REFINERY HISTORIC DISTRICT/CULTURAL LANDSCAPE EVALUATION

The subject site supported sugar refining operations from 1881 to ca.1950. The California Sugar Refinery was constructed on the site in 1881 and renamed as the Western Sugar Refinery ca.1891. Both companies were owned by Claus Spreckels; his second son Adolf Spreckels managed the Western Sugar Refinery following Spreckels’ death in 1908. In 1949, the California & Hawaii Refining Corporation (C&H) purchased and quickly sold the site to PG&E ca.1950. The only remaining buildings and structures associated with sugar refining operations are the two warehouses at 401 23rd Street and 435 23rd Street, as well as a remnant of the former sugar refinery wharf. The two warehouses have already been recommended as individually significant resources in association with Claus Spreckels’ sugar refinery. While the Turbine Hall of Station A is associated with Spreckels, it is not associated with the California Sugar Refinery, but rather with his Independent Gas & Electric Company, which provided electricity not only to the sugar refinery but to the rest of the city. Furthermore, Spreckels’ gas and electric company merged with PG&E less than two years after Station A was constructed. Thus, the Turbine Hall at Station A cannot be said to contribute to a potential California Sugar Refinery Historic District. As only two warehouses and a remnant wharf remain to represent this period of the site’s history, there do not appear to be sufficient buildings, structures, or landscape features to constitute a historic district or cultural landscape that would be eligible for listing in the California Register under any criteria.

PG&E HISTORIC DISTRICT/CULTURAL LANDSCAPE EVALUATION

In 1896, San Francisco’s two biggest gas and electric companies—the San Francisco Gaslight Company and the Edison Company—merged to form the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company. Despite the grand merger, competition to provide gas and electric services remained intense. Claus Spreckels of the Western Sugar Refining Company entered the market in 1901 with his own Independent Electric Light & Power Company and Independent Gas & Power Company. Spreckels hired engineer A.M. Hunt and plans were prepared for a state-of-the-art steam power station (completed in 1902). By the end of 1903, Spreckels’ Independent companies were consolidated and purchased by the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company. In October 1905, the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company and the California Gas & Electric Company merged to form the Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E). The steam power station at Potrero Point (Station A) was the biggest in the PG&E system.

PG&E used Station A as a power generator from 1905 to 1979. Station A’s Switching Center continued to be used until 1983, when the Boiler Hall was demolished. PG&E produced manufactured gas from 1905 to ca.1930 at a complex located to the north and west of Station A. The Meter House and the Compressor House (both individually eligible for the California Register) were part of PG&E’s gas manufacturing complex. An industry shift away from manufactured gas towards natural gas prompted PG&E to construct Unit 3, which the company operated from 1965 to 1999. In addition to Unit 3, PG&E constructed several utilitarian buildings and structures

---

58 As identified by historian Jonathan Lammers in 2017.
59 The Meter House (ca.1902) was constructed prior to the creation of PG&E.
60 In 1999, PG&E sold the site to the Southern Company. Unit 3 was decommissioned in 2011.
throughout the latter half of the twentieth century. A period of significance associated with PG&E’s operation at the site would extend from 1901 to 1999, a span of nearly 100 years.

PG&E’s longevity at the primary subject site reflects the evolution of power production from manufactured gas to steam to natural gas. However, the extant buildings and structures at the site are unable to adequately convey this evolution. Station A, Unit 3 and all secondary buildings, structures, and site features constructed by PG&E in the latter half of the twentieth century are not individually significant, nor do they possess significance when held together as a group. Although the Meter House and Compressor House were found to be individually significant buildings, they do not share a relationship (physical or functional) with Station A or Unit 3. All other buildings and structures associated with the gas manufacturing complex were demolished in 1961-62. Station A and Unit 3 similarly do not share a physical or functional relationship. Station A’s Boiler Hall was demolished in 1983. Three Peaker Plants (Units 4, 5 and 6) dating from 1976 were demolished in 2011. Three Fuel Storage Tanks dating to the 1960s and 1970s were demolished in 2017. Various other structures have been demolished, including a Hazardous Waste tank, an Ammonia tank, and an unknown structure; only their concrete pad foundations remain.

The lack of physical or functional connections between the remaining buildings, structures, and site features of PG&E’s steam, manufactured gas, and natural gas operations, coupled with the demolition of multiple structures, limits the site’s ability to convey its remarkable evolution of power production. Therefore, while the site possesses significance under Criterion 1 (Events), a historic district or cultural landscape does not appear to exist that would be eligible for listing in the California Register under any criteria due to a lack of integrity.

THIRD STREET INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT - POTENTIAL PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE EXPANSION

The following description is excerpted from the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation District Record for the Potrero Point Historic District, which was authored as part of a Central Waterfront Cultural Resources Survey update prior to adoption by the Board of Supervisors in 2008.

The boundaries of the proposed Third Street Industrial District encompass the highest concentration of significant light industrial and processing properties remaining in the Central Waterfront district. The linear character of the district boundaries is dictated by the separation of heavy maritime industrial uses along the waterfront from the residential enclave of Dogpatch. The intermediate zone between the two areas gradually developed with light industrial, repair, warehousing and food processing businesses, as well as some wholesale businesses, such as oil distribution companies, that needed to have proximity to rail lines along Third Street as well as a local labor force of blue collar workers. Historically, the blocks between Third and Illinois have been occupied by manufacturing operations and warehouses, most notable of which is the vast American Can Company plant. The proposed Third Street Industrial Historic District links Pier 70 and Dogpatch and provides a sense of historical and geographical continuity between the two areas. Potentially, these three districts could be conceived as a single entity, San Francisco’s only historic district that recognizes the remaining infrastructure of a mixed-use industrial and residential community, once the most important industrial zone on the West

---

Page & Turnbull researched other PG&E power plant sites and thoroughly reviewed the Humboldt Bay Power Plant as a case study. No evaluative framework specific to industrial power plants was cited, nor did further research uncover such a framework.
Previously identified contributing district resources on the subject site include Station A, the Meter House, the Gate House, and the Compressor House. Contributing resources adjacent to but outside of the subject site include the two former Spreckels warehouses addressed 401 23rd Street and 435 23rd Street. All designated contributors have a similar history and significance as the other properties within the Third Street Industrial District. Buildings on the detached subject parcels were constructed in the 1940s, within the previously defined period of significance of 1872 to 1958; however, they were not considered for the district.

Although Unit 3 and other secondary buildings and structures are within the boundaries of the Third Street Industrial District (which is significant under Criterion 1), they were constructed outside of the previously defined period of significance of 1872 to 1958. The end date for the period of significance was justified as 50 years prior to the time of survey in 2008, which means that it may be considered somewhat arbitrary. The District Record for the Third Street Industrial District does not identify or evaluate buildings or structures outside of the period of significance, such as Unit 3 or other secondary buildings and structures on the site.

Page & Turnbull believes there is potential to extend the period of significance to 1965. The year 1958 was an arbitrary date that cuts short a sustained period of productive industrial activity lasting until 1965, despite a post-World War II decline in employment. According to the District Record, “Between 1965 and 1980, jobs in the Central Waterfront dropped from 16,304 to 11,004, with most of the losses occurring in manufacturing and ship repair. By the late 1960s, Dogpatch had deteriorated to the point where the San Francisco Planning Department considered demolishing residential buildings and rezoning the area for industrial uses. Arson and industrial encroachment also took their toll, reducing the residential core of Dogpatch to what exists today. The 1980s witnessed a revival of the area, with an influx of artisans in search of inexpensive housing with character.”

The Granex Corporation copra (coconut meat)-loading crane was constructed in 1965 just south of Unit 3 at Islais Creek. Despite its location outside the Third Street Industrial District boundaries, the crane’s construction is supporting evidence of the immediate area’s continuing industrial activity up until 1965, prior to a general decline in the late 1960s. Industrial productivity through 1965 and the area’s subsequent decline suggest that the Third Street Industrial District’s period of significance could be extended beyond 1958 to 1965.

Should the district period of significance be extended to 1965, Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack would be considered district contributors as they are prominent industrial features and visual icons of the Central Waterfront area. Unit 3 does not directly relate to the history and significance as stated in the District Record, which specifies a typology of “light industrial, repair, warehousing and food processing businesses, as well as some wholesale businesses, such as oil distribution companies, that needed to have proximity to rail lines along Third Street as well as a local labor force of blue collar workers. Historically, the blocks between Third and Illinois have been occupied by manufacturing operations and warehouses.”

Yet, Station A, the Meter House, the Compressor House, and the Gate House were already determined to be contributors despite not fitting the specified typology, so it is reasonable to include Unit 3 with this grouping. Utilitarian buildings and structures on the subject site constructed prior to 1965 are unlikely to be considered district contributors, as these prefabricated buildings (often ordered from catalogs) were erected in great numbers in the area.

---

62 Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull, p.11.
63 Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull, p. 30.
64 Ibid.
Additionally, they are dissimilar to previously identified district contributors, none of which are prefabricated utilitarian buildings.

No previously identified Third Street Industrial District non-contributors would become contributors by extending the period of significance to 1965. With the extended period of significance and the addition of Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack, there are currently 24 contributing properties and 28 non-contributing properties in the district.
VI. CONCLUSION

The subject site at 1201 Illinois Street has been historically used for gunpowder production, barrel production, sugar refining, and power production. The site contains multiple buildings and structures dating its use as a power station, which spanned from 1901-02 to 2011. All buildings and structures from the gunpowder, barrel and sugar eras have been demolished. The subject site includes four extant previously determined contributors to the Third Street Industrial District: Station A (1901-02; 1930-31), the Meter House (ca.1902), the Gate House (ca.1914) and the Compressor House (ca.1924). The Meter House, Compressor House, and Station A were previously found individually eligible for the California Register.

Page & Turnbull evaluated all remaining buildings, structures and landscape features for eligibility to the California Register. Research did not uncover any remaining buildings, structures and landscape features to be eligible for the California Register individually or as part of a historic district or cultural landscape in association with either Spreckels’ sugar refinery or the Pacific Gas & Electric power station. Additionally, Page & Turnbull evaluated the possible expansion of the Third Street Industrial District period of significance (1872 to 1958) and found potential to expand the end date range to 1965 and include Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack as contributors to that historic district.
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APPENDIX A. AVAILABLE BUILDING PERMITS

Front and back pages of building permit applications currently on file with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection:
Bureau of Fire Prevention and Investigation

Construct and install on building to satisfaction of Bureau of Fire Prevention the following fire protection equipment and appliances:

F. D. (Dry) Standpipes
Wet Standpipes
Hose Reels
Tanks
Down Pipes
Automatic Fire Pumps
Automatic Sprinkler System
Water Service Connection
Ground Floor Pipe Casings
Refrigeration
Incinerators

Superintendent Bureau of Building Inspection
Zoning: Heavy Ind.
Approved: 

City Planning Commission
Approved: 

Director of Public Health
Approved: 

Department of Electricity
Approved: 

Bureau of Engineering
Approved: 

Approved:

Favorably 3/1/41

Plan to be filed

BLDG. FORM

Pacific Gas & Electric Co.
Owner

FOR PERMIT TO MAKE
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS or REPAIRS
TO BUILDING

Location: 120, 23rd Ave

Cost: $2,500.00

Filed: Feb 27, 1946

Approved:

Permit No.: 80997

Issued: 

Art Commission
Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location: Sta. A - P.O.B. No. 430 - 33rd St., San Francisco

(2) Present use of building: Power Station

(3) Use of building hereafter: Same

(4) Total Cost: $2,500.00

(5) Description of work to be done: Rearrangement of ventilating system in locker room of Station ‘A’ and all incidental work connected therewith.

(6) APPLICANT MUST FILL OUT COMPENSATION INSURANCE DATA ON REVERSE SIDE.

I hereby certify and agree, if a permit is issued, that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW, THE BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCES, SET-RACK LINE REQUIREMENTS AND THE FIRE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the STATE HOUSING ACT OF CALIFORNIA will be complied with, whether herein specified or not; and I hereby agree to save, indemnify and keep harmless the City and County of San Francisco against all liabilities, judgments, costs and expenses which may in anywise accrue against said city and county in consequence of the granting of this permit, or from the use or occupancy of any sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk placed by virtue thereof, and will in all things strictly comply with the conditions of this permit.

(8) Architect:

Certificate No. __________________________
State of California __________________________
License No. __________________________
City and County of San Francisco __________________________
Address __________________________

(9) Engineer:

Certificate No. __________________________
State of California __________________________
License No. __________________________
City and County of San Francisco __________________________
Address __________________________

(10) Plans and specifications prepared by Pacific Gas & Electric Company

Address 245 Market St., San Francisco, Calif.

(11) Contractor: H.H. Larsen Co.

License No. 8821
State of California __________________________
License No. K 333
City and County of San Francisco __________________________
Address 64 South Park, San Francisco, Calif.

(12) Owner: Pacific Gas & Electric Company

Address 245 Market St., San Francisco, Calif.

Owner’s Authorized Agent: __________________________

THE DEPARTMENT WILL CALL UP TELEPHONE NO.
IF ANY ALTERATIONS OR CHANGES ARE NECESSARY ON THE PLANS SUBMITTED.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREBY AND ACCORDING TO THE REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE.

I, [Applicant's Name], being the owner or person having the right and authority to build, do hereby apply for a building permit to erect, build, construct, alter or repair the building described in the plans and specifications attached hereto.

The plans and specifications attached to this application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and they are in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

I hereby agree to submit all necessary drawings and specifications for review by the Department of Building Inspection.

I, [Applicant's Name], hereby certify that the work to be done is necessary for the purpose stated in this application and that the plans and specifications submitted herewith are true and complete.

[Signature]
[Date]

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I am a duly licensed person while in the process of doing the work described in this application.

[License Number]
[Date]

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the plans of the building as shown by the submitted plans and specifications or in the building without the written consent of the Department of Building Inspection.

ALTERATION OR REPAIRS

No alteration or repair of any kind shall be made to the building without the written consent of the Department of Building Inspection.

SCHOOL USE

No alteration or repair of any kind shall be made to the building without the written consent of the Department of Building Inspection.

MOLD REMOVAL

No alteration or repair of any kind shall be made to the building without the written consent of the Department of Building Inspection.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

No description shall be made in the plans or specifications of any structure as shown by the submitted plans and specifications or in the building without the written consent of the Department of Building Inspection.

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I am a duly licensed person while in the process of doing the work described in this application.

[License Number]
[Date]

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

I have and will maintain workers' compensation insurance, as required by Section 3100 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued.

[Signature]
[Date]

RPR ARCHITECTS

TELEPHONE: [Number]

ADDRESS: [Address]

ARCHITECT [Name]

ENGINEER [Name]

[Signature]
[Date]
## CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

Contact the fire marshal at 310-286-5500 or the building official at 310-286-5504 for additional information.

This application is required under section 466.5 of the Building and Fire Code and requires an approval of the building. Work shall be done in accordance with all applicable codes. Any electrical or plumbing work shall require appropriate separate permits.

### DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

- **APPROVED:**
  - **DATE:** JUN 14 2001
  - **REASON:**

### BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION/PUBLIC SAFETY

- **APPROVED:**
  - **DATE:**
  - **REASON:**

### BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

- **APPROVED:**
  - **DATE:**
  - **REASON:**

### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

- **APPROVED:**
  - **DATE:**
  - **REASON:**

### REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

- **APPROVED:**
  - **DATE:**
  - **REASON:**
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

2+ PLAN SETS
NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREBY AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREOFATHER SET FORTH.

MATERIAL COSTS
2/19/04
342169
$1,178,3

INFORMATION TO BE FurnISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CONTENT</th>
<th>NO. OF CONTENTS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CONTENT</th>
<th>NO. OF CONTENTS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE: The undersigned, by his signature, agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco, its officers, employees, agents and contractors from any and all claims, demands, and damages for personal injury or property damage to persons or property caused by any condition arising from the work being performed under this permit.

I hereby certify and affirm that all of the information contained in this application is true and not fraudulent.

Date: 2-19-04

[Signature]

APPLICATIONS CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify and affirm that a permit is required for the construction described in the application and all provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances under which this permit is issued are hereby complied with.

Date: 2-19-04

[Signature]
CONSIDERATIONS AND STIPULATIONS

APPROVED: PERmit AND WORK STATED ON
CEA. PERmit CONCEIVED UNDER PERmit ER FOR THE
AREA CLEAR AIR PLAN BOARD 10/19/91.

APPROVED: LIVING SUIT FINE INSPECTION
AT THE START OF WORK 5/9-3308

APPROVED: BUREAU OF PREVENTIVE PUBLIC SAFETY

APPROVED: MECHANICAL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED: SPECIAL INSPECTIONS AND TESTING REQUIRED PER
BUILDING CODE SECTION 1714.7

APPROVED: CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED: Scope of work and construction staging area
are well within the property. EPT 1/25/04

APPROVED: Pass Ramps and work in a manner that does not
result in the creation of excessive noise, vibration,
or dust at the project site, in accordance with the
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Title 14,
California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Subtitle 1
§15155.1, and Federal Environmental Quality Act (CERCLA),
Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Subtitle A,
Part 308.

APPROVED: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

APPROVED: REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

APPROVED: HOUSING INSPECTION DIVISION

AGREEMENT TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OR REQUIREMENTS OF THE NOTED BUSINESSES OR DEPARTMENTS NOTED ON THIS APPLICATION AND ATTACHED STATEMENTS OF CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS, WHICH ARE HEREBY MADE A PART OF THIS APPLICATION.

Charles R. Heiden
OWNERS AUTHORIZED AGENT

I agree to comply with all conditions or requirements of the noted businesses or departments noted on this application and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments: 0

OFFICIAL COPY

REJECT TO
DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED: JUN 28, 2000

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE: 
REASON:
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 [ ] OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 [ ] OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

AN TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION: 2
TI-NUMBER OF STOREY(S): 3
AREA OF STRUCTURE: 3428.53
AREA OF MEANS OF EGRESS: 4175.3

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

BY TYPE OF USE: 2
C-NUMBER OF STOREYS: 3
AREA OF STRUCTURE: 3428.53
AREA OF MEANS OF EGRESS: 4175.3

WORKS TO BE CONSTRUCTED OR ALTERED: A
SPECIFICATIONS: 2

APPLICATION OF HABITATION: 1
WORKS TO BE CONSTRUCTED OR ALTERED: A
SPECIFICATIONS: 2

GENERAL CONTRACTOR

DESCRIPTION

Renzoni, Raymond
Baker Creek Construction Co., Inc., Belmont (T. 4423)

COST OF WORK

$950,000

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

DENIED HABITABLE CLAUSE

NOTE TO APPLICANT

This application is being submitted to the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of determining whether the application is complete and all requirements are met. The application will be denied if it is found to be incomplete or if any of the requirements are not met.

The City and County of San Francisco will then notify the applicant of the denial and provide an explanation of the reasons for the denial.

The applicant has the right to appeal the decision of the City and County of San Francisco to the Board of Appeals, Department of Building Inspection.

The City and County of San Francisco will not issue a permit unless the application is complete and all requirements are met.

The applicant must pay all applicable fees and comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to revoke any permit issued if the requirements of the permit are not met.

The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work is done in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to inspect the work at any time to ensure compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to require additional information or documentation to be submitted to verify compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to withhold or revoke any permit if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions of the permit.

The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work is done in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to inspect the work at any time to ensure compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to require additional information or documentation to be submitted to verify compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to withhold or revoke any permit if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions of the permit.

The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work is done in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to inspect the work at any time to ensure compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to require additional information or documentation to be submitted to verify compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to withhold or revoke any permit if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions of the permit.

The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work is done in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to inspect the work at any time to ensure compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to require additional information or documentation to be submitted to verify compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to withhold or revoke any permit if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions of the permit.

The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work is done in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to inspect the work at any time to ensure compliance with the permit conditions.

The City and County of San Francisco reserves the right to require add
CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

DATE: APR 26 2011
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

APPROVED: ROBERT CHEN
NO. 100081-11-12
DATE: APR 26 2011
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

APPROVED: DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
DATE: 3/4/04
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

APPROVED: CITY OF SF FIRE INSPECTOR
DATE: 6/25/04
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

APPROVED: MECHANICAL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION
DATE: APR 26 2011
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

APPROVED: CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION
DATE: APR 26 2011
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

APPROVED: BUREAU OF ENGINEERS
DATE: APR 26 2011
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

APPROVED: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
DATE: APR 26 2011
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

APPROVED: RECEIPTMENT AGENCY
DATE: APR 26 2011
REASON:

NOTIFIED MR.:

HUNTING INSPECTION DIVISION

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or department noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments: [Signature]

OWNERS AUTHORIZED AGENT:

[Signature]
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☐ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLANS: 2

APPLICATION MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I HAVE READ AND AGREE TO THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WHICH WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 □ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM □ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

DATE ISSUED: 12/19/2004

PERMIT NO: 1057254

REVISION NO: 04/11/05

ADDRESS: 1201-1203 PETERSON AVE.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

ANNUAL COST OF PERMIT: $800.00

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION: I
NATURE OF USE: INDUSTRIAL
MATERIALS OF CONSTRUCTION: STEEL

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION: I
NATURE OF USE: INDUSTRIAL
MATERIALS OF CONSTRUCTION: STEEL

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SITE

DIAGNOSIS OF SITE

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

MOLD WARNINGS CLAUSE. This permit is issued by the City and County of San Francisco, Department of Building Inspection and is subject to all applicable regulatory requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco. The applicant is responsible for maintaining compliance with all applicable regulations and standards as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work performed in connection with the permit is conducted in accordance with all applicable regulations and standards as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work performed in connection with the permit is conducted in accordance with all applicable regulations and standards as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco.

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

MOLD WARNINGS CLAUSE. This permit is issued by the City and County of San Francisco, Department of Building Inspection and is subject to all applicable regulatory requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco. The applicant is responsible for maintaining compliance with all applicable regulations and standards as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work performed in connection with the permit is conducted in accordance with all applicable regulations and standards as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work performed in connection with the permit is conducted in accordance with all applicable regulations and standards as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all work performed in connection with the permit is conducted in accordance with all applicable regulations and standards as may be prescribed by the City and County of San Francisco.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMITS, ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 2 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE
DATE REV. 2/08
NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

IMPORTANT NOTICES

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

APPLICANTS CERTIFICATION

Signature of Applicant or Agent
CONNECTION AND STIPULATIONS

FIRE ALARM

June 24, 2007

IN RE: FIRE WARD

BUILDING PERMIT: DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

Please notify fire inspector at the start of work. All building permits require building inspector sign-off instead of fire prevention & public safety.

Approved: N/A

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

Approved: N/A

MECHANICAL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

Approved: N/A

CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

Approved: N/A

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

Approved: N/A

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Approved: N/A

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Approved: N/A

HOUSING INSPECTION DIVISION

To comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various laws or departments noted on this application and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments

OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 3 □ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 □ OVER THE COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS □ DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE □

DATE ISSUED: 10/1/08
PLANS RECEIVED NO: 1201 Illinois St

APPLICANT:

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING INSPECTION OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR
PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS
AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREWITH AND
ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE
HEREINAFTER SET FORTH

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

- Excavate for and construct electric power transmission duct and brick backfill, replace
  over trenches. Approximate quantity 600 ft
  6' wide x 6' deep

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE: The undersigned(s) by acceptance of the permit(s) agree(s) to hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco and all municipalities and districts created or authorized by the City and County of San Francisco and their representatives and all persons or organizations doing or causing to be done any work covered by this permit, from and against all claims, damages, costs and expenses

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

OFFICE COPY

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WILL BE COMPLIED WITH

10/02/08 (REV. 10/02)
I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or department noted on this application and attached statements of conditions or stipulations which are hereby made a part of this application.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE 11-11

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

B Immediately above this line

5-24-2012

1921 Ulloa St. San Francisco

9175-003

1265380 5-24-12 $1000

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>NO. OF STORY(S)</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>NO. OF STORY(S)</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

| CONDITION \(P| 5-24-12 \) | CONSTRUCTION \(P| 5-24-12 \) | CONSTRUCTION \(P| 5-24-12 \) | CONSTRUCTION \(P| 5-24-12 \) | CONSTRUCTION \(P| 5-24-12 \) | CONSTRUCTION \(P| 5-24-12 \) |
|--------------|--------------|----------|-------|-----|----------|-------|
|              |              |          |       |     |          |       |

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy of any building or portion thereof unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the building official in writing that the change will not result in a hazardous condition.

The provisions of this building code are not to be construed as requiring the installation of sprinklers or fire alarm systems in buildings or structures other than those specifically required by the code.

The building official reserves the right to require such additional work as may be necessary to make the building as safe as the public interest requires.

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and amendments thereto shall be complied with.

OFFICE COPY

Date

May 24, 2012

VIVIAN L. DAY
DIRECTOR/CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED

MAY 24, 2012

SFFD INSPECTION

FEES REQ.

PAGE 3 OF 8

1921 Ulloa St. San Francisco

94118

COOK, PITA, PROTECTION: BYSTANDER, LIVING 5'-11'-05

(THIS INTERIOR ELEMENT MUST BE IN A FIREPROOF SPACE)

9-10-13

PAGE 2 OF 8

23 MISSION STR. San Francisco 94105

(THIS INTERIOR ELEMENT MUST BE IN A FIREPROOF SPACE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Copy</th>
<th>CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATE: _____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REASON: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTIFIED MR. ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureau or department noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments ___  Owners Authorized Agent ___
No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a building permit establishing such change. See San Francisco Building Code and San Francisco Housing Code.

No portion of building or structure or rubbish being used during construction to be closer than 10 ft. to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 366, California Penal Code.

Permits are issued by the San Francisco Building Code. The building permit shall be posted on the job. The person is responsible for proper presentation and application approval at building site.

Grade lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application and recorded in the records of the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco are acknowledged to be correct. All necessary permits for the grading and building permits must be obtained from the proper authorities. This application must be submitted to the City and County of San Francisco for approval. Approval of this application does not constitute an approval of the electrical wiring or plumbing installations. Separate permits for the electrical and plumbing installations must be obtained.

This is not a building permit. No work shall be started until a building permit is issued.

In building all electrical materials must have a clearance of not less than two inches from all electrical wires or equipment.

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX
OWNER
ARCHITECT
ENGINEER
ARCHITECT W/POWER OF ATTORNEY
CONTRACTOR
ATTORNEY IN FACT

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION
I CERTIFY THAT I HAVE READ THIS APPLICATION AND STATE THAT THE ABOVE INFORMATION IS CORRECT. I AGREE TO PAY THE CONSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREBY COMPLIED WITH.

APPROVED
APR 9 2014
SIGNED
CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

M-2

ELECTRICAL SWITCH STATION

PROJECT IS UNDER CPUC JURISDICTION

APR 23 2015

Jeff Chin SFFD

APPROVED:

APR 23 2015

Richard Tam, DBI

MAR 27 2015

PLANT CHECKER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

SPECIAL INSPECTIONS AND TESTS ARE REQUIRED AS PER BUILDING CODE SECTION 1704-

MAR 27 2015

Richard Tam, DBI

CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

Accepted by the City of San Francisco Bldg Inspect, DBI, with the following conditions:

1. Obtain copies and follow the procedures of the Site Mitigation Plan, Environmental Health and Safety Plan, Dust Control Plan and other documents and requirements to ensure compliance with the SFPUC Ordinance.

2. """

N/A

Fort Jumo,

On 22nd ST

Richard Tam, DBI

DEPUTY, DBI

APPROVED:

APPROVED:

SFPUC Capacity Charges

See attached SFPUC Capacity Charge Invoice for amount due. DBI will collect charges.

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various licenses or departments involved in this application, and to file statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Terry Hoge

OWNERS AUTHORIZED AGENT

02/01/15
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

FORM 3 Q OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 O OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSON TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREFORTH AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THE HEREINAFTER SETFORTS.

DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE ▼

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

IMPORTANT NOTICES

BUILDING PERMITS

IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION'S GUIDELINES, THE ABOVE APPLICANT MUST PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

1. PLAN DRAWINGS
2. MATERIALS LIST
3. TRADE CONTRACTORS' CONTACT INFORMATION

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS MAY BE DISAPPROVED.

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED, THE CONSTRUCTION DESIGNED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

OFFICE COPY

MAR 18 2014
I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments: 

Owner's Authorized Agent: 
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 ☑ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS ▼ DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE ▼

DATE FILED: SEP 11 2014
PENDING PERMIT NO.: 1201 Illinois St.
CITY STREET ADDRESS OF JOB: 4175/006

PERSON NO.: 1231889
INSURED NO.: 9/11/14
DEEMED COST OF CONSTRUCTION: $140,000
RECEIVED FEE: $775.00
DUE DATE: 8/1/14

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

IMPORTANT NOTICES

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

FIELD OFFICER'S NOTE: The inspector noted the following deficiencies:
(1) The required water supply is not provided.
(2) The electrical work is not complete.
(3) The plumbing work is not complete.
(4) The heating system is not complete.
(5) The ventilation system is not complete.
(6) The sewer system is not complete.
(7) The electrical system is not complete.
(8) The plumbing system is not complete.
(9) The heating system is not complete.
(10) The ventilation system is not complete.
(11) The sewer system is not complete.
(12) The electrical system is not complete.
(13) The plumbing system is not complete.
(14) The heating system is not complete.
(15) The ventilation system is not complete.
(16) The sewer system is not complete.
(17) The electrical system is not complete.
(18) The plumbing system is not complete.
(19) The heating system is not complete.
(20) The ventilation system is not complete.
(21) The sewer system is not complete.
(22) The electrical system is not complete.
(23) The plumbing system is not complete.
(24) The heating system is not complete.
(25) The ventilation system is not complete.
(26) The sewer system is not complete.
(27) The electrical system is not complete.
(28) The plumbing system is not complete.
(29) The heating system is not complete.
(30) The ventilation system is not complete.
(31) The sewer system is not complete.
(32) The electrical system is not complete.
(33) The plumbing system is not complete.
(34) The heating system is not complete.
(35) The ventilation system is not complete.
(36) The sewer system is not complete.
(37) The electrical system is not complete.
(38) The plumbing system is not complete.
(39) The heating system is not complete.
(40) The ventilation system is not complete.
(41) The sewer system is not complete.
(42) The electrical system is not complete.
(43) The plumbing system is not complete.
(44) The heating system is not complete.
(45) The ventilation system is not complete.
(46) The sewer system is not complete.
(47) The electrical system is not complete.
(48) The plumbing system is not complete.
(49) The heating system is not complete.
(50) The ventilation system is not complete.
(51) The sewer system is not complete.
(52) The electrical system is not complete.
(53) The plumbing system is not complete.
(54) The heating system is not complete.
(55) The ventilation system is not complete.
(56) The sewer system is not complete.
(57) The electrical system is not complete.
(58) The plumbing system is not complete.
(59) The heating system is not complete.
(60) The ventilation system is not complete.
(61) The sewer system is not complete.
(62) The electrical system is not complete.
(63) The plumbing system is not complete.
(64) The heating system is not complete.
(65) The ventilation system is not complete.
(66) The sewer system is not complete.
(67) The electrical system is not complete.
(68) The plumbing system is not complete.
(69) The heating system is not complete.
(70) The ventilation system is not complete.
(71) The sewer system is not complete.
(72) The electrical system is not complete.
(73) The plumbing system is not complete.
(74) The heating system is not complete.
(75) The ventilation system is not complete.
(76) The sewer system is not complete.
(77) The electrical system is not complete.
(78) The plumbing system is not complete.
(79) The heating system is not complete.
(80) The ventilation system is not complete.
(81) The sewer system is not complete.
(82) The electrical system is not complete.
(83) The plumbing system is not complete.
(84) The heating system is not complete.
(85) The ventilation system is not complete.
(86) The sewer system is not complete.
(87) The electrical system is not complete.
(88) The plumbing system is not complete.
(89) The heating system is not complete.
(90) The ventilation system is not complete.
(91) The sewer system is not complete.
(92) The electrical system is not complete.
(93) The plumbing system is not complete.
(94) The heating system is not complete.
(95) The ventilation system is not complete.
(96) The sewer system is not complete.
(97) The electrical system is not complete.
(98) The plumbing system is not complete.
(99) The heating system is not complete.
(100) The ventilation system is not complete.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APR 1 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 1 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

PECULIAR FEE

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

TYPE OF CONTROL

STORIES OF OCCUPANCY

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

NO. OF BASEMENTS (AND CELLARS):

A. OCCUPANCY:

B. OCCUPANCY:

C. OCCUPANCY:

D. OCCUPANCY:

E. OCCUPANCY:

F. OCCUPANCY:

G. OCCUPANCY:

H. OCCUPANCY:

I. OCCUPANCY:

J. OCCUPANCY:

K. OCCUPANCY:

L. OCCUPANCY:

M. OCCUPANCY:

N. OCCUPANCY:

O. OCCUPANCY:

P. OCCUPANCY:

Q. OCCUPANCY:

R. OCCUPANCY:

S. OCCUPANCY:

T. OCCUPANCY:

U. OCCUPANCY:

V. OCCUPANCY:

W. OCCUPANCY:

X. OCCUPANCY:

Y. OCCUPANCY:

Z. OCCUPANCY:

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION

ARCHITECT/ENGINEER (SIGNATURE)
I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 8 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

2 NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREBY AND, ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREAFTER SET FORTH.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

Each signer of this application acknowledges receipt of the form, has read the form, and agrees that the application is being submitted for the purpose stated herein.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Applicant's Certification

All information and documents submitted with this application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

OFFICE COPY

DEC 1 0 2014
I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments

OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 ☑ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 ☑ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HERewith AND ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONSIDERED BY THE INSPECTOR, IN ACCORDANCE TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREOFERTHER.

APPLICATION WAS FILED ON: 1/13/2016

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

DATE FILED: 1/20/15

PLANS/PERMITS NO.

(SUBJECT ADDRESS OF JOB)

ADDRESS: 501-1301

PROPOSED USE: LEGAL SIZE

PROPOSED COST: $250,000

PERMIT NO.: 34629

NEGATIVE COST: $250,000

NEGATIVE COST: $250,000

NEGATIVE COST: 1/13/15

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

NAME OF OWNER: NRC Financial LLC

ADDRESS: 461 W. 10th St., Oakland, CA 94607

PHONE: 925-427-3327

EXPIRATION DATE

GENERAL CONSTRUCTION

NAME OF PERSON: NRC Financial LLC

ADDRESS: 461 W. 10th St., Oakland, CA 94607

PHONE: 925-427-3327

EXPIRATION DATE

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

No changes were made to the structure of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. San Francisco Building Code and San Francisco Building Code. No portion of building in question was added during construction is to be less than 99% of any new construction. See Sec. 360, Civil Code, Division 2.

Pursuant to San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be required on the job. The owner is responsible for proper plans and applications being kept at all times.

These plans and applications accompanying this application are to be submitted. If verbal plans other than those submitted, revised plans, all other plans and specifications must be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection.

Any noncompliance with the code may modify the plan for compliance.

BUILDING PERMITS FOR THE COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY AS DESCRIBED, SHALL BE ISSUED.

APPLICATIONS FOR BUILDING PERMITS MAY CONSTITUTE AN APPLICATION FOR THE ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL, AND PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A GROUNDED SYSTEM FOR THE WATER AND PLUMBING MIGHT BE OBTAINED BY OBTAINING PLUMBING PERMITS AS REQUIRED AND AMOUNTS OF "Y" TO ANY OF LIENS OR SURVEY PLANS (OR AS SHOWN). THE APPLICATION IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO PLANS SHALL BE SEEN UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 920 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the applicant shall list the names and addresses of all workers employed in this project.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

HOLD HENDERSON CLAUSE: The person(s) by acceptance of the permit(s), expressly agree to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from any and all actions, claims, and suits for damages resulting from failure to comply with the provisions of Section 920 of the Labor Code, except for the performance of work for which this permit is issued. Any workers' compensation insurance coverage under (or as designed to be so) shall be maintained on and off the premises as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code.

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

I hereby do and will install a certificate of insurance to secure workers' compensation, as provided by Section 920 of the Labor Code, for the performance of work for which this permit is issued.

I hereby do and will maintain workers' compensation insurance, as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code, for the performance of work for which this permit is issued. Any workers' compensation insurance maintained as required shall be maintained on and off the premises as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code.

Applicant's Certification

I certify under penalty of perjury of the following:

☐ L I hereby do and will install a certificate of insurance to secure workers' compensation, as provided by Section 920 of the Labor Code, for the performance of work for which this permit is issued. Any workers' compensation insurance coverage under (or as designed to be so) shall be maintained on and off the premises as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code.

☐ L I hereby do and will maintain workers' compensation insurance, as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code, for the performance of work for which this permit is issued. Any workers' compensation insurance maintained as required shall be maintained on and off the premises as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code.

I certify under penalty of perjury of the following:

☐ L I hereby do and will install a certificate of insurance to secure workers' compensation, as provided by Section 920 of the Labor Code, for the performance of work for which this permit is issued. Any workers' compensation insurance coverage under (or as designed to be so) shall be maintained on and off the premises as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code.

☐ L I hereby do and will maintain workers' compensation insurance, as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code, for the performance of work for which this permit is issued. Any workers' compensation insurance maintained as required shall be maintained on and off the premises as required by Section 920 of the Labor Code.

Signature of Applicant or Agent

Date: 1/20/15
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I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments

OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
FORM 8

FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

(1) NAME OF JOB

(2) STREET ADDRESS OF JOB

(3) BUILDING INSPECTOR

(4) OWNER

(5) COST OF WORK

(6) FEE

(7) DATES

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

(1) GENERAL CONTRACTOR

(2) SUBCONTRACTOR

(3) MILL WORK

(4) ELECTRICAL

(5) PLUMBING

(6) MASONRY

(7) MECHANICAL

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

(10) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY OWNER, ADDRESSES

(11) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY CONTRACTOR, ADDRESSES

(12) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY SUBCONTRACTOR, ADDRESSES

(13) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY MILL WORKER, ADDRESSES

(14) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY ELECTRICIAN, ADDRESSES

(15) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY PLUMBER, ADDRESSES

(16) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY MASONRY WORKER, ADDRESSES

(17) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY MECHANICAL WORKER, ADDRESSES

(18) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY OWNER, ADDRESSES

(19) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY CONTRACTOR, ADDRESSES

(20) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY SUBCONTRACTOR, ADDRESSES

(21) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY MILL WORKER, ADDRESSES

(22) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY ELECTRICIAN, ADDRESSES

(23) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY PLUMBER, ADDRESSES

(24) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY MASONRY WORKER, ADDRESSES

(25) IF ALTERATION IS TO BE PERFORMED BY MECHANICAL WORKER, ADDRESSES

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

We hereby order the issuance of a permit for the work as described above and for the addition or alteration or repair as contemplated by the plans and specifications submitted herewith. In accordance with the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth.

[Signature]
### CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Notified MR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector, Dept. of Bldg., Insbr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention &amp; Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineer, Dept. of Bldg., Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer, Dept. of Bldg., Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inspection Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments □

Owner's Authorized Agent
### Application for Building Permit

#### Application Details
- **Authority:** City and County of San Francisco Department of Building Inspection
- **Application Type:** Building Permit for additions, alterations, or repairs
- **Number of Plans:** 10-14
- **Applicant:** [Name Redacted]
- **Address:** [Address Redacted]
- **Permission to Build:** In accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth.

#### Building Information
- **Type of Construction:** Substation
- **Description of Existing Building:** 
  - **Owner:** [Owner Redacted]
  - **Address:** [Address Redacted]
- **Date of Completion:** 1-20-19

#### Building Alteration
- **Type of alteration:** Substation
- **Location:** [Location Redacted]

#### Additional Information
- **Applicant's Certification:**
  - By [Applicant Redacted]
  - Approving Authority: Department of Building Inspection

### Important Notices

- All changes shall be made in the name of the owner or as authorized by a building permit issued by the Department of Building Inspection.
- The building permit shall be forthwith attached to and become a part of the plans and specifications.

---

**Hold Harmless Agreement:**

The holder of this permit agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco, its employees, and agents, from and against any and all claims, actions, or suits which may arise in connection with the performance of the work authorized and described in this permit.

**Signature of Applicant:**

[Signature Redacted]

**Date:** February 5, 2015

---

**Office Copy:**

[Stamp: Office Copy]
# CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Reason:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAN 26 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector, Dept. of Bldg. Inspect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Notified Mr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention &amp; Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inspection Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions and stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments: 0

Owner's Authorized Agent
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREWITH AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION TO BE PERFORMED FOR THE PURPOSE HEREBEOF SET FORTH.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING</th>
<th>LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF ALTERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION:</td>
<td>(a) TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) BLDG. OF OPTIMUS:</td>
<td>(b) BLDG. OF OPTIMUS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) NO. OF STORY(S) OF OPTIMUS:</td>
<td>(c) NO. OF STORY(S) OF OPTIMUS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION:</td>
<td>(d) DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTICE TO APPLICANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE PARTY(IES) herewith acknowledge that the building(s) and improvements hereby described and all work connected therewith may be dangerous to persons and property by reason of the happening of any of the events hereinafter named.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND DECLARE THAT I AM THE PERSON WHOSE NAME AND ADDRESS APPEAR ON THE APPLICATION, AND I AM THE OWNER, LESSEE, OR CONTRACTOR, AS THE CASE MAY BE, OF THE REAL PROPERTY WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS APPLICATION. ALL INFORMATION SUBMITTED WITH THIS APPLICATION IS TRUE AND CORRECT. I UNDERSTAND THAT A FALSE STATEMENT ON THIS APPLICATION MAY RESULT IN THE DENIAL OF THE APPLICATION OR THE REVOCATION OF THE PERMIT. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
<th>Approved by</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Notified MR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td>Thomas Le, DBI</td>
<td>FEB 05 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention &amp; Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inspection Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments: 

Owner's Authorized Agent: 

[Signature]
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3  OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

SFFD INSPECTION FEES REQUIRED

MAKER OF APPLICATION

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING INSPECTION OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR
PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS
AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREWITH AND
ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE
HEREAFTER SET FORTH.

DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APP LICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

IMPORTANT NOTES

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

APPLICANT’S CERTIFICATION

I VERIFIED AND CERTIFY THAT A PERMIT IS OBLIGED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES HERETO BE COMPLIRED WITH.

FEB 01 2016

OFFICE COPY
| OFFICIAL COPY |
| San Francisco |
| Department of Building Inspection |
| Conditions and Stipulations |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector, Dept. of Bldg. Insr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Hayes, SFFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 21 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention &amp; Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inspection Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments

Owner's authorized agent
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 □ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 □ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS: 2

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREBY AND WITH THE DESCRIPTION TO THE PURPOSE HEREOF AFTER SET FORTH.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

PROPERTY LOT: 11 B

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

Install New Fire Sprinkler System in Top Floor, Substation + basement

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

MWA ARCHITECTS 655 Montgomery St., 17th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104-9790

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE. The party executing is responsible for the accuracy and correctness of all work not performed under this permit, regardless of any errors or omissions in the plans and specifications, and for the proper performance of the work in accordance with the plans and specifications.

IMPORTANT NOTICES

Any alteration or change in the character of the occupancy or use of any building, including the installation of new or existing systems, shall be subject to the provisions of Title 15 of the International Building Code and the San Francisco Zoning Regulations.

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify and acknowledge that this construction is being performed in the manner described in the plans, specifications, and permits issued by the Department of Building Inspection of the City of San Francisco, and all laws and ordinances thereof shall be complied with.

OFFICE COPY

MAY 15, 2016

SFFD INSPECTION FEE REQ.

MAY 15, 2016

SFFD INSPECTION FEE REQ.

MAY 15, 2016

SFFD INSPECTION FEE REQ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions and Stipulations</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector, Dept. of Bldg. Inspr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention &amp; Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inspection Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments: [ ]

Owner's Authorized Agent: [ ]
**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**
**DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION**

This application is hereby made to the Department of Building Inspection of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth.

**DATE FILED:** 5/27/16

**FORM 2** OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

**NUMBER OF PLAN SETS:** 2

**PLANS PER RECIPIENT NO.**
1) STREET ADDRESS OF JOB: 1201 24TH ST, SF, CA 94117
2) BLUEPRINTS TO JOB: 4175/007
3) TOTAL COST OF JOB: $16,000.00
4) BLDG/LT.No.: 511142

**INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS**

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING**

- **(A) TYPE OF CONSTR.:**
- **(B) NO. OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY:**
- **(C) NO. OF BASEMENTS (AND CELLARS):**
- **(D) PREVIOUS USE:**
- **(E) DESCRIPTION:**

**DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION**

- **(A) NO. OF CONSTR.:** 1
- **(B) NO. OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY:**
- **(C) NO. OF BASEMENTS (AND CELLARS):**
- **(D) PREVIOUS USE:**
- **(E) DESCRIPTION:**

**ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION**

- **(A) NO. OF ELECTRICAL ROOM:**
- **(B) NO. OF FACILITIES:**
- **(C) NO. OF AUTOMOTIVE WORK TO BE PERFORMED:**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

- **(A) DOES THE ALTERATION CREATE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT OR pods to the BUILDING:**
- **(B) NO. OF AUTOMOTIVE WORK TO BE PERFORMED:**

**NOTICE TO APPLICANT**

- **FEE:** $50.00
- **IN THE PACKAGE:**
- **DATE OF BLDG:** 5/27/16
- **DATE OF LTR:** 5/27/16

**SIGNATURES**

- **APPLICANT:**
- **ARCHITECT:**
- **ENGINEER:**

**APPLICATION’S CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances thereof will be complied with.

**APPLICATION BLDG. No. 318, APPLICATION NO. 15-4167**

[Signature]

**R920-13**

**OFFICE COPY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector, Dept. of Bldg. Ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention &amp; Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inspection Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments:

Owner's Authorized Agent
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 4 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION
APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HERETOIN AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREOF AFTER SET FORTH.

DATE FILED: 8/19/2016
PLAN PREPARATION: 3,6101.0
 COLUMN ADDRESS OF JOB: 18701

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 1201 Illinois St

ESTIMATED COST: $35,000

PLANNED TO BE COMPLETE: 8/19/2016

IMPORTANT NOTICES

APPLICATION TO BE COMPLETED AND FILED WITH OFFICE OF BUILDING INSPECTION, DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO. ALL APPLICANTS MUST SIGN.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

ALPHABETICAL DESCRIPTION OF MODULES

FIRE ONLY

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

The undersigned is the owner of the property hereinafter described and is the person to whom this permit is issued. He is hereby notified that he is responsible for the performance of the work authorized by this permit in conformity with the requirements of the Building Code of the City and County of San Francisco.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will conform to the provisions of this permit.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the work herein described will be done in a workmanlike manner and will comply with the building code of San Francisco.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Notified Mr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector, Dept. of Bldg. Inspect.</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of City Planning</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention &amp; Public Safety</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[AUG 22 2016]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer, Dept. of Bldg. Inspection</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inspection Division</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td>[Reason]</td>
<td>[Notified Mr.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments [ ]

Owner’s Authorized Agent [ ]
IMPORTANCE NOTICE

The permits issued by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Building Inspection are subject to revocation or cancellation at any time for reasons including failure to comply with the permit conditions or failure to comply with applicable building codes or regulations. The permit holder is responsible for ensuring that the work is performed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and that all applicable building codes and regulations are followed. Any violation of the permit conditions or failure to comply with applicable building codes or regulations may result in the revocation or cancellation of the permit.

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

If there are any questions or concerns regarding the permit, the permit holder should contact the Building Inspection Department at (415) 554-1600 or visit the website at http://www.sfbuilding.org. It is the responsibility of the permit holder to ensure that all work is performed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and that all applicable building codes and regulations are followed. Any violation of the permit conditions or failure to comply with applicable building codes or regulations may result in the revocation or cancellation of the permit.

Appliquer's Certification

I hereby certify and affirm that the plan sets submitted are true, correct, and complete, and that the work to be performed is in accordance with the approved plans and specifications. I further certify that all work will be performed in accordance with all applicable building codes and regulations. If there are any questions or concerns regarding the permit, the permit holder should contact the Building Inspection Department at (415) 554-1600 or visit the website at http://www.sfbuilding.org. It is the responsibility of the permit holder to ensure that all work is performed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and that all applicable building codes and regulations are followed. Any violation of the permit conditions or failure to comply with applicable building codes or regulations may result in the revocation or cancellation of the permit.
CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

BUILDING INSPECTOR, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

APPROVED:

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

APPROVED: Amy Eng

BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY

APPROVED: SEP 11 2018

APPROVED: MECHANICAL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

APPROVED: CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

APPROVED: NA

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

APPROVED: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

APPROVED: REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

APPROVED: HOUSING INSPECTION DIVISION

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Owner's Authorized Agent

Number of attachments

Note: Dates and names of all persons notified during processing.
Approved: M-2

Zone: M-2

CPC Setbacks

Department of City Planning

Approved: 4/24/61 Wayne Kelley

Department of Public Health

Approved: 4/21/61

Department of Electricity

Approved:

Art Commission

Approved:

Bureau of Engineering

BBI Street Engineer

Boiler Inspector

Art Commission

Dept. of Public Health

Approved: 4/21/61

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO

Owner

FOR PERMIT TO MAKE ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS or REPAIRS TO BUILDING

Location: 10507 & Louisana Sts.

Total Cost $2,000

Filed: 5/4/1961

Approved: 5/4/1961

MAY 5 1961

Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection

Building Inspector, Bureau of Building Inspection

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various Bureaus or Departments noted herein.

Owner or Owner's Authorized Agent

Issued: 5/4/61
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

(3) Location: Humboldt and Louisiana Streets

(2) Total Cost: $2,500

(4) Basement: Yes or No

(6) No. of families: None

(8) No. of families: None

(9) Type of construction: Non-hazardous

(10) Building Code Occupancy Classification:

Any other building on lot: Yes (Must be shown on plot plan if answer is Yes)

(14) Electrical work to be performed: No

(15) Ground floor area of building: 750 sq. ft.

(17) Detailed description of work to be done: Constructing a new door opening and subsequently furnishing and installing an overhead aluminum sectional door thereof.

(18) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 389, California Penal Code.

(20) General contractor: Not selected yet


(22) Engineer: J. D. Workington

(23) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or subsidewalk space from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

(24) Owner: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Address: 245 Market Street, San Francisco, California

By: J. D. Workington
Address: 245 Market Street

OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.

PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY MUST BE OBTAINED ON COMPLETION OF HOTEL OR APARTMENT HOUSE PURSUANT TO SEC. 808 SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
Bldg. Form 1

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
FOR TYPE 1-2-3-4 STRUCTURES

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF
FINAL COMPLETION IS Posts ON THE BUILDING

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location of Lot: Street(s) ___________ Side of ___________

(2) Type of building ___________ No. of stories ___________ No. of basements ___________

(3) Total cost ___________ Height of building ___________ No. of families ___________

(4) Use of building ___________ Building Code Classification ___________

(5) Occupancy ___________ Building Code Classification ___________

(6) Size of lot: Front ___________ ft., Rear ___________ ft., Depth of lot ___________ ft., Depth of lot ___________ ft.

(7) Ground floor area of building ___________ square ft.

(8) Any other building on lot ___________ Yes or No ___________. (Must be shown on Plot Plan if answer is Yes)

(9) Is building designed for any more stories ___________ Yes or No ___________. How many ___________ Yes or No ___________.

(10) Design live load for floor ___________ and ___________ pounds per square foot (see Section 46 of Code of San Francisco)

Note: Sect. 2215, S.F. Building Code, "The full live load for which each floor or part of a floor in a commercial or industrial structure is designed shall be indicated on the drawings filed with the application and also be indicated on a small scale floor plan suitably framed under glass and permanently affixed to the structure and maintained in a conspicuous location in a public hall or corridor on each floor, etc."

(11) Supervision of construction by ___________ Address ___________ California License No. ___________

(12) General contractor ___________ Address ___________ California License No. ___________

(13) Architect ___________ Address ___________ California Certificate No. ___________

(14) Engineer ___________ Address ___________ California Certificate No. ___________

(15) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described and approved in this application, or in accompanying plans, all the provisions of all the laws and ordinances applicable to the construction will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from the use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street, or sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work authorized by this permit, or any work performed on or at the premises designated therein. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owners of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

(16) Owner ___________ Address ___________ Phone No. ___________ (For contact by Bureau)

By ___________ Address ___________ California State Law. (See Section 301 of Building Code.)
Grades lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If actual grade lines are not the same as shown on the drawings showing correct grade lines, cuts and fills together with complete details of retaining walls and wall footings required must be submitted to this bureau for approval.

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

Approved: A SEPARATE PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR DRIVEWAYS AND STREET SPACE

ALL ENCROACHMENTS IN THE OFFICIAL STREET OR SIDEWALK AREAS MUST BE GRANTED IN WRITING BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS OR BY RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

ALL ENTRANCES, BOTH PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR, SHALL MEET THE SIDEWALK GRADE. ALL RAMPING SHALL BE INSIDE OF PROPERTY.

8/14/63 R. Kinnic

Bureau of Engineering

Approved:

**ART COMMISSION**

Approved:

M. de Chard, 8/13/63

Plan checker, Bureau of Building Inspection

**REVIEW BY**

Bureau of Engineering

**REVIEW BY**

Bureau of Building Inspection

**ISSUED TO**

M. de Chard, 8/13/63

Plan checker, Bureau of Building Inspection

**APPROVED**

Bureau of Building Inspection

**REVISED**

Bureau of Building Inspection

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

Approved:

Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection

**PERMIT NO.**

E. E. P. 177

**ISSUED**

SEP 13 1963

**CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION**

Issued: 19
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

FOR TYPE 1-2-3-4 STRUCTURES

Date: August 7, 1963

LOT DESCRIPTION

(1) Location:
- North
- East
- West

Anne of Thunder Dr. (80')
Nearest Street

(2) Size of lot:
- Front:
- Rear:
- Average:

ft.
ft.
ft.

(3) Is any other building on lot?
- Yes
- No

If yes, show on plot plan.

(4) Is automobile driveway to be installed or altered?
- Yes
- No

(5) Will street space be used during construction?
- Yes
- No

BUILDING DESCRIPTION

(6) Type of Building:
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 1 Hr.
- N

(7) Use of building

(9) Occupancy

(8) Number of Dwelling Units

(10) Ground Floor Area

56 sq. ft.

(11) Height at the Center Line of Front of Bldg.

(12) Number of Stories

(13) Number of Basements

(14) Is building designed for additional stories?
- Yes; how many?
- No

(15) Total Cost

$3,600

(16) Will sub-sidewalk space be used?
- Yes
- No

(17) Design Live Load for floors: (To be posted in commercial and industrial buildings)

Transformer, 50,360 #

(18) Supervision of construction by

P. E.

Address

145 Market St.

(19) General Contractor

M K CORPORATION

California License No.

Address

519 California

Telephone

27624

(20) Architect or Engr.

P. E.

California Certificate No.

Address

(21) Engineer or Archt.

P. E.

California Certificate No.

Address

Telephone

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described and approved in this application, or in accompanying plans, all the provisions of all the laws and ordinances applicable to the construction will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from the use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street, or sidewalk space, or from anything else in connection with the work authorized by this permit, or any work performed on or at the premises designated therein. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owners of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

(22) Owner

M K CORPORATION

Address

519 California

Phone No.

By

Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor

Address

This permit and the approved plans must be kept on the job
MAY 23 1967

Bldg. Form 33904

Name: Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Location: South side of Humboldt Street, East of Illinois Street

Total Cost: $20,000.00

APPROVED:

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted herein.

Owner or Owner's Authorized Agent:

Date: MAY 26 1967
Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location: South side of Nob Hill Street, East of Illinois Street.

(2) Total Cost ($): $30,000

(3) No. of Stories: 1

(4) Basement or Cellar: No

(5) Present Use of building: Existing, No. of families: 3

(6) Proposed Use of building: Welding Shop, No. of families: 3

(7) Proposed Use of building: Welding Shop, No. of families: 3

(8) Proposed Use of building: Welding Shop, No. of families: 3

(9) Type of construction: 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5

(10) Proposed Building Code Classification

(11) Any other building on lot: No... (must be shown on plot plan if answer is yes)

(12) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building?: No

(13) Does this alteration create a horizontal extension to the building?: No

(14) Does this alteration constitute a change of occupancy?: Yes

(15) Electrical work to be performed: Yes...

(16) Plumbing work to be performed: Yes...

(17) Automobile runway to be altered or installed: Yes...

(18) Sidewalk over sub-sidewalk space to be repaired or altered: Yes...

(19) Will street space be used during construction?: Yes...

(20) Write in description of all work to be performed under this application:

(21) Supervision of construction by: George C. Grubb... Address: 264 Market Street, San Francisco

(22) General Contractor: E. V. Stackford... Address: 245 Market Street, San Francisco

(23) Architectural Engineer: J. Frits... Address: 245 Market Street, San Francisco

(24) Architectural Engineer: J. Frits... Address: 245 Market Street, San Francisco

(25) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

(26) Owner: Pacific Gas and Electric Co. Address: 245 Market Street, San Francisco

By: J. Frits

This is a Copy of the Original Permit and Form of Application Stamped with a Seal of the City and County of San Francisco.
### Building Permit Information

**Application #:** [Redacted]

**Location:** [Redacted]

**Building Description:** [Redacted]

**Type:** [Redacted]

**Date:** [Redacted]

**Approved:** [Redacted]

---

### Building Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23rd St.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th St.</td>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th St.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th St.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th St.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th St.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th St.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th St.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st St.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**City and County of San Francisco**

**Department of Public Works**

**Building Inspection**

---

**Official Copy**

---

**Acknowledgment:**

[Redacted]
CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

Approved: Zone M-2 C.P.C. Setback

[Signature]

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

 Approved:

[Signature]

BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY

 Approved:

[Signature]

OFFICE COPY

Approved:

[Signature]

SALT ENGINEER BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

Approved:

[Signature]

DIRECION OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Approved:

Approved:

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureau or departments noted on this application, and the attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application. Number of attachments: 1

[Signature]
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION PERMIT
DATE: December 28, 1971

(1) LOCATION: 1801 Illinois St.

(2) ASSESSOR'S ROLL NO.

APPROVED

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

 DEPT. PUBLIC WORKS
JAN - 6 1972

Alfred Shelley

9142

63

(5) STRUCTURE NO.

(6) USE OF LOT:

OFFICE & LABORATORY

(7) NUMBER OF AREAS OR CELLARS

(8) USE OF LOT:

FRONT:

REAR:

AND SIDE:

(17) PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO. ALL DISCONNECTION NUMBERS:

ELECTRIC:

GAS:

(18) CONTRACTOR:

Cleveland W. Roman Co.

(19) OWNER:

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

This is not a Demolition Permit.

No work shall be started until a Demolition Permit is issued.
CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

APPROVED:

HISTORIC LANDMARK? YES □ NO □

DEC 28 1971

APPROVED:

☐ DEMOLITION PROGRAM REQUIRED FOR MORE THAN 2 OR MORE THAN 2 STORIES

[Signature]
BUILDING INSPECTOR, BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED:

☐ SPECIAL INSPECTION REQUIRED

CIVIL ENGINEER, BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED:

PREVENT TRUCK SPILLAGE FROM TRUCK OVERLOADING

REPAIR WALKS

DEC 31 1971

APPROVED:

FREE PREVENTION INSPECTOR, BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS OF THE VARIOUS BUREAUS OR DEPARTMENTS NOTED HEREON.

[Signature]
OWNERS OR OWNERS AUTHORIZED AGENT (TO BE AUTHORIZED ARCHITECT, ENGINEER OR CONTRACTOR)
This application approved for site permit only. No work may be done or progress beyond phase of work for which plans have been approved.

Prepared for: 3/1/73

Civil Engineer, Bureau of Building Inspection

Approved:

NOT REFERRED TO DEPT. OF PUBLIC HEALTH FOR EXAMINATION.

Department of Public Health

Approved:

Fire Prevention & Public Safety

Approved:

Bureau of Engineering

Approved:

Act Commission

Approved:

Department of City Planning

Approved:

AS HOUSING AND SHELTER FOR TURBINE GENERATORS - NOT FOR HUMAN OCCUPANCY (EXCEPT OCCASIONAL MAINTENANCE). OBTAIN PERMIT FROM S.F.P.D. FOR FUEL OIL STORAGE.

Revised Form 2304-73

Lot No. 453

Assessor's Block No. 4175

Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection

NO PORTION OF BUILDING, STRUCTURE OR SCAFFOLDING TO BE CLOSER THAN 10 FEET TO ANY WIRE CONTAINING 750 VOLTS OR MORE. SEE DEC. 301 OF BUILDING CODE.

I AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OF STIPULATIONS OF THE VARIOUS BUREAUS OR DEPARTMENTS NOTED ON THIS APPLICATION.

OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT

Permit No. 315682

Issued 3/5/73

Certificate of Final Completion: 3/5/73
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
FOR TYPE 1n-3-3-8 STRUCTURES

Date ________________________

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth.

LOT DESCRIPTION

(1) Location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

600' feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Rise of lot:

front: 900 ft.

rear: 900 ft.

average depth: 1,700 ft.

(3) Is any other building on lot? 

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, show on plot plan.

(4) Is automobile runway to be

installed or altered? 

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(5) Will street space be used

during construction? 

Yes [ ] No [ ]

BUILDING DESCRIPTION

(6) Type of Building:

[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ]

(7) Use of building:

Two GAB Turbine Generators

(8) Occupancy:

(9) Number of Dwelling Units:

(10) Ground Floor Area:

5,280 sq. ft.

(11) Height at the Center Line of Front Line of Bldg.:

21 ft.

(14) Is building designated for additional stories?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(15) Total Cost: $ 608,000

(16) Will sub-sidewalk space be used?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(17) Design Livable Load for Floor(s) (To be posted, in commercial and industrial buildings)

(18) Supervision of construction by Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Address: 77 Beale St.

(19) General contractor: Not selected yet California License No.: ______________

Address: ______________ Telephone: ______________

(20) Architect or Eng. R. V. Battiger California Certificate No. CR-7866

Address: 77 Beale St. Telephone: 781-4211

(21) Engineer or Ascht. R. V. Battiger (Not commissioned)

Address: 77 Beale St. Telephone: 781-4211

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described and approved in this application, or in accompanying plans, all the provisions of all the laws and ordinances applicable to the construction will be complied with. I furthermore agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all claims and damages which may arise from the use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street, or sidewalk space, or from anything else in connection with the work authorized by this permit, or any work performed on or at the premises designated therein. The foregoing covenants shall be binding upon the owners of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

(22) Owner: Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Address: 77 Beale Street, San Francisco Phone No. 781-4211

By: 

Signature: ______________

Address: ______________

Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor:

THIS PERMIT AND THE APPROVED PLANS MUST BE KEPT ON THE JOB.
Grade lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If actual grade lines are not the same as shown on said drawings showing correct grade lines, rate and fills together with complete details of retaining walls and wall footings required must be submitted to this bureau for approval.

BLDG. FORM

No.: 41-75

APPLICANT OF
Pacifica Electric Co. Owner

OFFICE COPY

Type: 1

Location: 1201 1115 30th St.

San Francisco, Calif.

Total Cost: $40,000.00

Filed: 1/8/15 1931

REFER TO Dept. of Health
Bar. of Engineering

APPROVED

Dept. Public Works

MAY 31 1931

Alfred Holder

Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection

Permit No.: 3117590

Issued: MAY 31 1931

Certificate of Final Completion:

MAY 31 1931

OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
FOR TYPE 1-2-3-4 STRUCTURES

Date: March 19, 1977

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

LOT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Location:</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>side of Humboldt Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Name of Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 feet</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>side of Illinois Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Name of Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Size of lot:
- front: 900 ft.
- rear: 800 ft.
- average depth: 1,700 ft.

(3) Is any other building on lot? [ ] yes [ ] no
If yes, show on plot plan.

(4) Is automobile roadway to be installed or altered? [ ] yes [ ] no

(5) Will street space be used during construction? [ ] yes [ ] no

BUILDING DESCRIPTION

(6) Type of Building: [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 1 story [ ] N

(7) Use of building:
- Oil Retention Basin

(8) Occupancy:
- G

(9) Number of Dwelling Units:
- None

(10) Ground Floor Area:
- 8,000 sq. ft.

(11) Height at the Center Line of Street:
- 29' 6" ft.

(12) Number of Stories:
- 1

(13) Number of Basements:
- None

(14) Is building designed for additional stories? [ ] yes [ ] no

(15) Total Cost:
- $ 0,000

(16) Will sub-sidewalk space be used? [ ] yes [ ] no

(17) Design Live Load for floors: To be posted, in commercial and industrial buildings

(18) Supervision of construction by [ ] Pacific Gas & Electric
- Address: 77 Beale Street

(19) General Contractor:
- Selected by [ ]
- California License No.
- Address:
- Telephone:

(20) Architect or Engnr.:
- E. E. Savits
- California Certificate No. CE-5727
- Address: 77 Beale St.
- Telephone: 781-4211

(21) Engineer or Archt.:
- (for design)
- California Certificate No.
- Address:
- Telephone:

(22) Owner:
- Pacific Gas & Electric Company
- Address: 77 Beale Street
- Phone No. 781-4211 (Ext. 1425)
- (For contact by Bureau)

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described and approved in this application, or in accompanying plans, all the provisions of all the laws and ordinances applicable to the construction will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco City and County and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from the use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street, or sidewalk space, or from anything else in connection with the work authorized by this permit, or any work performed on or at the premises designated therein. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owners of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

Owner:
- Address: 77 Beale Street

Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor

THIS PERMIT AND THE APPROVED PLANS MUST BE KEPT ON THE JOB

5/4 6-68
Approved: M.2

Zone...

CPC Setbacks...

6/27/73

Res. W. Fakhri
Department of City Planning

PROJECT IN A CATEGORY C. P. COMM. FOUND
HAS NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON ENVIRONMENT

Approved:

Building Inspector, Bureau of Building Inspection

Lot Nos. 3
Assessor's Block No. 4175

Total Cost $60,000

Filed 9

Approved: Refer to Bureau of Engineering

JUL 12 1973
Dept. Public Works

Alfred H. Edlin

JUL 18 1973

Permit No. 37906-3

Issued
Application for Permit

Quarrying — Grading — Excavation — Filling

Strike out words NOT applicable

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to proceed with the work as indicated in the plans and specifications submitted herewith (unless waived by the Superintendent) and in accordance with the description and for the purposes hereinafter set forth in Item No. 9 below.

1. Location of Lots: N side of Humboldt Street
   S 500 Ft. E ½ of Illinois Street

2. Total Cost: $60,000

3. Area Involved: 62,000 Sq. Ft.


5. Maximum Depth of Fill: 5 Ft.

6. Amount of Material: 6000 CY

7. Does this Affect Adjoining Property? Yes or No: No

8. Where underpinning of adjacent property is necessary, complete engineering details must be approved by the Bureau of Building Inspection before excavation begins.

9. Write in description of all work to be performed under this application: (Reference to plans is not sufficient)

   Grading, excavation and footings for
   and wall footing construction

10. General Contractor: Contract not awarded
    California License No.

11. Civil Engineer: R V Bettinger
    California License No. 1865, CE
    Address: 77 Beale St., San Francisco, CA
    Phone No. 781-4211

12. I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit, and all the laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or subsidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.

13. Owner: Pacific Gas & Electric Co
    Address: 77 Beale St, San Francisco
    Phone No. 781-4211

By: (Signature)

Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Engineer or General Contractor.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
OFFICE COPY

APPROVED

Date: AUG 10, 1973

DEPT. PUBLIC WORKS

(1) STREET ADDRESS OF JOB
401 ILIYON STREET

(2) ESTIMATE COST OF JOB
$600,000

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STRUCTURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STRUCTURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FUEL OIL STORAGE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHEDULED COMPLETION DATE: NO. 1

GENERAL CONSTRUCTION

AMERICAN BRIDGE DIV. US STEEL 105 OYSTER PT. BLVD. 355 240418

G'S PRESSTON O'AMERICAN BRIDGE DIV. US STEEL, 105 OYSTER PT. BLVD. 355 240418

LH HARRISON PO BOX 950 PITTSBURGH, PA. 94505 014146

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR NAME AND NUMBER: L.H. HARRISON

DESCRIPTION OF ALL WORK TO BE PERFORMED MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THIS OFFICE FOR APPROVAL.

TO ERECT A 250,000 BBL FUEL OIL STORAGE TANK AND CONTAINMENT WALL

IMPORTANT NOTICES

The plans shown shall be the exclusive property of the company or use without prior written permission from the architect or engineer. Any changes in building plans shall be made by the architect or engineer. All plans shall be kept on file at the building site.

Check appropriate box:
- OWNER
- ARCHITECT
- ENGINEER
- LEASE
- CONTRACTOR

APPlicant's Certification

I certify that the information on this application is true and correct. I understand that the building will be completed in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted. I agree to comply with all laws and ordinances applicable to the construction of the building.

(Handwritten signature)

[Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent]
### Conditions and Stipulations

**For Work Started Only**

**J. Mill**

**Notified Mr.**

**Notified By:**

**Notified Mr.**

---

**Approved:**

1. **Approve Portal Type**
   - **Approved:** M-2 Heavy Industrial Zoning District
   - **Approve under provision of the City Planning Code and the California State Environmental Quality Act**
   - **Under the latter act a declaration of negative impact upon the environment has been made.**
   - **M.P. 25473**
   - **Build:** 7/9/72
   - **Date:** 7/9/72
   - **Reason:**
   - **Notified Mr.**

2. **Provide approved fire extinguishing equipment as required in section 14.2.3 S.F. Fire Code.**
   - **Approved:**
   - **Noted in Plans:**
   - **Approved for containment only.**
   - **Civil Engineer, S.B. of Bldg. Inspection:**
   - **Approved:**
   - **Notified Mr.**

---

**Bureau of Engineering**

**Approved:**

**Department of Public Health**

**Approved:**

**Reinvestment Agency**

---

**I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application and attached statements of conditions or stipulations which are hereby made a part of this application.**

**Owner orLessee:**

**Number of Attachments:**

---
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

APPLICATION IS MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREFORSET FORTH.

LOT 3 BLOCK 4175
Lot

Louisiana Street

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

| TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION | NO. OF OCCUPANCIES | TOTAL OCCUPANCIES | OCCUPANCIES | OCCUPANCIES
|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------
|                      |                    |                   |             |             |

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>NO. OCCUPANCIES</th>
<th>OCCUPANCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT SELECTED AS YES

ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER FOR DESIGN

WHEREAS ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER FOR CONSTRUCTION

CALIF. LICENSE NO.

CALIF. CERTIFICATE NO.

CALIF. CERTIFICATE NO.

OWNER: LIEGE CO.

ADDRESS: 77 BAY ST. S.F.

PHONE (FOR CONTACT BY BUREAU)

Existing building consists of 10 bays of steel framing construction. It is proposed to retain the 4 bays of office use and remove the remainder 6 bays of shop use. There is presently an existing wall at the 4th bay; no work is to be done to this wall except closing up two small wall openings with construction to match existing. Utilities to be re-routed to provide continued service to remaining building.

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See Sec. 104.5, 104.9, 104.11, 104.12, 104.14, Building Code and Sec. 104.3, San Francisco Housing Code. No portion of building or structure or its foundation shall be used during construction, to be closer than 10" to any side containing more than 750 tons. See Sec. 10.5, San Francisco Police Code.

PERMITTED TO SEC. 104.3, San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on the job. The owner is responsible for approved plans and specifications being complied with. The Code and Ordinances governing the construction are those in effect as herein created. The work shall be completed in accordance with the code and Ordinances relating to labor and working conditions at all times during construction.

ANY DELAY CAUSED BY REQUESTS OR BY CODE MAY BE APPEALED, BUILDINGS NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLIANCE IS POSTED ON THE BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED. WHEN REQUIRED, APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTRICAL, WATER OR PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR THE WORK IS AND MUST BE OBTAINED SEPARATE PERMITS ARE REQUIRED IF ANSWER IS "YES" TO ANY OF ABOVE QUESTIONS. (104.16, 104.17, 104.20) OR (20.20). THIS IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

In dwelling all building materials must have a clearance of not less than two inches from all electrical wires or appliance.

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES INDEED WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

I CERTIFY THAT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE ABOVE WORK I SHALL NOT EMPLOY ANY PERSON IN VIOLATION OF THE LABOR CODE OF CALIFORNIA RELATING TO WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE.

I FURTHER AGREE TO SAVE SAN FRANCISCO AND ITS OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES HARMLESS FROM ALL COSTS AND DAMAGES WHICH MAY ACCURSE FROM USE OR OCCUPANCY OF THE SIDEWALK, STREET OR SUBSIDENCE SPACE OR ANYTHING ELSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE WORK INCLUDED IN THE PERMIT. THE FOREGOING COVENANT SHALL BE BINDING UPON THE OWNER OF SAID PROPERTY, THE APPLICANT, THEIR HEIRS, SUCCESSIONS AND ASSIGNS.

SIGNATURE OF OWNER OR AUTHORIZED AGENT

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX:

OWNER [ ] ARCHITECT [ ]

ENGINEER [ ] LEASEE [ ]

AGENT WITH POWER OF ATTORNEY [ ]

CONTRACTOR [ ] ATTORNEY IN FACT [ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector</td>
<td>9/17/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of City Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Fire Prevention &amp; Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer, BUI, OF BLDG. INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of Attachments: □

Signature of Owner, Lessee or Authorized Agent for Owner or Lessee: 

[Signature]
## Application for Building Permit, Additions, Alterations or Repairs

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plan and specifications submitted herewith and according to the ordinance and for the purpose hereinafter set forth.

### Description of Existing Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure</td>
<td>Office, Warehouse, Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Storied Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Use</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Warehouse, Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Warehouse and Cellar Buildings</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Warehouse and Cellar Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Building After Proposed Alteration

- **Proposed Alteration:**
  - **Type of Structure:** Warehouse, Shop
  - **Number of Storied Buildings:** 2
  - **Number of Stories:** 2
  - **Present Use:** Office
  - **Proposed Use:** Warehouse, Shop
  - **Number of Warehouse and Cellar Buildings:** 0
  - **Number of Warehouse and Cellar Units:** 0

### General Contractor

- **Name:** Not Selected Yet
- **Address:** 2653, 77 Beale Street, S.F.
- **CAUQ. License No.:** 78265

### Architect or Engineer (For Design)

- **Name:** B. V. Settlinger
- **Address:** 2653, 77 Beale Street, S.F.
- **CAUQ. License No.:** 78265

### Architect or Engineer (For Construction)

- **Name:** B. V. Settlinger
- **Address:** 2653, 77 Beale Street, S.F.
- **CAUQ. License No.:** 78265

### Construction Lender (Name and Address of any lender)

- **Name:** 77 Beale Street, S.F.
- **Address:** 77 Beale Street, S.F.
- **CAUQ. License No.:** 78265

### Owner—Lessee (Cross Out One)

- **Name:** [Crossed Out]
- **Address:** [Crossed Out]
- **Telephone:** 781-217

### Important Notices

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without the approval of a building permit, unless such change is authorized by the San Francisco Building Code and Sec. 104, San Francisco Health Code.

No portion of the existing building shall be used in any manner after receiving a building permit unless as allowed under the San Francisco Building Code and Sec. 104, San Francisco Health Code.

### Applicant's Certification

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances thereof will be complied with. I certify that in the performance of the above work I shall not employ any person in violation of the Labor Code of California relating to women's compensation insurance.

I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalks, streets or subterranean space or from anything else in connection with the work included in this permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.
Notify Building Inspector at start of job.

Building Inspector, Bldg. Inspect

Date: 5/17/52

Approved:

Not reviewed by the Department of City Planning. Issuance of the requested permit may require additional information that use of this property has or does not conform to the City Planning Code.

Department of City Planning

Approved:

Bureau of Fire Prevention & Public Safety

Approved:

Civil Engineer, Bldg. Inspect

Approved:

Bureau of Engineering

Approved:

Department of Public Health

Approved:

Redevelopment Agency

Approved:

Approved:

Approved:

Approved:

Approved:

HOLD SECTION - NOTE DATES AND NAMES OF ALL PERSONS NOTIFIED DURING PROCESSING

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

Notified Mr.

Date: ___________

Reason: ___________

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations which are hereby made a part of this application.

Signature of owner, lessee, or authorized agent for owner or lessee

Number of Attachments: ___________
77917
382/94
OCT 10 1973

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

APPROVED
Dept. Public Works
OCT 1 1973
Alfred Building

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

Description of Building

1. Alterations
2. New Area
3. Total Area
4. Total Floor Area

Plans and Specifications

1. Architectural
2. Engineering

Building Permit

1. Permit No.
2. Issued Date
3. Expiration Date

Building Inspector

1. Name
2. Signature

General Contractor

1. Name
2. Address

Builder's Lien and Accident Insurance

1. Policy No.
2. Issued Date

MC Paulo ESY 5348

Modify boiler on Unit 5, Hudson Power Plant, to reduce NOx (oxides of nitrogen) emissions by installing a system for two-stage combustion and flue gas recirculation to the burners. Work includes (1) replacing some existing piping, (2) installation of recirculation line, (3) installation of structural steel, (4) installation of structural steel, (5) installation of necessary support electric and instrumentation equipment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions and Stipulations</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If there is no approval, the 'Approved' column should be marked with an 'X'.*
# Application for Building Permit

## Description of Existing Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Rebuilt No.</th>
<th>כנ</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1 73</td>
<td>8065</td>
<td>1:32</td>
<td>8065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Building After Proposed Alteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1201 Illinois St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## General Contractor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>License No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ewing F. Hallan</td>
<td>777 Beale St.</td>
<td>CE-10084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td>777 Beale St.</td>
<td>281-4211 Ext. 5348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Enlarge (9) Fuel Oil Pump Bases

### Important Notices

- Change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without or involving removal or relocation of any structural element existing such change. See Sec. 301.102, 301.103, 301.104, 301.202, 301.203, 301.204, 301.205, and 301.206 of the Building Code and Sec. 301.207, San Francisco Building Code.

- Computer printing or drawing accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If hand drawings and cut but not the same as those printed conveyances, the original plans and specifications shall be submitted to the building inspector for approval and shall not exceed 250 square feet. See Sec. 3.2.3 California Building Code.

- Any alteration to an existing building, which is shown on the plans and specifications, must be submitted to the building inspector for approval and shall not exceed 250 square feet. See Sec. 3.2.3 California Building Code.

- Plans and specifications shall be submitted to the building inspector for approval and shall not exceed 250 square feet. See Sec. 3.2.3 California Building Code.

## Applications Certification

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances thereof will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officers and employees harmless from all claims and damages which may arise from the issuance of this permit. The owner of said property, the applicant, and all persons, successors, and assignees are hereby released from all liability.

Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent

[Signature]

Check appropriate box:
- [ ] Owner
- [ ] Architect
- [ ] Engineer
- [ ] lessee
- [ ] agent with power of attorney
- [ ] contractor
- [ ] attorney in fact
not reviewed by the Department of City Planning. Issuance of the requested permit constitutes no indication that use of this property does or does not conform to the City Planning Code.

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

APPROVED: 11-12-73

BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & FIRE SAFETY

APPROVED: For pump bases only

CIVIL ENGINEER, BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED: 11-12-73

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

APPROVED:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

APPROVED:

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

APPROVED:

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent for Owner or Lessee

Number of Attachments: 1

[Signature]

Date: 11-12-73

Reason:

[Signature]

Date: 11-12-73

Reason:

[Signature]

Date: 11-12-73

Reason:

[Signature]

Date: 11-12-73

Reason:

[Signature]

Date: 11-12-73

Reason:

[Signature]

Date: 11-12-73

Reason:
CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

APPROVED.

HISTORIC LANDMARK

YES ☐

NO ☒

PROJECT IN A CATEGORY C-P. CONC. FOUND

HAS NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON ENVIRONMENT.

R. D. Tschirch 12-24-73

BUILDING INSPECTOR, BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED.

☐ SPECIAL INSPECTION REQUIRED

☐ DEMOLITION PROGRAM REQUIRED, BUILDING NOT TYPE 5 OR MORE THAN 2 STORIES.

D. M. Melvin 12-24-73

BUILDING INSPECTOR, BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED: 12/24/73

APPROVAL BY CITY ENGINEER

REQUIRED FOR USE OF DEMOLITION EQUIPMENT ON STREET OR SIDEWALK.

TELEPHONE 556-5940

REPAIR WALKS

Comply with Sec. 446.3.2

7 th & S St. Sf, Cal.

PREVENT TRUCK SPILLAGE

FROM TRUCK OVERLOADING

E. Reider

SUPERINTENDENT

APPROVED.

FIRE PROTECTION INSPECTOR, BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

I AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS OF THE VARIOUS BUREAUS OR DEPARTMENTS.

OWNER OR CROWNED AUTHORIZED AGENT OF CITY OR AUTHORIZED ARCHITECT, ENGINEER OR CONSTRUCTION.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application for Building Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Building</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong> 7700 San Francisco St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner:</strong> John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Code:</strong> 123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection:</strong> Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inspection Results:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> May 15, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspector:</strong> Jane Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Alterations or Repairs:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Square Footage:</strong> 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Permit Numbers:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P-12345678</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- This permit is issued under the provisions of the building code for the above work. No work shall be started until a permit is obtained. The completion of any work done without a permit is prohibited. Any work done without a permit shall be demolished at the owner's expense. 
- This permit is valid for a period of 60 days from the date of issuance. 
- The permit holder shall comply with all laws and regulations pertaining to the proposed work. 
- Any violations of the building code shall result in fines and possible suspension of the permit. 
- This permit is subject to inspection by the building department. 
- Any unauthorized alteration or addition to the building shall result in the revocation of this permit. 

**Signatures:**
- Owner: John Doe (May 15, 2023) 
- Inspector: Jane Smith (May 15, 2023) 
- Permit Issuing Authority: Building Department (May 15, 2023)
# CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**San Francisco**

**Department of City Planning**

**Approved:**

- Project in a Fire Hazard Area, No. 11, SF
- Hudson

**Notified:**

**Approved:**

- Fire Department required per Sec. 24.10 Fire Code. Contact Chief
  Engineer, Bureau of Water Supply & Sewer

**Notified:**

**Approved:**

- Special Inspection and Reports Required Under Section 208.1
  Submit Reports to the Bureau of Building Inspection for the Following:
  - Contractor
  - Engineer

**Notified:**

**Approved:**

- All encroachments in the official street or sidewalk areas must be granted in writing by the Director of Public Works or by Resolution of the Board of Supervisors. All entrances, both pedestrian and vehicular, shall meet the sidewalk grade. All ramping shall be inside of premises.

**Notified:**

**Approved:**

- **Department of Public Health**
- **Redevelopment Agency**

**Notified:**

---

I agree to comply with all conditions and stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Signature of Owner, Lessee, or Authorized Agent for Owner or Lessee

Number of Attachments: 0
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

APPLICATION IS MADE HEREIN TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMIT TO ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS TO THE PREMISES DESCRIBED BELOW AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE SPECIFIED HEREIN.

10 STREET ADDRESS OF JOB
Lot 3 Block 4175
1201 ILLINOIS STREET

$380,800.00
4/93

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

[Table with columns for Type of Construction, Initial Number of Stories, Initial Number of Units, etc.]

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

[Table with columns for Type of Construction, Proposed Number of Stories, Proposed Number of Units, etc.]

GAS

[Table with columns for Number of Gas New Service, Proposed Gas Equipment, etc.]

MACHINE GENERATOR

[Table with columns for Number of Machine Generators, Proposed Machine Generators, etc.]

GENERAL CONSTRUCTION

Not yet selected.

ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER FOR DESIGN
R. V. Bettanger
77 Beale Street
C.R. 8855

CONTRACTOR WHERE FEES ARE PAID
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
77 Beale Street
781-4251

This work to be done in conjunction with Application #18669.

(Notice) Permit #637568, addendum one (1), which was approved on April 27, 1973.

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No changes shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See Sec. 106, 107, 108 of San Francisco Building Code and Sec. 104, San Francisco Housing Code.

The Fire Marshal or Building Official shall have power and authority to enter and pass through the said building or structure and the premises, during actual construction, to see that the work is being done in strict conformity with laws, ordinances and building regulations, and no violation thereof shall be permitted.

The person or persons installing gas appliances shall do so in strict accordance with the rules and regulations of the Department of Public Works. All persons installing gas appliances shall have a certificate of qualification issued by the Department of Public Works.

Any question as to the application of the rules of the City and County of San Francisco, as set forth in this permit, shall be referred to the Building Official for decision. No permit shall be issued until the satisfactory completion of the work as approved by the Building Official.

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify and agree that I am a legal owner and have the right to make the improvements described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances thereof will be complied with.

I certify that in the performance of the above work I shall not engage in any work in violation of the Labor Code of California, relating to women's equal rights and pay.

I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and the persons doing the work harmless from all claims and damages which may arise from the use or occupancy of the building, street or sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The following contractor shall be responsible for the work done:

Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX

☐ Owner
☐ Architect
☐ Engineer
☐ Contractor

☐ Agent with Power of Attorney

☐ Attorney in Fact

[Signature]
CONCLUSIONS AND STIPULATIONS

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Notified By:

DATE:

REASON:

I AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS OF THE VARIOUS BUREAUS OF DEPARTMENTS NOTED ON THIS APPLICATION. AND ATTACHED STATEMENTS OF CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS WHICH ARE HEREIN MADE A PART OF THIS APPLICATION.

NUMBER OF ATTACHMENTS

[Signature]
Grade lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If actual grade lines are not the same as shown revised drawings showing correct grade lines, cuts and fills together with complete details of retaining walls and wall footings required must be submitted to this bureau for approval.

NORTH
22nd STREET

WELL SITE

SOUTH
23rd STREET

Humboldt St.

ILESSIS STRE!

Lot No. 3

Ancon's Block No. 4175

I Agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application.

Owner's Authorized Agency

MAY 16 1975

M. Cleen
Civil Engineer, Bureau of Building Inspection

MAY 9 1975

MAY 5 - 1975

A. L. 402053

APPROVED 1975

Alfred Wally

Permit No. 402053
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-5-75</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9-75</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Application for Building Permit

## Description of Existing Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description of Building</th>
<th>Power Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Building After Proposed Alteration

- **Type of Owner:** [Select]
- **Address:** [Enter Address]
- **Proposed Use:** [Enter Use]
- **Occupancy Code:** [Enter Code]
- **PEL Code:** [Enter Code]
- **Certification:** [Enter Certification]
- **Contractor:** [Enter Contractor]
- **Estimate of Cost:** [Enter Cost]
- **Phone:** [Enter Phone]
- **Certificate No.:** [Enter Certificate]
- **Supervising Engineer:** [Enter Engineer]

## Field HAZUS-MH Clause

Amendment of this permit, agreed to by the owner, is subject to all applicable laws, regulations, and codes. A violation of this permit may result in the imposition of fines, penalties, or other legal consequences. The owner shall be responsible for compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

## Important Notices

The changes shall be made in the character of the owner's occupancy without obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such changes. See Sec. 102, 104A, 104L, 104C, 502, 502A, San Francisco Building Code, and Sec. 104C, San Francisco Planning Code. The permit of building or structure shall be issued before any work is commenced on the site. See Sec. 341, California Building Code. The building permits issued by the City and County of San Francisco shall be valid for one year from the date of the application for the permit. The building permits shall be valid for one year from the date of application. The building permits shall be valid for one year from the date of application. The building permits shall be valid for one year from the date of application.

## Applicant's Certification

I hereby certify and agree that the work described in this application, all the provisions of the Permit and all Laws and Ordinances thereto will be complied with.

## Notice to Applicant

In accordance with the provisions of Section 2500 of the California Code of the State of California, any applicant who fails to file, or files with the Central Permit Bureau, either Certificates of Occupancy or Building Permits, shall be subject to a penalty of $200.00 or less, whichever is applicable. The following methods of compliance:

1. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
2. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
3. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
4. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
5. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
6. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
7. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
8. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
9. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
10. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
11. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
12. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
13. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
14. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
15. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
16. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
17. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
18. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
19. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**
20. **Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit.**

**Applicant:**

**Date:**

**Inspector:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REASON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>2023-01-01</td>
<td>Reason 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>2023-02-02</td>
<td>Reason 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTICE: If any of the above are not in agreement with the plans or specifications, notify the Building Inspector for further action.*

*NOTICE: Any non-compliance with the Building Code will result in a fine of $500 per day.*

The approval of this application and issuance of the permit does not constitute approval of the building. The building inspection is a separate process. This permit is valid for 90 days from the date of approval.
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CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

Applicant hereby certifies and declares that it is a permit holder for the construction described in this application. All the provisions of the permit and all terms and conditions thereof will be complied with.

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

GIVE NOTICE TO THE APPLICANT, ANY OFFICER, AGENT, OR EMPLOYEE OF THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, AND ANY OFFICE, OFFICER, OR AGENT OF ANY CORPORATION, COMPANY, ASSOCIATION, OR CORPORATION, TO WHOM SUCH NOTICE IS DELIVERED, THAT ANY DESTRUCTION OF THE PREMISES OR ANY PART THEREOF AFTER THE DATE OF THE NOTICE SHALL BE DEemed a VIOLATION OF THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO has, on the 12th day of June, 1984, granted the following permit:

Application No. 1201 Illinois St.

To

R. V. Bettiner

77 BEAR ST.

This is a RE-APPLICATION OF THE PERMIT, WHICH WAS NOT STARTED WITHIN THE ALLOWED TIME LIMIT.

APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE

Applicant: R. V. Bettiner

Signature: [signature]

Date: 5/20/84

OFFICE COPY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
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City: San Francisco

State: California

Zip Code: 94118
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Total Cost: $500,000
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CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

DATE
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TECHNICAL EXCEPT FROM EXEMPTIAL REVIEW

APPROVED: FOR WORK STATED
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I AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS OF THE ABOVES

DATE
REASON

NOTIFIED MR.

AGENT FOR CHAM OF JESSA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEP. 01 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPLICATION FILING FEE —
PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT

DATE: 1-28-88

RECEIVED OF: P. L. & E.

BUILDING APPLICATION NUMBER: 980099

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

185852
Any electrical or plumbing work will require appropriate separate permits.
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APPLICATION FILING FEE - PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT

DATE: 11-9-88

RECEIVED OF: PACIFIC INS & PLUMB 681766

FILING APPLICATION NUMBER: 681766

FEE FOR APPLICATION FILING AND CHECKING PLANS, PRESCRIBED BY SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST OF JOB</th>
<th>GENERAL FEE</th>
<th>FUNDING FEE</th>
<th>TOTAL DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING FEE: FULL PLAN CHECK FUND [ ]

DIT AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

Y/ N: Y

Collect Filing Fee Letter in
**Application for Building Permit**

**Additions, Alterations or Repairs**

**City and County of San Francisco**
**Department of Public Works**

**FIRE**

**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT**

**ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

**FORM 2**

**OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED**

**FORM 6**

**FIRE PROOFING AGREEMENTS**

**Applications for Building Permits for the Purpose of FIRE PROOFING AGREEMENTS ARE REQUIRED AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREINSTATED SET FORTH.**

**Two Number of Plan Sets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Set</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>603805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>760389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information to be Furnished by All Applicants**

**Description of Existing Building**

**01: Containment**

**Description of Building After Proposed Alteration**

**01: Containment**

**Additional Information — Form 3 Applicants Only**

**S. K. Kho**

**Ba. F1612, One California, S.F., CA 94105**

**C.12608**

**Reinforced Concrete Oil Containment Bunker for Sludge Tank**

**Notice to Applicant**

**A.** The Plan Files shall be returned to the applicant at the time of issuance or as otherwise required by law.

**B.** The Plan Files shall be returned to the applicant at the time of issuance or as otherwise required by law.

**Additional Information**

**Reinforced Concrete Oil Containment Bunker for Sludge Tank**

**Application for Building Permit**

**Additions, Alterations or Repairs**

**City and County of San Francisco**
**Department of Public Works**

**FIRE**

**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT**

**ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

**FORM 2**

**OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED**

**FORM 6**

**FIRE PROOFING AGREEMENTS**

**Applications for Building Permits for the Purpose of FIRE PROOFING AGREEMENTS ARE REQUIRED AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREINSTATED SET FORTH.**

**Two Number of Plan Sets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Set</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>603805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>760389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information to be Furnished by All Applicants**

**Description of Existing Building**

**01: Containment**

**Description of Building After Proposed Alteration**

**01: Containment**

**Additional Information — Form 3 Applicants Only**

**S. K. Kho**

**Ba. F1612, One California, S.F., CA 94105**

**C.12608**

**Reinforced Concrete Oil Containment Bunker for Sludge Tank**

**Notice to Applicant**

**A.** The Plan Files shall be returned to the applicant at the time of issuance or as otherwise required by law.

**B.** The Plan Files shall be returned to the applicant at the time of issuance or as otherwise required by law.

**Additional Information**

**Reinforced Concrete Oil Containment Bunker for Sludge Tank**

**Application for Building Permit**

**Additions, Alterations or Repairs**

**City and County of San Francisco**
**Department of Public Works**

**FIRE**

**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT**

**ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

**FORM 2**

**OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED**

**FORM 6**

**FIRE PROOFING AGREEMENTS**

**Applications for Building Permits for the Purpose of FIRE PROOFING AGREEMENTS ARE REQUIRED AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREINSTATED SET FORTH.**

**Two Number of Plan Sets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Set</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>603805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>760389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information to be Furnished by All Applicants**

**Description of Existing Building**

**01: Containment**

**Description of Building After Proposed Alteration**

**01: Containment**

**Additional Information — Form 3 Applicants Only**

**S. K. Kho**

**Ba. F1612, One California, S.F., CA 94105**

**C.12608**

**Reinforced Concrete Oil Containment Bunker for Sludge Tank**

**Notice to Applicant**

**A.** The Plan Files shall be returned to the applicant at the time of issuance or as otherwise required by law.

**B.** The Plan Files shall be returned to the applicant at the time of issuance or as otherwise required by law.

**Additional Information**

**Reinforced Concrete Oil Containment Bunker for Sludge Tank**

**Application for Building Permit**

**Additions, Alterations or Repairs**

**City and County of San Francisco**
**Department of Public Works**

**FIRE**

**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT**

**ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

**FORM 2**

**OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED**

**FORM 6**

**FIRE PROOFING AGREEMENTS**

**Applications for Building Permits for the Purpose of FIRE PROOFING AGREEMENTS ARE REQUIRED AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREINSTATED SET FORTH.**

**Two Number of Plan Sets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Set</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>603805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>760389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information to be Furnished by All Applicants**

**Description of Existing Building**

**01: Containment**

**Description of Building After Proposed Alteration**

**01: Containment**

**Additional Information — Form 3 Applicants Only**

**S. K. Kho**

**Ba. F1612, One California, S.F., CA 94105**

**C.12608**

**Reinforced Concrete Oil Containment Bunker for Sludge Tank**

**Notice to Applicant**

**A.** The Plan Files shall be returned to the applicant at the time of issuance or as otherwise required by law.

**B.** The Plan Files shall be returned to the applicant at the time of issuance or as otherwise required by law.

**Additional Information**

**Reinforced Concrete Oil Containment Bunker for Sludge Tank**
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

In the space designated above, indicate the number of plan sets required for this application.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

N/A

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

MORE SPACE

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION — FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE: The Permittee, by acceptance of the permit, agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from and against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from any breach of any provision of this permit. The Permittee further agrees to hold the City and County of San Francisco harmless against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from any breach of this permit. The Permittee further agrees to hold the City and County of San Francisco harmless against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from any breach of this permit.

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See San Francisco Building Code for San Francisco housing construction.

No portion of the building or structure shall be altered, added, increased or decreased in size or shape, or shall be subject to alteration, unless the alteration is approved by the Building Code Official.

All alterations, additions or reductions in the building or structure must be made in compliance with all applicable codes, ordinances and regulations of the City and County of San Francisco.

It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure that all work required to be performed by the permittee is performed in a safe and workmanlike manner.

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS OF SAN FRANCISCO, FOR PERMIT TO BLDG IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HERETO AND ACCORDING TO THE CONDITIONS AND FOR THE REASONS STATED ABOVE.

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

HARVEY SPEARS, AGREE TO THE EXHIBIT OF THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THE APPLICATION AND TO FOLLOW THE ORDERS AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF, THE WORK TO BE PERFORMED AND THE COST THEREOF.

APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE

Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>FEE CHARGED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>7.28.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDI</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICATION FILING FEE — PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT**

**DATE:** 7.28.90

**RECEIVED OF:** Wade McElwee

**BUILDING APPLICATION NUMBERS:** 9014560

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS CENTRAL PERM BUREAU**

**FEE FOR APPLICATION FILING AND CHECKING PLANS, PRESCRIBED BY SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>FEE CHARGED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>7.28.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDI</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEIVED OF</td>
<td>RATE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ROLLING APPLICATION NUMBER | 9023605 |

| BUREAU APPLICATION | 221143 |

| FEE FOR APPLICATION FILING AND CHECKING PLANS | 9|0|2|3|6|0|5 |

| ESTIMATED COST OF JOB | 29,000 | 198.66 | 22.10 |

| TIME | FEES | 78.13 | COFFEE | 10.00 |

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

SF
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE COPY

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HERETO AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSES HEREBY SET FORTH.

N. WHipple

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPICANTS

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF STRUCTURE</th>
<th>LOCATION, CLASS OF OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>BEG. AND END. DATES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Electric Shop</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF STRUCTURE</th>
<th>LOCATION, CLASS OF OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>BEG. AND END. DATES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Electric Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

I HOLD MY LICENSE FOR THE FOLLOWING:

OWNER: 27 Gable Ln, Em 2010

CONTRACTOR: 27 Gable Ln, Em 2010

ARCHITECT: 27 Gable Ln, Em 2010

ENGINEER: 27 Gable Ln, Em 2010

APPLICANTS CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF AND WILL COMPLY WITH THEM.

Applicant's Signature

Date
APPLICATION FILING FEE — PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT

RECEIVED OF

FEDERAL SIGN 10/81

910 2311

2/11/91

APPLICATION FILIING FEE

PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT

223925

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
SMALL PERMIT BUREAU

SEASONAL PERMIT BUREAU

ESTIMATED COST OF PLAN
PRELIMINARY

FULL PLAN CHECK

$50.00

7.50

DECLARATION

10/81

7

50.00

PRELIMINARY

SUBMISSIONS

10/81

2/11/91

910 2311

FEDERAL SIGN 10/81

910 2311

2/11/91
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION FILING FEE</th>
<th>PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>3-26-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEIVED</td>
<td>P.G. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYMENT</td>
<td>9/04/90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEES FOR APPLICATION FILING AND CHECKING PLANS, PRESCRIBED BY SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED COST OF JOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERmitted Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMITTED FEES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL PLAN CHECK FEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMIT REQUIRED:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNEXATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICE COPY

APPROVED

O.C.E.

DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS

APPLICANT: 

1201 ILLINOIS ST. SF, CA 94107

3-13-91

APPROVALS ISSUED

REPAIR SIDING, REPLACE EXHAUST FAN, ADD AIR LOUNES.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

WELDING SHOP

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

WELDING SHOP

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION — FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

A NO CASH DISBURSEMENT OR CASH ADVANCE IS TO BE MADE TO ANY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR OR SUPPLIER IN EXCESS OF THE AMOUNT OF THE CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT. A NO CASH ADVANCE SHALL BE MADE FOR WORK COMPLETED OR MATERIALS SUPPLIED IN EXCESS OF THE CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT. A NO CASH ADVANCE SHALL BE MADE FOR WORK COMPLETED OR MATERIALS SUPPLIED IN EXCESS OF THE CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT.

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the laws and ordinances thereto will be complied with.

Cesar Alcantar 3-13-91
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQUENTIAL CODE OF JOB</th>
<th>RECEIVED BY</th>
<th>PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#11610</td>
<td></td>
<td>225423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38124</td>
<td></td>
<td>9104810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee for Application Filing and Checking Plans, Prescribed by San Francisco Building Code

- Plan Fee: $38,124
- Check No.: 9104810
- Date: 3-25-91

City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Works
Central Permit Bureau
**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT**

**ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE OFFICE OF BUILDING INSPECTION FOR PERMISON TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUMMITTED HEREBY AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREINAFER SET FORTH.**

---

**INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIFFERENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION — FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Certificate of No Setoff issued by the Director of Industrial Relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a.</td>
<td>Certificate of Workers' Compensation Insurance issued by an admitted insurer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b.</td>
<td>An essay or dissertation of (2) prepared by the Director of (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The cost of the work to be performed is $100 or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The work is not considered a major work on the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NOTICE TO APPLICANT**

**NO LENDER**

---

**APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION**

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREIN WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

---

**SIGNATURES**

- Applicant: [Signature]
- Date: 3/13/91
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEIVED OF</th>
<th>9/10/4844</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**APPLICATION FILING FEE - PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING APPLICATION NUMBER</th>
<th>225422</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FEE FOR APPLICATION FILING AND CHECKING PLAN, PRESCRIBED BY SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FEE PAID**

| AMOUNT | 138.00 |

**FEE PAID**

| AMOUNT | 138.00 |

**DATE**

| 3-21-71 |
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM APR-162, 2/1/77, REVISION 0

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety

Construct and install on building to satisfaction of Bureau of Fire Prevention the following fire protection equipment and appliances:

- F. D. (Dry) Standpipes
- Wet Standpipes
- Hose Reels
- Tanks
- Down-Pipes
- Automatic Fire Pumps
- Automatic Sprinkler System
- Water Service Connection
- Ground Floor Pipe Casings
- Refrigeration
- Incinerators

Approved: [Signature]

Supervisor of Bureau of Building Inspection

Approved: [Signature]

Chief Planning Commission

Approved: [Signature]

Director of Public Health

Approved: [Signature]

Department of Electricity
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Bureau of Engineering
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Fire Marshal

Approved: [Signature]

Art Commission

BLDG. FORM

No. 2

APPLICATION FOR PERMIT TO ERECT

FOR PERMIT TO ERECT

1201 Illinois

STORY FRAME BUILDING

Location BLOCK 3179 APPROX

1000' EAST OF TERMINUS

OF HUMBOLDT ST

Cost $4000

Filed Aug 29 1946

Approved: [Signature]

Dept. Public Works

SEP 2 1946

Superintendent Bureau of Building Inspection

Permit No.

Issued 85015

Certificate of Final Completion

Applied for

Issued 193

No.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
FRAME BUILDING

August 27, 1946

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location of Lot: Street

(2) Number of Stories: One

(3) Total Cost: $6,000.00

(4) Purpose or Occupancy: Pump House


(6) Any other building on lot at present: Yes

(7) Contractor (DOES) carry Workmen's Compensation Insurance.

Address: 245 Market Street, San Francisco, California

I hereby certify and agree, if a permit is issued, that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW, THE BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCES, SET-BACK LINE REQUIREMENTS AND THE FIRE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the STATE HOUSING ACT OF CALIFORNIA will be complied with, whether herein specified or not; and I hereby agree to save, indemnify and keep harmless the City and County of San Francisco against all liabilities, judgments, costs and expenses which may in anywise accruu against said city and county in consequence of the granting of this permit, or from the use or occupancy of any sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk placed by virtue thereof, and will in all things strictly comply with the conditions of this permit.

(9) Architect

Certificate No. License No.
State of California City and County of San Francisco

Address

(10) Engineer

Certificate No. License No.
State of California City and County of San Francisco

Address

(11) Plans and specifications prepared by

Other than Architect or Engineer

Address

(12) Contractor

License No. License No.
State of California City and County of San Francisco

Address

(13) Owner

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Address

Owner's Authorized Agent.

The Department will call up telephone No. if any alterations or changes are necessary on the plans submitted.

Certificate of Final Completion must be obtained on completion of building, pursuant to Sec. 9.
**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT**

**ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

**FORM 3**

OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

**FORM B**

OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

**NUMBER OF PLAN SETS**

- **6-3/96**
- **5.29.96**

**INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS**

**DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF CONSTR.</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO. OF STORY OR LEVELS OCCUPIED</strong></td>
<td><strong>RENTAL AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>FINISH CODE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRUCTION TO BE PERFORMED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF CONSTR.</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO. OF STORY OR LEVELS OCCUPIED</strong></td>
<td><strong>RENTAL AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>FINISH CODE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANTS ONLY**

- **A**. Certification of Consent to Self-Build issued by the Director of Industrial Relations.
- **B**. Certificate of Worker's Compensation Insurance issued by an admitted insurer.
- **C**. A true copy of duplicate of (b) certified by the Director or (c) certified by the issuer.
- **D**. A copy of the bond in the amount of $100 or less.
- **E**. A true copy of the application for the building permit which must be submitted with the application for the building permit. Separate copies are sufficient if all other copies are identical.
- **F**. THIS IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE PERMITTED UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

**NOTICE TO APPLICANT**

- **A**. A true copy of the plans and specifications submit to the City of San Francisco for the building permit.
- **B**. A true copy of the plans and specifications submit to the City of San Francisco for the building permit.

**APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION**

- **A**. A true copy of the plans and specifications submit to the City of San Francisco for the building permit.
- **B**. A true copy of the plans and specifications submit to the City of San Francisco for the building permit.

**APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE**

- **A**. A true copy of the plans and specifications submit to the City of San Francisco for the building permit.
- **B**. A true copy of the plans and specifications submit to the City of San Francisco for the building permit.

**IMPORTANT NOTES**

- **I**. A true copy of the plans and specifications submit to the City of San Francisco for the building permit.
- **II**. A true copy of the plans and specifications submit to the City of San Francisco for the building permit.

**DATE RECEIVED**

- **6-3/96**
- **5.29.96**

**PLANNED CONSTRUCTION**

- **1201 ILLINOIS STREET**
- **GATEHOUSE**

**FINISHED COST**

- **$25,000**

**REINFORCE BRICK PARAPETS**

- **REMOVE PORTION OF PARAPET & BRICK WALL.**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

- **FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY**
- **54.5**
- **348.29**
- **564.23**

**ADDRESS**

- **PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO., 77 BAY STREET, SF, CA (415) 973-3586**
- **PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO., P.O. BOX 770000, SF, CA 94177 (415) 973-3586**
- **Donald F. Willoughby, PG&E, MAILCODE FAB, P.O. BOX 770000, SF, CA 94177**

**APPLICANT ADDRESS**

- **PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO., 77 BAY STREET, SF, CA (415) 973-3586**
- **PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO., P.O. BOX 770000, SF, CA 94177 (415) 973-3586**
- **Donald F. Willoughby, PG&E, MAILCODE FAB, P.O. BOX 770000, SF, CA 94177 (415) 973-3586**

**SIGNATURE**

- **A.**
- **B.**
- **C.**
- **D.**
- **E.**
- **F.**
- **G.**
- **H.**
- **I.**
- **J.**
- **K.**
- **L.**
- **M.**
- **N.**
- **O.**
- **P.**
- **Q.**
- **R.**
- **S.**
- **T.**
- **U.**
- **V.**
- **W.**
- **X.**
- **Y.**
- **Z.**

**Apply to the Department of Public Works San Francisco for Permit**
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM A OFFICE OF BUILDING INSPECTION

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICE COPY
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO
BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS
SUBMITTED HERETOFORTH AND ACCORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION
AND FOR THE PURPOSE HEREBEFORTH SET FORTH.

INFORMATION TO BE PURSUED BY ALL APPLICANTS

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

[Table with columns for Type of Use, No. of Stories, and Description of Occupancy]

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

[Table with columns for Type of Use, No. of Stories, and Description of Occupancy]

[Description of Building: Powerplant (Unoccurred)]

[ plan set to be submitted]

INFORMATION TO BE PURSUED BY ALL APPLICANTS

[All above works are required per permit]

Safeguards Program

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION — FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY

[Formulas and calculations]

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

[Signature and date]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Total Floor Area</th>
<th>Permit Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>123 Mission St.</td>
<td>5,000 sq ft</td>
<td>09411388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the image of this document appears less sharp than this notice, it is due to the quality of the original.
**FRANKFORD DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION**

**NO VIOLATION**

**OCT 4 1995**

**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT**

**ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

**APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED AND ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS AND FOR THE PURPOSE DEPICTED ON THE ATTACHED PLANS.**

**OFFICE COPY**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**2 + CALIFORNIA**

**NUMBER OF PLAN SETS**

**9-10x14 8 1/2 x 11 120) 10-4-95 5 100**

**INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS**

**DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING**

**DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION — FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>PREVIOUS OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>NEW OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NEW OCCUPANT</th>
<th>TOTAL OCCUPANT</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1201 Illinois St</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTICE TO APPLICANT**

**HIC06 HARMONY CLAUSE:** The Permittee(s) in accordance with the provisions of Section 3800 of the California Code of Regulations, having submitted the plans and specifications for alterations to a building or structure subject to the supervision and control of the City of San Francisco, hereby agree to abide by all applicable codes, laws, rules, and regulations of the City and County of San Francisco, and agree to comply with all such codes, laws, rules, and regulations.

**APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances thereto will be complied with.

**SIGNATURE**

Date: 9-1-96
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HERENUM AND FOR THE PURPOSE SET FORTH HEREBIN:

1201 Illinois St
San Francisco
S 3 23rd St
0 N 23rd St

NO COMPATIBLE USE

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

DEC 19 1995

DEP

9-18-95

26,087

12-19-95

$45,000

No Change shall be made in this Building Permit without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See San Francisco Building Code and San Francisco Housing Code.

No portion of building or structure or any building yard during construction, to be closer than 10 ft. to any eave containing more than 1500 cu. ft. See Sec. 330, California Penal Code.

Pursuant to the San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on the job. The owner is responsible for approving plans and application filed kept at building site.

Grades shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If seasonal grades there are not on plans or sections and drawings showing seasonal grade lines, such and full together with complete details of retaining walls and well drainage are required in the plans for foundation work.

Any stipulation herein or by Code may be approved.

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED, WHEN REQUIRED.

APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTRICAL WORKING ON PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR THE WORKING AND PLUMBING MUST BE OBTAINED.

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

No change shall be made in this Building Permit without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See San Francisco Building Code and San Francisco Housing Code.

No portion of building or structure or any building yard during construction, to be closer than 10 ft. to any eave containing more than 1500 cu. ft. See Sec. 330, California Penal Code.

Pursuant to the San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on the job. The owner is responsible for approving plans and application filed kept at building site.

Grades shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If seasonal grades there are not on plans or sections and drawings showing seasonal grade lines, such and full together with complete details of retaining walls and well drainage are required in the plans for foundation work.

Any stipulation herein or by Code may be approved.

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED, WHEN REQUIRED.

APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTRICAL WORKING ON PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR THE WORKING AND PLUMBING MUST BE OBTAINED.
CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DATE: 9/21/95

APPROVED:

PLEASE NOTIFY FIRE INSPECTOR AT THE START OF WORK 556-3900.

APPROVED:

BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY

APPROVED:

PLAN CHECKER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

APPROVED:

ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

APPROVED:

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH

APPROVED:

MECHANICAL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION

APPROVED:

Owner's Authorized Agent

[Signature]

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the terms herein and any other requirements noted on this application, and attached statement of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of Assessments:

[Signature]
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I. INTRODUCTION

This Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) Part 2, containing a Proposed Project Analysis, has been prepared at the request of Associate Capital for the Potrero Power Station. This report is associated with the HRE Part 1, which was prepared by Page & Turnbull and finalized on January 29, 2018.

Potrero Power Station is located in San Francisco’s Central Waterfront neighborhood, south of the Pier 70 mixed-use project. It is within a PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution & Repair - General) and M-2 (Heavy Industrial) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District (Figure 1). It sits on an irregularly shaped industrial site that is bordered by 22nd Street to the north, the San Francisco Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south, and Illinois Street to the west. The subject site is addressed as 1201 Illinois Street and encompasses the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 4232/006, 4232/001, 4175/002, 4175/017, and 4175/018. The site functioned as a sugar refinery from 1881 to 1951 and as a power plant from 1902 to 2011.

The subject site includes three extant and previously documented individually eligible properties to the California Register: the Meter House, the Compressor House, and Station A. The Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, and Gate House were also found to contribute to the California Register-eligible Third Street Industrial District. In addition, the HRE Part 1 found that Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack contributed to the Third Street Industrial District with an extended period of significance of 1872 to 1965. All six buildings are considered historic resources for the purposes of CEQA. Page & Turnbull evaluated the other buildings, structures, and landscape features on the site and found them to be ineligible for listing in the California Register individually or as part of a historic district or cultural landscape in association with either Spreckels’ sugar refinery or the Pacific Gas & Electric power station.

The proposed project includes the demolition of Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. Demolition is considered an impact on an historic resource for the purpose of CEQA and project impacts on these individual historic resources will not be further considered in this report. Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are proposed to be retained and rehabilitated, though Unit 3 may be demolished if the block is determined to be used for residential rather than hotel use. It will be assumed for the analysis in this report that Unit 3 will be demolished. The remainder of the site would be redeveloped into a mixed-use site with commercial, residential, and outdoor public space.

Because the proposed project includes the demolition of contributors to the Third Street Industrial District, the primary purpose of this report is to assess the effects on integrity and eligibility of the historic district, as well as compatibility of new construction, in order to determine if the proposed project has any potential impacts on the historic district according to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

---

1 The subject site has also been referenced in prior documentation as the “Potrero Power Plant.”
Historic Resource Evaluation, Part 2

Potrero Power Station
San Francisco, California

Figure 1: Project site (colored yellow) and the Third Street Industrial District (outlined in red dashes).2
Source: Google Earth; ESA, 2017.

METHODOLOGY

This report follows the general outline provided by the San Francisco Planning Department for HRE Part 2 reports. As all of the buildings at the site of the proposed project have already been evaluated for their historic significance, this report does not include any historic research or historic

2 As of July 2017, the three large fuel storage tanks located between 22nd and Humboldt streets were demolished.
evaluations, but summarizes the previous evaluation findings. All photos of the site were taken by Page & Turnbull in June and July 2017.

This report uses the documentation from the HRE Part 1 to summarize the historic status and inform the character-defining features of the historic resources on the site and for the Third Street Industrial District. The report includes a project description and an analysis of potential impacts of the proposed project according to CEQA.
II. SUMMARY OF HISTORIC STATUS

This section of the report summarizes the historic findings from the HRE Part 1.

POTRERO POWER STATION PROPERTY

The subject site includes three extant and previously documented individually eligible properties to the California Register: the Meter House (ca.1902), the Compressor House (ca.1924), and Station A (1901-02; 1930-31). Ward Hill of Dames & Moore determined the period of significance for both the Meter House and Compressor House to span from their dates of construction to 1930, at which point the supply of cleaner and less expensive natural gas increased and reliance on manufactured gas diminished. These buildings were determined individually eligible based on their association with the Pacific Gas & Electric’s (PG&E) gas manufacturing facility and their significance in the history of gas manufacturing in Northern California.

Though Station A (1901-02; 1930-31) was evaluated and found not to be an individual resource due to impacted integrity in the Dames & Moore report, it was subsequently identified as individually significant and eligible for listing in the California Register under Criteria 1 and 3 as part of expert testimony in 2002 in a case regarding the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Application for Certification. The expert testimony was on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco. While there has been disagreement regarding the integrity of Station A among professional architectural historians, for the purposes of CEQA review, the San Francisco Planning Department takes the position that Station A is an individual historic resource.

The Gate House (ca.1914) was previously evaluated and found not to be an individual resource due to impacted integrity.

The Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, and the Gate House were all previously determined to be contributors to the Third Street Industrial District, which is a sub-district of the Central Waterfront/Potrero Point Historic District that was first identified by the San Francisco Planning Department in the Central Waterfront Survey in 2001 and documented in the Central Waterfront Survey Update in 2008. Additionally, Page & Turnbull evaluated a possible expansion of the Third Street Industrial District’s period of significance (1872 to 1958) and found reason to expand the length of time to 1965 (see the next section for more information). This would make Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack, both built in 1965, contributors to the historic district.

THIRD STREET INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

The Third Street Industrial District is a sub-district of the Central Waterfront Historic District (also known as the Potrero Point Historic District) and was documented by Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull in 2008. The Third Street Industrial District is a narrow, linear district that includes the blocks bounded by 18th Street to the north, Illinois Street to the east, 24th Street to the south, Third Street to the west, and the parcels that once constituted PG&E’s Potrero Power Station and the

---

3 Page & Turnbull believes the construction date of the Meter House to be ca.1902, rather than the 1914 date recorded on the DPR 523 form, due to the fact that the building is depicted on the 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.

4 Station A includes: the Boiler Hall (1901-02; demolished in 1983); the Turbine Hall (1901-02); the Switching Center (1930-31); the Machine Shop Office (ca.1911); and the Machine Shop (ca.1915).

remnants of the Western Sugar Refinery. The district also includes several properties on the west side of Third Street between 20th and 22nd streets and the contiguous block bound by 19th, 20th, and Tennessee streets. The Third Street Industrial District is significant under Criterion 1 (Events) for association with the industrial development of the City of San Francisco and under Criterion 3 (Architecture) based on its collection of late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century American industrial buildings and structures that remain substantially intact. It was originally identified with a period of significance of 1872 to 1958. The end date for the period of significance was justified as 50 years prior to the time of survey in 2008, and cuts short a sustained period of productive industrial activity lasting until 1965, despite a post-World War II decline in employment. The immediate area saw continuing industrial activity up until 1965, prior to a general decline in the late 1960s. Industrial productivity through 1965 and the area’s subsequent decline suggest that the Third Street Industrial District’s period of significance should be extended beyond 1958 to 1965.

The following table of contributing properties to the Third Street Industrial District is based on the table included in the 2008 DPR 523D form. Page & Turnbull reviewed all contributors in order to identify demolitions and major alternatives since the district was adopted and has provide additional comments on their current status in the “Remain Contributor” column below. Buildings highlighted in green are on the subject site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Remain Contributor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>20th Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20th and Illinois streets paving</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3994 002</td>
<td>2085 3rd Street</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Gilmore Oil Co. Office Bldg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4045 002</td>
<td>2121 3rd Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Seaside Oil Co. Plant</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058 005</td>
<td>2289-2295 3rd Street</td>
<td>Pre-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058 009</td>
<td>2201-2203 3rd Street</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Alberta Candy Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058 010</td>
<td>2225 3rd Street</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>M. Levin and Sons Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058 010</td>
<td>2255 3rd Street</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Jos. Levin and Sons Warehouse</td>
<td>Demolished except for part of facade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059 001A-001B</td>
<td>815-825 Tennessee</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Bowie Switch Co.</td>
<td>Demolished except for facade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059 008</td>
<td>2250 3rd Street</td>
<td>Post-1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059 009</td>
<td>2290-2298 3rd Street</td>
<td>1917; 1940</td>
<td>Anglo California Trust Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059 011</td>
<td>724-728 20th Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Dr. Frank M. Close Medical Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 003J</td>
<td>2350 3rd Street</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 003R</td>
<td>2440 3rd Street</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Bertsch Machine Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 003</td>
<td>2360-2364 3rd Street</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Pellegrini Bros. Winery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 030</td>
<td>2400 3rd Street</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Goodyear Rubber Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4109 001</td>
<td>2301 3rd Street</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>American Can Co. Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4172 005</td>
<td>2530 3rd Street</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>(1516-1510 Kentucky Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4172 007</td>
<td>2542-2544 3rd Street</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>(1522 Kentucky Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Former Western Sugar Refinery warehouses located south of the subject site were determined eligible for listing in the National Register.
7 Survey methodology used 50 years as a cut-off date, which means that the period of significance has a shelf-life that needed to be updated as time passes.
As reflected in the table above, four contributing buildings have been demolished since the historic district was documented in 2008. The boundaries of the district have not changed, though. With an expanded period of significance of 1872 to 1965 that adds Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack, the district currently includes 25 extant contributing resources and 28 non-contributing properties (Figures 2 - 4). All of the non-contributing properties were reviewed, and aside from Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack at Potrero Power Station, none of the other properties changed status from non-contributing to contributing within the extended period of significance.
Figure 2. Map of Third Street Industrial District boundaries, showing correct boundary that includes the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses at 435 23rd Street (map in 2008 DPR 523D form was incorrect). Detailed maps follow in Figures 5 and 6. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map, edited by Page & Turnbull, January 2018.

Figure 3. Detail view of the north portion of the Third Street Industrial District, showing lot numbers. Contributing properties are shaded red. Contributors that have been demolished since 2008 are not colored. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map; edited by Page & Turnbull, January 2018.
Figure 4. Detail view of the south portion of the Third Street Industrial District, showing lot numbers. Contributing properties are shaded red. Contributors that have been demolished since 2008 are not colored. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map, edited by Page & Turnbull, January 2018.
III. CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

This section provides lists of character-defining features identified in Page & Turnbull’s HRE Part 1 for all historic resources, including Station A, the Meter House, the Gate House, the Compressor House, Unit 3, and the Boiler Stack. A separate table contains character-defining features of the Third Street Industrial District, as inferred from the Central Waterfront DPR 523D form authored by Kelley & VerPlanck and Page & Turnbull in 2008.

For a property to be eligible for national, state, or local designation under one of the significance criteria, the essential physical features (or character-defining features) that enable the property to convey its historic identity must be evident. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms such as form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials.

Station A – inclusive of the Turbine Hall, Machine Shop, Machine Shop Office, and Switching Center – is primarily referenced as one resource throughout the HRE Part 1, with the exception of the Buildings Table, where the portions of Station A are described chronologically by date of construction. Rather than retain the chronological order featured in the HRE Part 1, the character-defining features table below groups the physical portions of Station A one after another for clarity. The Meter House, Gate House, Compressor House, Unit 3, and Boiler Stack follow. All numbers in the left column are referenced in the site plan (Figure 5), which is included in the HRE Part 1.
Figure 5: Site map with buildings, structures and features at Potrero Power Station showing Third Street Industrial District contributors and non-contributors. Map is not drawn to scale. Source: San Francisco Property Information Map, edited by Page & Turnbull.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Station A Turbine Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Construction:</strong> 1901-02; 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APN:</strong> 4175/017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Character-Defining Features:**

- Rectangular plan
- Built out to lot lines between 23rd and Humboldt streets
- Four stories tall
- Massive brick masonry construction
- Classical decorative brick quoin patterning
- Multi-lite steel-sash windows at the north façade, deeply recessed
- Multi-lite steel-sash windows at the south façade
- Symmetrical window pattern at north and south facades; irregular window pattern at east façade (west façade not visible)
- Slightly-pitched gable roof with steel trusses; corrugated metal roof material at northern portion
- High volume and industrial character of interior

---

**Potrero Power Station Historic Buildings – Character-Defining Features Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1</strong></th>
<th>East façade of Turbine Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**South façade of Turbine Hall. The two left (west) bays constitute the adjacent Station A Switching Center, built in 1930-31.**

| **2** | | |
|-------| | |

**North façade of Turbine Hall**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Character-Defining Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Station A Machine Shop Office | ca.1911              | 4175/017     | - Rectangular plan  
- One story tall  
- Reinforced concrete construction  
- Flat roof  
- Greek Revival features at the primary façade, including: gabled pediment; pedestrian entrance and full-height windows with corbels and triangular and arched pedimented hoods; pilasters topped with Doric capitals and egg and dart molding; and dentil cornice  
- Concrete stairs parallel to facade |
| Station A Machine Shop      | ca.1915              | 4175/017     | - Irregular plan  
- Tall single story  
- Reinforced concrete construction with brick cladding  
- Corbelled brick detailing at parapet  
- Decorative brick quoin patterning  
- Flat roof |
| Station A Switching Center  | 1930-31              | 4175/017     | - Rectangular plan  
- Four stories tall  
- Concrete construction with brick cladding  
- Multi-lite steel-sash windows  
- Flat roof  
- Corbelled brick detailing at parapet  
- Decorative quoin patterning  
- Engraved signage reading “Station A” and “Pacific Gas and Electric Company” |
Name: Meter House; Gas Meter Shop
Date of Construction: ca.1902
APN: 4175/017

Character-Defining Features:
- Rectangular plan
- One story
- Brick masonry construction
- Multi-lite wood-sash windows with concrete sill and brick arched lintel
- Multi-lite wood-sash lunette windows at the gable peaks of the west and east facades
- Rhythmic brick pilasters and cornice
- Dentil cornice
- Steel truss gable roof with a raised central monitor
- Partially glazed metal pedestrian doors
- Loading door opening at the west facade [metal roll-up door not historic]
- Volume and industrial character of interior
- Shortened north facade due to raised street grade

Name: Gate House
Date of Construction: ca.1914
APN: 4175/017

Character-Defining Features:
- Rectangular plan
- Single story
- Brick masonry construction
- Flat roof
- Simple decorative brick cornice
- Rectilinear wood-sash transomed windows
- Brick window and door surrounds
Name: Compressor House

Date of Construction: ca.1924

APN: 4175/017

Character-Defining Features:

- L-shaped plan
- Tall one story
- Brick masonry construction
- Multi-lite steel-sash windows with decorative brick surround
- Brick parapet (partial stepped parapet at the east façade)
- Corbeled brick cornice
- Brick quoin patterning
- Round openings
- Loading door openings at all facades [metal roll-up doors not historic]
- Slightly pitched concrete gable roof with steel trusses
- Two monitor roof skylights
- Volume and industrial character of interior
Name: Unit 3 Power Block: Generator, Turbine, Boiler, and Unit 3 Office
Date of Construction: 1965
APN: 4232/006

**Character-Defining Features:**
- Eight-story steel frame structure, primarily exposed
- Concrete elevator shaft
- Control room and offices of concrete construction
- Metal panel cladding and glazing of south office portion
- Industrial character with remnants of equipment infrastructure
North façade of Unit 3

South façade of Unit 3

South (left) and east (right) façade of Unit 3
Office
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Boiler Stack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction: 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN: 4232/006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character-Defining Features:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reinforced concrete construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tapered form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 300-foot height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crow’s nest walkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exterior metal ladder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Street Industrial District Character-Defining Features**

Representative sample of contributors with historic uses:

Alberta Candy Company at 2201-2203 Third Street

M. Levin & Sons Warehouse at 2225 Third Street

Location: primarily along Third Street between 18th and 24th streets, with Potrero Power Station and Western Sugar Refinery Warehouse buildings to the east on 23rd Street

Years Constructed: primarily during the first half of the twentieth century

Character-Defining Features:

• Linear character of district along Third Street, with exception of Potrero Power Station site and Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses, which make the district L-shaped
• High concentration of manufacturing, repair, and processing plants and warehouses of industrial character
• Historic location of industries dependent on nearby waterfront and freight-hauling Santa Fe Railroad trains that ran along Illinois Street
• Buildings with the following typical features:
  o Brick and concrete construction
  o One to four stories in height
  o Flat roofs
  o Ornamented parapets
  o Steel-sash and wood-sash windows
  o Rectilinear and arched window openings
  o American Commercial style
Mixed-use commercial and boarding house at 2290 Third Street

American Can Co. Building on Third Street between 20th and 22nd streets

American Can Co. Building Third Street between 20th and 22nd streets

American Can Co. Building Third Street between 20th and 22nd streets
IV. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is state legislation (Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.) that provides for the development and maintenance of a high-quality environment for the present-day and future through the identification of significant environmental effects. CEQA applies to “projects” proposed to be undertaken or requiring approval from state or local government agencies. “Projects” are defined as “…activities which have the potential to have a physical impact on the environment and may include the enactment of zoning ordinances, the issuance of conditional use permits and the approval of tentative subdivision maps.”* Historic and cultural resources are considered to be part of the environment. In general, the lead agency must complete the environmental review process as required by CEQA.

A property may qualify as a historic resource if it falls within at least one of four categories listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), which are defined as:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1 (g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

4. The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Pub. Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Pub. Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Pub. Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.9

The Compressor House, Meter House, Station A, Gate House, Unit 3, and the Boiler Stack have been determined eligible for listing in the California Register and are therefore considered historical resources for CEQA review as defined under Category 3 above.

---

8 Ibid.
9 Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.
As a certified local government and the lead agency in CEQA determinations, the City and County of San Francisco has instituted guidelines for initiating CEQA review of historic resources. The San Francisco Planning Department’s “CEQA Review Procedures for Historical Resources” incorporates the State’s CEQA Guidelines into the City’s existing regulatory framework. To facilitate the review process, the Planning Department has established the following categories to establish the baseline significance of historic properties based on their inclusion within cultural resource surveys and/or historic districts:

- **Category A – Historical Resources is divided into two sub-categories:**
  - **Category A.1 – Resources listed on or formally determined to be eligible for the California Register.** These properties will be evaluated as historical resources for purposes of CEQA. Only the removal of the property’s status as listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources by the California Historic Resources Commission will preclude evaluation of the property as a historical resource under CEQA.
  - **Category A.2 – Adopted local registers, and properties that have been determined to appear or may become eligible, for the California Register.** These properties will be evaluated as historical resources for purposes of CEQA. Only a preponderance of the evidence demonstrating that the resource is not historically or culturally significant will preclude evaluation of the property as an historical resource. In the case of Category A.2 resources included in an adopted survey or local register, generally the “preponderance of the evidence” must consist of evidence that the appropriate decision-maker has determined that the resource should no longer be included in the adopted survey or register. Where there is substantiated and uncontroverted evidence of an error in professional judgment, of a clear mistake or that the property has been destroyed, this may also be considered a “preponderance of the evidence that the property is not an historical resource.”

- **Category B - Properties requiring further consultation and review.** Properties that do not meet the criteria for listing in Categories A.1 or A.2, but for which the City has information indicating that further consultation and review will be required for evaluation whether a property is an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

- **Category C - Properties determined not to be historic resources or properties for which the city has no information indicating that the property is a historic resource.** Properties that have been affirmatively determined not to be historical resources, properties less than 50 years of age, and properties for which the City has no information.

---

10 San Francisco Planning Department, “San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16: City and County of San Francisco Planning Department CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources,” (San Francisco: October 2004).
11 Ibid.
As previously discussed, the Compressor House, Meter House, Station A, Gate House, Unit 3, and the Boiler Stack have been determined eligible for listing in the California Register eligible for listing in the California Register, and therefore each falls under Category A.2, “properties that have been determined to appear eligible for the California Register.”

**THRESHOLD FOR SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE**

According to CEQA, a “project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.”12 Substantial adverse change is defined as: “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired.”13 The historic significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance” and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register.14 Thus, a project may cause an adverse change in a historic resource but still not have a significant effect on the environment as defined by CEQA as long as the impact of the change on the historic resource is determined to be less-than-significant, negligible, neutral, or even beneficial.

In other words, a project may have an impact on a historic resource, and that impact may or may not impair the resource’s eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. If an identified impact would result in a resource that is no longer able to convey its historic significance and is therefore no longer eligible for listing in the California Register, then it would be considered a significant effect.

In addition, according to Section 15126.4(b)(1) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), if a project adheres to the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (the Standards), the project’s impact “will generally be considered mitigated below the level of a significance and thus is not significant.”15

---

12 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).
13 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(1).
14 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(2).
15 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15126.4(b)(1).
V. PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following project description is derived from the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of a Public Scoping Meeting, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department (November 1, 2017, Case No. 2017-011878ENV).

The Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development project (proposed project) is located on an approximately 29.0-acre site along San Francisco’s central bayshore waterfront, encompassing the site of the former Potrero Power Plant that closed in 2011. California Barrel Company LLC, the project sponsor, seeks to redevelop the site for a proposed multi-phased, mixed-use development, and activate a new waterfront open space. The proposed project includes the demolition of about 20 existing buildings on the property, including four historic resources: Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. The project proposes to retain and rehabilitate the Boiler Stack, and it may or may not retain Unit 3. Under the proposed land use program, the project may convert the Unit 3 power block on Block 9 into a hotel. In addition, the 300-foot tall Stack would be seismically stabilized and preserved. A plaza in front of Unit 3 and at the base of the Stack would connect the structure to a proposed Power Station Park. However, under the proposed flexible land use program, residential land use could be developed on Block 9 instead of a hotel, in which case, the Unit 3 power block would also be demolished. The remainder of the site would be redeveloped into a mixed-use site with commercial, residential, and outdoor public space.

The proposed project would include amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code, creating a new Potrero Power Station Special Use District (SUD). The proposed rezoning would modify the existing height limits of 40 and 65 feet to various heights ranging from 65 to 300 feet.

The proposed project would provide for development of residential, commercial (including office, research and development [R&D]/life science, retail, hotel, and production, distribution, and repair [PDR]), parking, community facilities, and open space land uses. Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 5.3 million gross square feet (gsf) of new uses, including between approximately 2.4 and 3.0 million gsf of residential use (about 2,400 to 3,000 dwelling units), between approximately 1.2 and 1.9 million gsf of commercial uses (office, R&D/life science, retail, hotel, and PDR), approximately 925,000 gsf of parking, and approximately 100,000 gsf of community facilities. Most new buildings would range in height from 65 to 180 feet, with one building at 300 feet. Approximately 6.3 acres would be devoted to publicly accessible open space.

More specifically, Block 4, 12, and 14 would have a “Flex Residential or Commercial” land use designation, and Block 9/Unit 3 would have a “Flex Hotel or Residential” land use designation. Otherwise, blocks in the northwest and central interior portions of the project site would be designated “Residential,” and blocks along the project site’s north and south sides would be designated “Research & Development/Office.” In the central-west area of the project site, Block No. 5 would be designated “Residential and District Parking Garage.” Areas designated “Publicly Accessible Open Space” would be located along east-west and north-south axes within the interior of the project site and along the waterfront adjacent to the bay. Ground floor frontages along 23rd Street would host PDR use, and ground floors on blocks fronting the waterfront and open space areas would contain retail (e.g., outdoor cafes and dining). All other ground floors would contain active uses (e.g., neighborhood retail or residential units).

The proposed project would include transportation and circulation improvements, shoreline improvements, and utilities infrastructure improvements. Transportation and circulation improvements would include creating a continuous street network, connecting to the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project directly north of the project site, establishing a new bus stop and shuttle service that the project would provide, and installing traffic signals at the intersections of Illinois Street at
23rd and Humboldt streets. The roadway network would be designed to be accessible for all modes of transportation, including vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian improvements. In addition to waterfront parks, proposed shoreline improvements could include construction of a floating dock extending out and above the tidal zone to provide access from the site to the bay for fishing and recreational watercraft. The proposed project would construct infrastructure and utilities improvements, including potable and emergency water and recycled water distribution; wastewater and stormwater collection; and natural gas and electricity distribution.

A Design for Development (D for D) would be adopted as part of the proposed Potrero Power Station SUD, which would articulate standards and guidelines for building design, open space character, and the public realm. The D for D would establish controls for bulk restriction, articulation, and modulation; building materials and treatment; building frontage utilization; design parameters for open space and streets; and parking and loading standards. Standards in the D for D would be mandatory, measurable, and quantitative design specifications. The design guidelines would be more qualitative and flexible.

Project design and construction would likely occur in seven overlapping phases, with each phase lasting approximately three to six years. The first phase of construction is anticipated to start on the southeast portion of the project site and the last phase of construction would end in the northwest portion of the project site. Total construction is estimated to occur over a 16-year period, from 2020 to 2036, but could occur over a somewhat longer or shorter period, depending on market conditions and permitting requirements.

Additional details regarding the project description are included in the NOP (see Appendix).
Figure 7. Proposed Height District Plan. Source: Perkins+Will, 2017
VI. ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS AND COMPATIBILITY

This section discusses the potential effects of the proposed project, as described in the previous section, on identified historic resources as required by CEQA.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC IMPACTS ON HISTORIC RESOURCES AT THE SITE

The project proposes to retain and rehabilitate the Boiler Stack, a highly visible component of the Potrero Power Station that directly conveys the historic industrial functions of the site. Unit 3 may or may not be retained and rehabilitated as part of the project; it may be demolished if the block is determined to be used for residential rather than hotel use. Because of this ambiguity, the analysis of impacts assumes that Unit 3 will be demolished.

The proposed project also includes the demolition of four contributors to the Third Street Industrial District: Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House. The Meter House, Compressor House, and Station A have also been identified as individually significant resources. Due to the high number of historic resources proposed to be demolished (five of six), the project would have an impact on historic resources at the subject site.

THIRD STREET INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT: IMPACTS AND COMPATIBILITY

The Third Street Industrial District is primarily oriented linearly north-south along the Third Street corridor between 18th and 24th streets. The location of the industries on and near Third Street was dependent on the nearby waterfront and freight-hauling Santa Fe Railroad trains that ran along Illinois Street. The historic district contains a variety of heights and densities, as is typical with industrial land uses.

Contributors located at the Potrero Power Station site are located east of the primary portion of the district, at the tail of the L-shaped district. Separated from the primary portion of the district by a PG&E substation, the Meter House, Compressor House, Station A, and the Gate House are east of other Third Street-facing contributors to the district. Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are located furthest east, at the edge of the San Francisco Bay. Station A is located immediately north of the western of the two Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses at 435 23rd Street, while Unit 3 and the Boiler Stack are located immediately north of the eastern of the two warehouses.

Impact of Demolition of Third Street Industrial District Contributing Resources

This section discusses the effects of demolition of contributing resources on the Third Street Industrial District’s other contributors on and near the Potrero Power Station site, as well as on the district’s overall integrity.

Effect of Demolition of Contributors at Project Site

Specific to the Potrero Power Station project site, the proposed demolition of Station A, the Gate House, the Meter House, and the Compressor House would increase the physical distance between the remaining contributor, the Boiler Stack (and Unit 3, if it is retained), and the primary portion of the district, oriented north-south along Third Street. This would further disconnect the Boiler Stack from the main portion of the district. The demolition of the other contributing buildings on the site would eliminate the Boiler Stack’s site-specific context for its historic use, and the overall Potrero Power Station site would lose its historic industrial character.

However, the Boiler Stack (and Unit 3, if it is retained) would continue to convey the district’s broader industrial themes and physically relate to the overall district via close proximity to the
adjacent Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses, provided the rehabilitation of the Boiler Stack retains its character-defining features.

**Effect of Demolition on Historic District**

Regarding the Third Street Industrial District at large, most of the contributing buildings are one- to four-story concrete industrial buildings, with a few concrete or wood-frame commercial buildings. They range in size from 25' frontages to a full block long. One corner commercial building was built in the late 1800s, but the rest of the buildings on Third Street were built in the 1910s to 1950s (three in the 1910s, six in the 1920s, three in the 1930s, one in the 1940s, and two in the 1950s). Beyond Third Street, the two Western Sugar Refinery warehouses are large concrete buildings constructed in the 1920s.

Thus, the contributing buildings on the Potrero Power Station property are some of the oldest in the district—particularly Station A, which was built in 1901-02 (with an addition in 1930-31), the Meter House from ca. 1902, and the Gate House from ca. 1914. These buildings contribute to the character-defining typology of large brick industrial buildings in the district, which would be largely lost with their demolition.

The district currently contains 25 contributing and 28 non-contributing resources. The proposed project would demolish five of the identified Third Street Industrial District contributors (if Unit 3 is demolished), leaving 20 contributors. Thus, with 20 contributors and 28 non-contributors, by the numbers, there would be an approximately 42 percent ratio of contributors to non-contributors in the district. As a result, the proposed project’s demolition of contributors would further compromise the district’s integrity and ability to convey its significance, and consequently its eligibility for listing in the California Register under both Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 3 (Architecture).

**Compatibility of Proposed Project with Third Street Industrial District**

The proposed project is currently in the conceptual design phase, so information is not known regarding architectural style, materials, or other characteristics that may be relevant to a discussion of compatibility with the nearby historic district. As mentioned earlier, a Design for Development (D for D) would be adopted as part of a proposed Potrero Power Station Special Use District (SUD), which would articulate standards and guidelines for building design, open space character, and the public realm.

Thus, this section discusses compatibility of the proposed project with the Third Street Industrial District as best as possible at the conceptual level, using Standard 9 of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation as guidance. Standard 9 reads: “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.”

**Compatibility of New Construction on Contributors at Project Site**

The new construction at Potrero Power Station would not physically affect the majority of the remaining contributors to the Third Street Industrial District, as the project does not involve additions or alterations to any buildings facing Third Street or the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses at 435 23rd Street. The Boiler Stack would be restored and would retain its characteristic
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16 National Park Service, Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Website accessed on 3 January 2018 from: https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation.htm
materiality and industrial form and height, but it would not continue to be used as a stack. Unit 3, if rehabilitated, would be converted to a hotel use; the design team has communicated that the industrial character with its concrete and steel frame structure would be retained.

The Third Street Industrial District is recognized for its concentration of manufacturing, repair, and processing plants and warehouses of industrial character. The proposed project would introduce residential use and a variety of commercial uses. The latter would include 645,738 gsf of R&D/life science space and 45,040 gsf in PDR (a total of 13 percent of the total gsf for the project), some of which may be categorized as light industrial uses. The R&D uses would be placed at the north and south sides of the site, while the PDR uses would be located in ground floor frontages on 23rd Street. Some of these buildings appear to be situated near the Boiler Stack (and Unit 3, if retained), and there is a possibility that they could be designed to reinforce an industrial character.

New public open spaces are proposed on the site that would introduce a non-industrial character; all are located along the waterfront at the east side of the project site or at the center of the site. Their presence would affect the setting of the Boiler Stack (and Unit 3, if retained).

Though the designs of the new buildings are as yet unknown, their heights are proposed to be between 65 feet immediately north-adjacent to the Boiler Stack (and Unit 3, if retained) and 125 feet to the west and north with a proposed 300-foot tower. In comparison, Unit 3 is approximately 150 feet tall and the Boiler Stack is approximately 300 feet tall. Though the immediately adjacent buildings would be shorter than the Boiler Stack (and Unit 3), the proposed new construction would represent a change from the current condition with regard to scale, density, setting, and feeling for the contributing resource(s), as well as the Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses immediately to the south.

Compatibility of New Construction on Historic District

Regarding the relationship between the new construction and the Third Street Industrial District at large, the new buildings would be taller than the average heights of buildings in the Third Street Industrial District, which stand one to four stories in height. The new buildings at the northwest corner of the Potrero Power Station project site would be closest to the north-south linear portion of the historic district. These buildings would look out upon the rear facade of the contributing three-story American Can Company building at 2501 Third Street. The new buildings would have residential uses, and would be 85 feet tall. These attributes are incongruous with the historic character and setting of the Third Street portion of the historic district. In this area, though, the new construction’s density would be consistent with the density along Third Street.

The new buildings immediately north of the two- and three-story tall Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses on 23rd Street would have R&D/life science and office uses or residential uses that are 95’ and 125’ tall. Both the height and density would be incongruous with the historic character and setting of the southeast portion of the historic district.

The project’s conceptual plan for new construction does not appear compatible with regard to the height and density of the proposed buildings, and would affect the integrity of the Third Street Industrial District’s setting and feeling. However, disassociated from the demolition of contributing resources on the site, the density and height of new construction alone would not affect the historic district’s overall integrity such that the district would no longer be able to convey its historic significance.
PROJECT IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

As mentioned previously, the designs of the new buildings at Potrero Power Station have not yet been developed. The following project improvement measure would ensure greater compatibility with the historic district:

- The new construction should reference the industrial character of the surrounding area with the use of brick and concrete, large bands or punched openings with rectilinear multi-lite windows, and possibly some references to the American Commercial style such as the use of pilasters or simple cornices.

- Special care should be taken along 23rd Street and Illinois Street to design new buildings that reinforce the industrial character and help to unify this street with the contributing resources on Third Street.

- The design of buildings and streetscapes adjacent to the Union Iron Works National Register district should also reference the industrial character of the adjacent district.

- Public open spaces, streetscapes, and publicly accessible building spaces should feature art and artifacts that are historically significant and help to express the industrial and power-generation history of the site and the industrial character of the historic district. Specifically, found objects on the site should be repurposed in coordination with a site-wide historical interpretation program.
VII. CONCLUSION

The proposed project at the Potrero Power Station involves the demolition of historic and non-historic buildings and structures and the construction of new buildings in San Francisco’s Central Waterfront neighborhood. Five of the buildings proposed for demolition are contributors to the Third Street Industrial District; three of these buildings have also been identified as individually significant. The project proposes to retain and rehabilitate the Boiler Stack, and may or may not retain Unit 3. Due to the high number of historic resources proposed to be demolished (five of six), the project would have an impact on historic resources at the subject site.

The demolition of contributing resources on the site would eliminate the Boiler Stack’s site-specific context for its historic use, and the overall Potrero Power Station site would lose its historic industrial character. It would affect the visual continuity of the Boiler Stack (and Unit 3, if retained) to much of the Third Street Industrial District, but the Stack would remain associated with the broader industrial themes of the district via the adjacent proximity of the contributing Western Sugar Refinery Warehouses. However, taking into account the four previous demolitions of contributors to the historic district since 2008, the proposed project’s demolition of five contributors would further compromise the district’s integrity and its eligibility for listing in the California Register under both Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 3 (Architecture).

The project’s conceptual plan for new construction does not appear compatible with regard to the height and density of the proposed buildings, and would affect the integrity of the Third Street Industrial District’s setting and feeling. However, disassociated from the demolition of contributing resources on the site, the density and height of new construction alone would not affect the historic district’s overall integrity such that the district would no longer be able to convey its historic significance.

Nevertheless, when considering both demolition of contributing resources and new construction that would affect the historic district’s integrity of setting and feeling, the proposed project would compromise the Third Street Industrial District’s eligibility for listing in the California Register.
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Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of a Public Scoping Meeting

**Date:** November 1, 2017  
**Case No.:** 2017-011878ENV  
**Project Title:** Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project  
**Zoning:** M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and PDR 1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair - General)  
40-X and 65-X Height District  
**Block/Lot:** Assessor’s Block 4175/Lot 002, Block 4175/Lot 017, Block 4175/Lot 018, Block 4232/Lot 001, Block 4232/Lot 006; and non-assessed Port and City/County of San Francisco properties  
**Lot Size:** Approximately 29.0 acres (1,262,300 square feet)  
**Project Sponsor** California Barrel Company LLC  
Erin Epperson - (415) 796-8945  
e2@associatecapital.com  
**Lead Agency:** San Francisco Planning Department  
**Staff Contact:** Melinda Hue – (415) 575-9041  
melinda.hue@sfgov.org

The San Francisco Planning Department has prepared this Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in connection with the project listed above. The purpose of the EIR is to provide information about the potential significant physical environmental effects of the proposed project, to identify possible ways to minimize the project’s significant adverse effects, and to describe and analyze possible alternatives to the proposed project. The San Francisco Planning Department is issuing this NOP to inform the public and responsible and interested agencies about the proposed project and the intent to prepare an EIR. This NOP is also available online at: http://sf-planning.org/environmental-impact-reports-negative-declarations. The Planning Department also hereby gives notice of a public scoping meeting on this project.

**PROJECT OVERVIEW**

The Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development project (proposed project) is located on an approximately 29.0-acre site along San Francisco’s central bayshore waterfront, encompassing the site of the former Potrero Power Plant that closed in 2011. California Barrel Company LLC, the project sponsor, seeks to redevelop the site for a proposed multi-phased, mixed-use development, and activate a new waterfront open space.

The proposed project would rezone the site, establish land use controls, develop design standards, and provide for development of residential, commercial [including office, research and development (R&D)/life science, retail, hotel, and production, distribution, and repair (PDR)], parking, community facilities, and open space land uses. **Figure 1** shows the project location.
The proposed project would include amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code, creating a new Potrero Power Station Special Use District (SUD). The proposed rezoning would modify the existing height limits of 40 and 65 feet to various heights ranging from 65 to 300 feet.

Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 5.3 million gross square feet (gsf), of uses, including between approximately 2.4 and 3.0 million gsf of residential uses (about 2,400 to 3,000 dwelling units), between approximately 1.2 and 1.9 million gsf of commercial uses (office, R&D/life science, retail, hotel, and PDR), approximately 925,000 gsf of parking, and approximately 100,000 gsf of community facilities. Most new buildings would range in height from 65 to 180 feet, with one building at 300 feet. Approximately 6.3 acres would be devoted to publicly accessible open space. A more detailed breakdown of proposed land uses is described below under Project Characteristics and Components.

The proposed project would include transportation and circulation improvements, shoreline improvements, and utilities infrastructure improvements. Transportation and circulation improvements include creating a continuous street network, connecting to the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project directly north of the project site, new bus stop and shuttle service that the project would provide, and installation of traffic signals at the intersections of Illinois Street at 23rd and Humboldt Streets. The roadway network would be designed to be accessible for all modes of transportation, including vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian improvements. In addition to waterfront parks, proposed shoreline improvements could include construction of a floating dock extending out and above the tidal zone to provide access from the site to the bay for fishing and recreational watercraft. The proposed project would construct infrastructure and utilities improvements, including potable and emergency water and recycled water distribution; wastewater and stormwater collection; and natural gas and electricity distribution.

Project construction would likely occur in seven overlapping phases, with each phase lasting approximately three to six years. The first phase of construction is anticipated to start on the southeast portion of the project site and the last phase of construction would end in the northwest portion of the project site. Total construction is estimated to occur over a 16-year period, from 2020 to 2036, but could occur over a somewhat longer or shorter period, depending on market conditions and permitting requirements.

PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is generally bounded by 22nd Street to the north, the San Francisco Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south, and Illinois Street to the west. The approximately 29.0-acre site is comprised of the following five sub-areas, shown in Figure 2 and described below:

- **Power Station sub-area** — approximately 21.0 acres, currently owned by the project sponsor. This site includes a large portion of the site of the former power station formerly owned and operated by the Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and by NRG Potrero LLC and their predecessors.

- **PG&E sub-area** — approximately 4.8 acres owned by PG&E, located in the northwest corner of the project site, and also a portion of the site of the former power station.

- **Port sub-area** — approximately 2.9 acres owned by the City and County of San Francisco (the City) through the Port of San Francisco (Port), consisting of three noncontiguous areas. The largest area is 1.6 acres located between the Power Station sub-area and the bay; the second largest is 1.3 acres along 23rd Street between the Power Station site and Illinois Street; and the smallest piece is less than one tenth of an acre on the northeast corner of the site next to the bay.
Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project

Figure 2
Project Site Sub-Areas and Ownership

Source: Perkins+Will, 2017
• **Southern sub-area**—approximately 0.2 acres owned by Harrigan Weidenmuller Company, located south of the Power Station sub-area along 23rd Street.

• **City sub-area**—The City owns a triangular-shaped area less than one tenth of an acre between the Power Station and Port sub-areas along 23rd Street.

The project sponsor has received letters of authorization from the City, Port, PG&E and Harrigan Weidenmuller Company to study the project on their respective properties.

**EXISTING LAND USES AND SITE HISTORY**

**Existing Site Characteristics and Adjacent Uses**

Existing structures at the project site consist primarily of vacant buildings and facilities, as shown in Figure 3. The project site currently has little vegetation other than occasional ruderal weeds and unmaintained landscaping. Current uses on the Power Station sub-area include warehouses, parking, vehicle storage, and office space. Twenty-four structures remain on the site associated with the former power plant. The most prominent structures on the project site are the Unit 3 power block (including a 120-foot tall steel frame boiler structure and 40-foot tall turbine-generator-condenser structure, see Figure 3, Building Key No. 25) and the four-story concrete control room building (Key No. 22); the adjacent 300-foot tall concrete boiler exhaust stack (the “Stack” – Key No. 23); and the Station A buildings (including the four-story unreinforced masonry turbine hall building, see Key No. 16) and adjoining concrete with brick façade switching center building (see Key No. 15).

Although shown on Figure 3, the three large fuel oil storage tanks in the Power Station sub-area (see Key No. 6) were demolished in mid-2017 and are no longer present. PG&E is currently performing remediation of contaminants at the Power Station sub-area, as discussed further below under **Summary of Site Conditions**.

The PG&E sub-area is currently used by PG&E for storage and construction staging. It also houses power transmission equipment. The sections of the Port sub-area on the east side of the project site consist primarily of vacant land with unmaintained landscaping surrounded by a fence, rip rap, and some shoreline improvements. The sections of the Port and City sub-areas in the south portion of the project site, and privately-owned Southern sub-area, are currently part of 23rd Street and are paved.

The project site is located within the Central Waterfront neighborhood.1 Adjacent land uses in the general vicinity of the project site consist primarily of industrial, warehouse, and vacant uses. Directly to the north of the project site is the 35-acre Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project, which is currently proposed for rehabilitation and redevelopment. This area consists of historic shipyard property that is now used for a variety of temporary uses, including event venues, artist studios, storage, warehouse, parking, recycling yard, and office space. The Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project has been approved for development of up to approximately 5.3 million gsf of residential, commercial, retail/arts/light-industrial, and open space uses and improvements to existing structures; construction is planned to occur over several development phases from 2018 through 2029. San Francisco Bay lies directly east of the project site, with the site located along the central waterfront between

---

1 The Central Waterfront neighborhood includes all of the Dogpatch neighborhood and the eastern portion of the Potrero Hill neighborhood.
Figure 3
Existing Structures on Project Site

SOURCE: Perkins+Will, 2017
Piers 70 and 80. To the south of the project site, across 23rd Street, are commercial warehouse uses, including DHL Express and SF Storage, and the PG&E Transbay Cable converter station. Farther to the south, and along the bay shore is Warm Water Cove Park. To the west of the project site, across Illinois Street from the PG&E sub-area, is the American Industrial Center, a large, multi-tenant light industrial building. Adjacent to the project site to the west of the Power Station sub-area is PG&E’s Potrero Substation, a functioning high-voltage transmission substation serving San Francisco. Farther west beyond the American Industrial Center are the residential areas of the Potrero Hill and Dogpatch neighborhoods. The nearest existing residential uses are located on Third Street west of the project site.

Zoning and Land Use Designations

Zoning and Height and Bulk Districts. The Power Station sub-area is zoned M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Port sub-area is zoned M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair – General) and is located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The PG&E sub-area is zoned M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and located in the 40-X and 65-X Height and Bulk Districts. Figure 4 shows the existing zoning at the project site.

General Plan Land Use Designations. The project site is located within the southeastern portion of the Central Waterfront Area Plan (shown on Figure 1), which is one of the four plan areas covered by the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan that was adopted in 2009. Goals for the Central Waterfront include: “encourage development that builds on the Central Waterfront’s established character as a mixed-use working neighborhood;” “establish a land use pattern that supports and encourages transit use, walking, and biking;” and “better integrate the Central Waterfront with the surrounding neighborhoods and improve its connections to the Port land and the water’s edge.”

Port Waterfront Land Use Plan. The waterfront parts of the Port sub-area are located within the southern waterfront portion of the Port’s Waterfront Land Use Plan, which was adopted in 1997 and is being updated. Objectives for the Port’s southern waterfront include: “enhance public access and open space.”

Summary of Site Conditions

The project site has been used for various power producing and industrial activities since the mid-1800s.2 Starting in the 1870s and continuing until the 1930s, PG&E and its predecessors used the northeastern portion of the site for manufactured gas plant operations. Around 1910, PG&E began operating a power plant on the site, which continued to be operated by NRG Potrero LLC and its predecessors after PG&E sold the site in 1999. The power plant ceased operations in 2011. Hazardous materials from these and other industrial operations have been identified in the soils and groundwater at the site. When it sold the property, PG&E retained the responsibility to characterize and remediate soil, soil gas, and groundwater, and remediation of the site is currently underway under the oversight of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (regional board), irrespective of the proposed project.
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**Figure 4**
Existing Zoning on Project Site

SOURCE: Perkins+Will, 2017
For the purposes of remediation, the project site is divided into five remediation areas, with one additional offshore remediation area for a total of six, as depicted on Figure 5. The remediation process for each of these areas includes conducting sampling; preparing a risk assessment; implementing appropriate remediation measures; preparing a risk management plan; and executing deed restrictions for current and future land owners. In general, PG&E’s remediation plans involve removal of affected soils in some areas, in-place stabilization of areas with cement mix where affected soils are deeper, and installation of a durable cover across the entire site.

Remediation is complete at two of these six areas, comprising 60 percent of the site (i.e., the Station A remediation area, and North Switchyard and General Construction Yard remediation area), the other four are currently in various stages of the remediation decision-making process, as summarized below.

- **Station A remediation area (approximately 13 acres)**—Chemicals of concern have been identified in the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in this area, and naturally-occurring asbestos is also present in the soil. In 2015, the regional board approved a risk management plan for the Station A area that includes leaving the soil and groundwater in place and installing a durable cover to prevent contact with site soils. On February 13, 2017, the regional board issued a no further action letter for the Station A area. The regional board recorded a land use covenant that restricts future uses of the Station A area to industrial and commercial uses and requires compliance with the risk management plan. Other more sensitive land uses, such as residential, parks or playgrounds, are permitted in this area if the pre-agreed procedures specified in the risk management plan are completed and the regional board provides written approval. The project sponsor plans to submit a request to the regional board for approval for residential use in the area, and anticipates approval of the request, after the regional board reviews a risk assessment and determines what, if any, additional remedial measures must be implemented to ensure site conditions are protective of future residents. In some instances, it is anticipated that the findings of the risk assessment will show that the cover remedy imposed for commercial/industrial use is also protective for residential use so no additional remedial actions would be required. In many instances, it may be necessary to install vapor barriers or vapor recovery systems in residential buildings, and it is also possible targeted removal of contaminants may be necessary to allow residential use.

- **Unit 3 remediation area (approximately 1.5 acres)**—This remediation area includes the Unit 3 power generation facility, which was shut down in 2011. Chemicals of concern have been identified in the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in this area, and naturally-occurring asbestos is also present. On September 15, 2017, the regional board approved the site investigation report and human health risk assessment for the Unit 3 area. Based on similarities between this area and the Station A area, the regional board anticipates that the appropriate remedy for this area will include installation of a durable cover as well as preparation of a risk management plan and deed restriction, and PG&E is now in the process of updating.

---


4 San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, No Further Action, Station A Area, Former Potrero Power Plant, 1201 Illinois Street, City and County of San Francisco. February 13, 2017.


Figure 5
Remediation Areas

SOURCE: Geosyntec, 2017; Google Earth, 2017
the plan for the Station A area to cover this area as well. PG&E anticipates that the final remedy could be in place by the end of 2017. It is expected that the same land use restrictions that apply to the Station A area for commercial and industrial uses will apply to the Unit 3 area, including the potential for a written variance by the regional board for a change in land use.

- **Northeast remediation area (approximately 3.5 acres)**—This area has been affected by releases from a former manufactured gas plant that was located on the Power Station sub area. Chemicals of concern have been identified in the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater in this area, and naturally-occurring asbestos is also present. The Northeast Area is covered by a durable cover consisting of building foundations, pavement, or hardscape. The human health risk assessment for this area concluded that vapor intrusion mitigation measures may be required if new structures for human occupancy are constructed. PG&E prepared a draft remedial action plan for this area in January 2016, and the regional board approved the plan in July 2016.7 Durable covers will be placed over the entire remediation area to prevent human contact with the soil, and long-term groundwater monitoring will be required. Remediation is expected to begin in 2018. As part of the final remedy, it is anticipated that land uses in this area will be restricted to industrial or commercial uses and that the regional board will require compliance with a remedial action plan similar to the one for the Station A area, described above, including the specified provisions for changing future land uses to more sensitive uses. As with Station A, the project sponsor plans to submit a request to the regional board for approval for residential use in the area, and anticipates approval of the request, after the regional board reviews a risk assessment, and determines what, if any, additional remedial measures must be implemented to ensure site conditions are protective of future residents. The same process and potential additional remedial measures described for the Station A area would apply in this area.

- **Tank Farm remediation area (approximately 4 acres)**—This area included three large above-ground fuel tanks formerly used to house fuel oil and blended mixtures of distillate fuels consisting of Jet A, kerosene, and diesel.8 The tanks were removed in the spring of 2017, and PG&E is currently developing a work plan to investigate and characterize chemicals of concern in the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater. It is anticipated that PG&E will complete investigation of the Tank Farm Area and develop a remedy consisting of a durable cover, risk management plan, and deed restriction that allows use of the property for commercial/industrial uses. PG&E projects that the remedial action plan will be completed by the end of 2019. The final remedy is expected to include a risk management plan that will likely contain procedures for seeking regional board approval for changes in land uses to more sensitive uses, similar to that described above for the Station A area. As with Station A, the project sponsor plans to submit a request to the regional board for approval for residential use in the area, and anticipates approval of the request, after the regional board reviews a risk assessment, and determines what, if any, additional remedial measures must be implemented to ensure site conditions are protective of future residents. The same process and potential additional remedial measures described for the Station A area would apply in this area.

- **North Switchyard and General Construction Yard remediation area (approximately 4.8 acres, within the PG&E sub-area)**—Chemicals of concern have been identified in the soil and groundwater in this area, and

---

naturally-occurring asbestos is also present; no information is available on chemicals in soil vapors. In 2012, the regional board issued a no further action letter for this portion of the PG&E property; at that time, the regional board observed that this area was expected to remain in operation into the foreseeable future. PG&E prepared a site management plan that specifies requirements for the protection of human health and the environment during construction or maintenance activities such as soil excavation that could penetrate the durable cover or otherwise result in exposure to the site soil. The regional board and PG&E recorded a deed restriction for the North Switchyard and General Construction Yard in January 2012. The deed restriction requires maintenance of the site cap and compliance with the site management plan. The deed restriction also limits future land uses of the site to commercial and industrial purposes and specifies notification requirements for any excavation work greater than 50 cubic yards of soil. The site management plan provides that the plan be updated if there are changes in land use, and any updates to the plan must be approved by the regional board. As with Station A, the project sponsor plans to submit a request to the regional board for approval for residential use in the area, and anticipates approval of the request, after the regional board reviews a risk assessment, and determines what, if any, additional remedial measures must be implemented to ensure site conditions are protective of future residents. The same process and potential additional remedial measures described for the Station A area would apply in this area.

- **Offshore remediation area** *(adjacent to the project site)* — PG&E prepared a remediation plan for the Offshore Sediment Area in February 2017. The planned remedial approach for the offshore sediments includes dredging up to several feet of sediment from near the bay shoreline to remove those sediments with the highest concentration of hazardous substances. An engineered erosion protection cap or revetment will be placed over the affected area. PG&E’s remedial action will also include replacement of the revetment constructed as part of an interim remedial measure in 2010, described above for the Northeast Area. Additional remediation is planned in the transition zone, 100 to 150 feet offshore. PG&E anticipates implementing the offshore sediment remediation in the spring of 2019.

**Historic Resources**

A large portion of the project site is located within the Third Street Industrial District, which is eligible as an historic district on the California Register of Historical Resources, as identified as part of the Central Waterfront Historic Resources Survey Summary Report in 2008. This district, shown on Figure 1, encompasses the highest concentration of light industrial and processing properties remaining in the Central Waterfront District. The district includes good examples of the late 19th and early 20th century American industrial design.9

The project site contains four extant properties previously determined to be contributors to the Third Street Industrial District. The Meter House (ca. 1902) and the Compressor House (ca. 1924) were determined to be individually eligible for the California Register based on their associations with the PG&E gas manufacturing facility and their significance in the history of gas manufacturing in Northern California. Station A (ca. 1901) and the Gate House (ca. 1901) were also determined to be contributors to the Third Street Industrial District,

---

but these two buildings were found not to be individual resources due to impacted integrity. These buildings were primarily constructed of brick in the American Commercial style.

No buildings on the project site are listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

**PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS AND COMPONENTS**

The Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development project would rezone and establish development controls for a multi-phased, mixed-use development at the project site. The project would include amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code, and create a new Potrero Power Station SUD. The SUD would establish land use controls for the project site and incorporate design standards and guidelines in a new Potrero Power Station Design for Development document (D for D). The Zoning Maps would be amended to show changes from the current zoning to the proposed SUD zoning. The Zoning Map amendments would also modify the existing height limits on the portions of the project site not owned by the Port. The proposed project would include market-rate and affordable residential uses, commercial mixed uses (including office and R&D/life science uses), hotel use, PDR uses, retail uses, community facilities uses and other active uses, and parking. The proposed project would also include public access areas and open space, playing fields and other active open space uses, shoreline improvements, an internal grid of public streets, shared public ways, and utilities infrastructure. Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 5.3 million gsf of development.

**Table 1** summarizes the project’s characteristics, including a description of the types and amounts of proposed land uses, details regarding proposed dwelling units, building height limits, vehicle and bicycle parking, and other descriptors. It should be noted that the proposed project incorporates a flexible land use program, in which certain blocks on the project site may be designated for either residential or commercial uses (referred to as "flex blocks"), depending on market conditions, and could affect the type and amount of land uses on those blocks. Accordingly, the proposed project could include between approximately 2.4 and 3.0 million gsf of residential uses (between about 2,400 and 3,000 dwelling units), and between approximately 1.2 and 1.9 million gsf of commercial uses. The proposed project would also include over 925,000 gsf parking, approximately 100,000 gsf of community facilities, and approximately 6.3 acres of open space.

The proposed project would demolish about 20 existing structures on the project site, including the two historic buildings in the Power Station sub-area—the Meter House and the Compressor House—which have been identified as eligible for the California Register. Two other historic properties in the Power Station sub-area—Station A and the Gate House—would also be demolished as part of the proposed project; these two properties have been identified as contributors to the historic Third Street Industrial District, but neither are considered individual resources because of their current lack of integrity. Under the proposed land use program, the project would rehabilitate Unit 3 power block, and convert the Unit 3 power block into a hotel. However, under the proposed flexible land use program, residential land use could be developed on Block 9 instead of a hotel, in which case, the Unit 3 power block would be demolished.
### Table 1

**Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Characteristic</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Site Size and Shape</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>29.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Length and Width</td>
<td>Approximately 1,650 feet by 950 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Land Use Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area (gsf)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,682,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Retail)</td>
<td>107,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Office)</td>
<td>597,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (R&amp;D/life science)</td>
<td>645,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Hotel)</td>
<td>241,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (PDR)</td>
<td>45,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>100,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>946,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Area</strong></td>
<td>5,367,860 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Dwelling Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bedroom</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Dwelling Units</strong></td>
<td>2,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Parking</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Spaces</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Class 1</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bicycle Parking</strong></td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area (gsf)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly Accessible Open Space</td>
<td>Approximately 6.3 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Open Space</td>
<td>36 square feet per unit if located on balcony, or 48 square feet per unit if commonly accessible to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Characteristics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area (gsf)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>5 to 30 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>65 to 180 feet; one building at 300 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td>All blocks would include ground floor active/retail/production space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basements</td>
<td>All development blocks would allow but not require one below-grade level of vehicle parking spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Land Use Plan

Figure 6 presents the proposed land use plan. As shown in Figure 6, Blocks Nos. 4, 12, and 14 would have a “Flex Residential or Commercial” land use designations, and Block No. 9/Unit 3 would have a “Flex Hotel or Residential” land use designation. Otherwise, blocks in the northwest and central interior portions of the project site would be designated “Residential,” and blocks along the project site’s north and south sides would be designated “Research & Development/Office.” In the central-west area of the project site, Block No. 5 would be designated “Residential and District Parking Garage.” Areas designated “Publicly Accessible Open Space” would be located along east-west and north-south axes within the interior of the project site and along the waterfront adjacent to the bay. Ground floor frontages along 23rd Street would host PDR use, and ground floors on blocks fronting the waterfront and open space areas would contain retail (e.g., outdoor cafes and dining). All other ground floors would contain active uses (e.g., neighborhood retail or residential units).

Under the proposed project, the existing Unit 3 power block is proposed to be rehabilitated and converted into a hotel, with public access at the ground floor and a rooftop bar. In addition, the 300-foot tall Stack would be seismically stabilized and preserved. A plaza in front of Unit 3 and at the base of the Stack would connect the structure to a proposed Power Station Park. However, as noted above, if residential land use is developed on Block 9 instead of a hotel, then the Unit 3 power block would be demolished.

The proposed project could include the construction of a dock to be used for fishing and to allow people to access the water from the project site. The facility would have a pile-supported fixed pier structure that extends out over and above the tidal zone. An approximately three-foot-wide, 80-foot-long gangway would extend from the fixed pier to a floating dock, which would be held in place by guide piles. The floating dock would be approximately 15 feet wide and 120 feet long, and composed of composite boxes with foam infill or reinforced concrete. The elevation of the pier structure is proposed to be slightly higher than current elevations of the shoreline to account for sea level rise in the future.
Unit 3 would be demolished if Block 9 is developed with Residential land use and not Hotel land use.

SOURCE: Perkins+Will, 2017

Figure 6
Proposed Land Use Plan
Height and Bulk

Figure 7 presents the proposed height district plan. The proposed project would include amendments to the Zoning Map on the portions of the project site not owned by the Port to modify the existing height limits of 40 and 65 feet to heights ranging from 65 up to 300 feet. As shown in Figure 7, proposed height limits would generally step up from east to west across the project site and then step down again towards Illinois Street. Block 9 and the eastern portion of Block 4 would have proposed height limits of 65 feet facing the bay. Blocks 1, 5 and 7 would contain up to 180-foot height limits, and Block 6 would have a 300-foot height limit. Several of the project site blocks (No. 1, 6, 7 and 8) would allow for podium structures with height limits (65 to 85 feet) lower than the upper level heights; and other blocks (4 and 5) would have split zoning heights.

Design for Development

The Design for Development (D for D) would be adopted as part of the proposed SUD. The D for D would articulate standards and guidelines for building design, open space character, and the public realm. Standards in the D for D would be mandatory, measurable, and quantitative design specifications. The design guidelines would be more qualitative and flexible. The proposed Planning Code amendments (included in the SUD) and the D for D would, together, guide and control all development within the SUD after project entitlements are obtained. Subsequent submittals of proposed building designs would be evaluated for consistency with both the SUD and the D for D.

The D for D would establish controls for bulk restriction, articulation and modulation, building materials and treatment, building frontage utilization, design parameters for open space, streets, and parking and loading standards.

Open Space Improvements

As shown in Figure 8, the proposed project would provide approximately 6.3 acres of publically accessible open space. These improvements are intended to complement the planned adjacent Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project waterfront improvements; extend the Blue Greenway and Bay Trail through the project site; and create an urban waterfront space, activated by the proposed uses in the buildings adjacent to the waterfront-facing open spaces. Key components of the open space program area are described below:

- **Waterfront Park and Potrero Nuevo Point Park.** This proposed approximately 2.8-acre waterfront park would extend the Blue Greenway and Bay Trail from the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project through the project site, and provide spill-out spaces for retail, quiet spaces, waterfront viewing terraces, and a waterfront playground. The adjacent proposed Potrero Point Park on the Port sub-area would contain a 1.2-acre park that would extend as a bulb-shaped area into the bay.

- **Louisiana Paseo.** This proposed 0.7-acre plaza-type open space adjacent to Blocks 6 and 10 would have spill-out space for outdoor dining, and a path to the proposed Power Station Park.

- **Power Station Park.** This proposed 1.2-acre central green space would extend east-west through the interior of the project site and connect the Louisiana Paseo to the waterfront. This park would contain
Figure 7
Proposed Height District Plan
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flexible lawn spaces suitable to accommodate two adjacent U-6 soccer fields. The portion of the proposed Power Station Park between the Louisiana Paseo and Maryland Street would be intended for community building activities such as an outdoor game room.

• **Rooftop Soccer Field.** A public open space is proposed on a portion of the roof of the parking structure on Block 5. This rooftop open space would include a 0.7-acre U-10 soccer field.

### Vehicle Parking

As shown in Table 1, the proposed project would provide between 2,622 and 2,690 vehicle off-street parking spaces, depending on the final use of each flex block. No off-street parking would be provided for proposed retail uses on the project site. The proposed centralized parking facility to be located at the intersection of Humboldt Street and Georgia Street would contain approximately 756 parking spaces. All parking would be accessory to principal uses. Approximately 35 on-street passenger loading spaces would be provided along the internal streets and approximately 34 commercial delivery spaces would be provided, either through in-building loading docks or on-street loading zones along the internal streets. Additionally, the project would be designed with about 179 on-street parking spaces.

All development blocks would allow—but not require—parking one level below-grade or parking within above-grade podium levels wrapped with active uses. The proposed project would include 50 car-share parking spaces located in a limited number of on-street parking spaces, as well as in buildings with podium/underground parking and in the proposed centralized parking facility.

### Bicycle Parking

At least 1,417 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces would be located either on the ground floor of each building or in the first sub-grade level of each building, and in all events in the locations compliant with the Planning Code. The proposed project would include 259 to 262 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, all of which would be located in the right-of-way adjacent to each building or in the publicly accessible open space.

### Transportation and Circulation Plan

**Figure 9** shows the proposed street plan. The north-south streets include Michigan, Georgia, Maryland, and Delaware Streets, which would connect the project site to 22nd Street; Georgia, Maryland, and Delaware Streets would connect to 23rd Street, although Georgia Street would be slightly offset at Humboldt Street before connecting to 23rd Street. East-west streets include Humboldt and 23rd Streets, which would connect

---

10 U-6 soccer fields refer to soccer fields for children under six years old, and generally measure approximately 20 yards in width by 30 yards in length.
11 U-10 soccer fields refer to soccer fields for children under ten years old, and generally measure approximately 40 yards in width by 60 yards in length.
12 Average number presented; the actual number of bicycle parking spaces will vary based on the selected use of each Flex Block.
13 Section 155.1(a) of the planning code defines class 1 bicycle spaces as “spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, nonresidential occupants, and employees” and defines class 2 bicycle spaces as “spaces located in a publicly-accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use.”
Figure 9
Proposed Street Type Plan

Note: Terminology is according to San Francisco Better Streets.
to Illinois Street on the west and Delaware Street on the east. The proposed interior neighborhood streets are Georgia Street, Maryland Street, and Delaware Street, each in a north-south alignment. Delaware Street, north of Humboldt Street, would become a shared public way with the street and pedestrian walking surface at the same grade as it enters the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project. A service lane would be added at the northern boundary of the project site, straddling the property line with the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project.

As shown on Figure 9, the project includes a Humboldt Street alternate condition, which applies only to the westernmost segment of Humboldt Street located on PG&E property. The proposed project would expand the width of Humboldt Street along its entire extent across the project site, but this alternate condition would occur only if PG&E does not agree to the proposed street width on its property, in which case the roadway would be narrower along this segment.

The proposed street improvements would connect to the planned development in the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project to create a continuous street network in the project vicinity, and similarly, the planned extended Blue Greenway and Bay Trail would provide pedestrian access along the waterfront between the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project and the project site. Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, and Delaware Streets would connect the project site to the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project.

The proposed project would include vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements to 23rd and Humboldt Streets to accommodate the anticipated increase in on-site activity.

The proposed new streets would provide access for emergency vehicles, on-street parking, and off-street passenger and freight loading. Humboldt, Maryland, and Delaware Streets would be designed as primary on-street loading corridors. The project site would be accessible for all modes of transportation via 23rd Street, Humboldt Street, Georgia Street, and Maryland Street, Michigan Street, Louisiana Street, and Delaware Street.

The proposed project would include the installation of traffic signals at the intersections of Illinois Street with both 23rd and Humboldt Streets.

**Transit.** A bus stop would be built on the project site to accommodate the proposed SFMTA “XX” bus route at the intersection of Maryland Street and 23rd Street. The proposed XX bus route would enter the project site on Maryland Street from the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project, and a bus layover would be located on 23rd Street between Maryland and Delaware Streets. The proposed bus layover would accommodate two, 40-foot-long buses and would provide a bathroom facility nearby for drivers.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Network.** The proposed project would include a pedestrian and bicycle network. It would allocate space for bike share dock(s) onsite and include a network of new pedestrian pathways and Class I and II bicycle facilities to contribute to the continuous Blue Greenway/Bay Trail that provides continuous waterfront access from the Embarcadero, including Crane Cove Park, Slipways Commons, and Warm Water Cove.

---

14 The connection on Delaware Street would be for pedestrians only.
Transportation Demand Management. The proposed project would include a Transportation Demand Management program (TDM). With a goal of achieving a sustainable land use development, the TDM would prioritize pedestrian and bicycle access and implement measures to encourage alternative modes of transportation. Alternative modes of transportation would be encouraged through building a dense, walkable, mixed-use, transit-oriented development, encouraging bicycling and walking and prioritizing safety, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Key strategies in the TDM would be bike sharing stations and other means to encourage bicycle use, unbundled parking, car-sharing services, and other approaches to discourage use of single-occupant private vehicles. The proposed project would implement amenities and education strategies regarding transportation choices, including real-time occupancy data for shared parking facilities and production of brochures and newsletters.

The TDM would also include a shuttle service program, anticipated to provide service at 15-minute intervals during peak times, and provide access to the BART 16th Street station and Caltrain station at Fourth and King Streets.

Infrastructure and Utilities

In addition to transportation and circulation improvements, the proposed project would develop other infrastructure and utilities systems to support the proposed uses. This would include the following:

- **Potable Water.** The project would construct potable water distribution pipelines within the planned streets that would connect to existing water lines in 23rd and Illinois Streets. To reduce potable water demand, high-efficiency fixtures and appliances would be installed in new buildings.

- **Recycled Water.** The project site is located within a designated recycled water use area, and the project would provide the piping needed to distribute recycled water when it becomes available, as required under San Francisco’s Recycled Water Use Ordinance.

- **Non-potable Water.** Similarly, the project would comply with San Francisco’s Non-potable Water Ordinance and would include the diversion and reuse of graywater and rainwater for toilet and urinal flushing and irrigation.

- **High Pressure Water.** The proposed project would include the extension of the high pressure auxiliary water supply system (AWSS) distribution line to the project site by connecting to the existing 14-inch line in Third Street at its intersection with 23rd Street. The line would be installed in 23rd Street to the intersection with Maryland Street, and then extend through the site, northerly in Maryland Street, and connect to the AWSS system proposed to be constructed under the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project.

- **Wastewater.** Wastewater from the project site is currently collected and conveyed in the existing combined sewer system within Illinois Street and treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. The project would extend wastewater collection lines throughout the project Site. The wastewater within the Power Station sub-area would be collected and conveyed to a pump station on the eastern portion of the site. From the pump station a force main would convey the wastewater to the existing combined sewer system.
• **Stormwater.** The proposed project would include a stormwater management system that would meet the City’s stormwater management ordinance. The system would be designed with low-impact design concepts and stormwater management systems, designed to retain and reuse some of the stormwater captured on site. The proposed project also may treat and discharge stormwater via outfalls to the bay, adhering to San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

• **Electricity.** The project site has electrical service from existing overhead power lines adjacent to the site. The proposed project would extend underground electrical distribution lines to serve each proposed building. Other existing electrical facilities within the site will either be maintained or relocated.

• **Natural Gas.** There is existing natural gas service to the project site in Humboldt Street. The proposed project would extend natural gas distribution lines throughout the project site, connecting to the existing facilities on Illinois Street and 23rd Street.

**Sustainability Plan**

The proposed project would establish a Sustainability Plan that outlines performance and monitoring criteria for its operation. To address the potential hazard of future sea level rise in combination with storm and high tide conditions, the proposed project would make physical improvements to the shoreline, such as berms, seawalls, or rip rap replacement. As part of the first construction phase, elevations at the shoreline would be increased by approximately 3 to 7 feet to address sea level rise risk and wave run-up, and the finished floor elevations for the ground floors of buildings on Blocks 3, 4, 8, 9, and 12 would be increased to take into account the potential 100-year flood with future sea level rise of up to 66 inches.

The proposed project would comply with the state’s Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, the San Francisco Green Building Requirements for renewable energy, and the Better Roof Requirements for Renewable Energy Standards. At least 15 percent of the roof area of residential and commercial buildings would be equipped with roof-mounted or building integrated solar photovoltaic systems and/or roof-mounted solar thermal hot water systems. Different approaches to the energy system, including a district energy system distribution loop or capturing heat from the district’s wastewater system, will be explored as part of the Sustainability Plan to be included in the proposed project.

**PROJECT CONSTRUCTION**

**Construction Schedule**

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to occur in phases over the course of 16 years, from 2020 to 2036. The initial phase of construction (Phase 0), from 2020 to approximately 2022, would include demolition, site preparation and rough grading for the entire project site, including construction of interim surface parking improvements for use by construction vehicles as well as site users prior to the construction of permanent parking facilities.

After the initial construction phase (Phase 0), there would be seven construction phases corresponding to seven areas, each consisting of two to three blocks and associated areas for streets and open spaces. Construction duration in each area would range from five to six years, with construction activities occurring
up to six days a week. Nighttime construction activity would likely occur during Phase 1, before there is residential occupancy in the project site. Throughout the project site, construction activities in each area would commence following completion of remediation activities in that area, and all construction would be conducted consistent with requirements of the applicable regional board-approved risk management plan.

Figure 10 shows the proposed seven areas for the construction phasing, and Table 2 presents the anticipated construction schedule for each phase. However, Phases 6 and 7 would be within the PG&E sub-area, and construction of these areas and the adjacent street improvements would only occur when and if PG&E authorizes construction of these phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE BY PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 0</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demolition, Soil Excavation and Grading

As noted above, the project would require demolishing about 20 structures, encompassing about 100,000 square feet.

The proposed grading plan would maintain the existing drainage patterns of the project site, with elevations sloping gently west to east toward the waterfront. The proposed elevations of the public access areas and proposed buildings along the waterfront, and as noted above, would include protection from sea level rise.

Although PG&E’s environmental remediation activities are independent of the project, the project may include excavation by the project sponsor of contaminated soil and other remedial measures to the extent the regional board requires such activities to allow residential use or to address previously unknown contaminants discovered during the course of project construction. Soil excavation would also occur during construction of the proposed project, including, for example, to allow construction of subterranean parking garages.

---

15 All dates in Table 2 are approximate estimates and could be affected by market conditions, PG&E’s remediation process, the City’s permitting process, among other factors.
Figure 10
Proposed Project Phasing Plan
Building Foundations

Construction of the proposed project would require deep foundations for moderately to heavily loaded structures built in areas outside (bayward) of the historic 1851 shoreline (shown on Figure 1), but shallow foundations made with spread footings with slab-on-grade or a structural mat foundation could be used inland of the historic 1851 shoreline. Structures in the vicinity of the historic 1851 shoreline may be founded on intermediate foundations using spread footings or a structural mat foundation, underlain by improved soil. Shallow foundations are currently anticipated for Phases 2, 4, 6, and 7. Deep foundations are anticipated during Phases 1 and 3. Phases 1, 3, and 4 may involve intermediate foundations.

Deep foundations would be comprised of steel pipe-piles driven to bedrock. Pile driving operations would likely be performed over a maximum duration of six weeks per building, with about two piles installed per hour, on average, and approximately 400 to 500 piles per structure. The maximum pile length for the project is anticipated to be 70 feet, and pile diameters are anticipated to range from 14 to 16 inches in diameter. The project would include controlled rock fragmentation on the project site as an alternative to blasting, where appropriate.

REQUIRED PROJECT APPROVALS

The proposed project is subject to review and approvals by several local, regional, state, and federal agencies. Certification of the Final EIR by the San Francisco Planning Commission, which would be appealable to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, is required before any other discretionary approval or permits would be issued for the proposed project. The proposed project may require major project approvals and/or plan amendments from the following:

Federal Agencies

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
• Possible Clean Water Act section 404/Rivers and Harbors Act section 10 Permit

U.S. Fish and Wildlife
• Approval and/or permits for potential impacts to federally listed species under the federal Endangered Species Act

National Marine Fisheries Service
• Possible Essential Fish Habitat Consultation
• Possible Federal Endangered Species Act Consultation

State and Regional Agencies

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
• Approval of permits for improvements and activities within the commission’s jurisdictions

Regional Water Quality Control Board - San Francisco Bay Region
• Approval of Section 401 water quality certification
• Approval of requests for residential or other sensitive uses in areas with a land use covenant restricting such uses without regional board approval
• Site-specific approval of soil disturbance activities under the applicable Risk Management Plan
• General Construction Stormwater Permit

Bay Area Air Quality Management District
• Approval of any necessary air quality permits (e.g., Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate) for individual air pollution sources, such as boilers and emergency diesel generators

California Public Utilities Commission
• Approval of any relocated PG&E operations, if applicable

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
• Approval and/or permits for potential impacts to state-listed and California Department of Fish and Wildlife managed species under the California Endangered Species Act.

Local Agencies
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
• Approval of general plan amendments
• Approval of planning code amendments and associated zoning map amendments
• Approval of a Development Agreement
• Approval of Final Subdivision Map
• Approval of street vacations, dedications and easements for public improvements, and acceptance (or delegation to Public Works Director to accept) of public improvements, as necessary

San Francisco Planning Commission
• Certification of the Final EIR
• Approval of Proposition M Office Allocation per Planning Code section 321, to the extent applicable
• Approval of Special Use District Design for Development
• Initiation and recommendation to board to approve amendments to the general plan
• Initiation and recommendation to the board to approve planning code amendments adopting a Special Use District and associated zoning map amendments
• Recommendation to board to approve a Development Agreement

San Francisco Port Commission
• Adoption of findings regarding Public Trust consistency, if applicable
• Consent to a Development Agreement and recommendation to the board to approve, if applicable
• Approval of project construction-related permits for property within Port jurisdiction
• Approval of Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control Permit

San Francisco Department of Building Inspection
• Issue demolition, grading, and site construction permits

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
• Consent to Development Agreement
San Francisco Department of Public Works
- Review of subdivision maps and presentation to the board for approval
- Consent to Development Agreement
- Issuance of public works street vacation order, if applicable

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Approval of transit improvements, public improvements and infrastructure, including certain roadway improvements, bicycle infrastructure and loading zones, to the extent included in the project, if any.
- Consent to Development Agreement.

San Francisco Fire Department
- Consent to Development Agreement

San Francisco Department of Public Health
- Oversee compliance with San Francisco Health Code Article 22A (Maher Ordinance)

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The San Francisco Planning Department is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed project on the environment. The EIR will be prepared in compliance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, sections 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, and will address project-specific construction and operational impacts. The EIR is an informational document for use by governmental agencies and the public to aid in the planning and decision-making process. The EIR will disclose any physical environmental effects of the project and identify possible ways of reducing or avoiding its potentially significant impacts.

The EIR will address all environmental issue topics required under CEQA. The EIR will evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project resulting from construction and operation activities, and will propose mitigation measures for impacts determined to be significant. The EIR will also identify potential cumulative impacts that consider impacts of the project in combination with impacts of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects. The EIR will address all environmental topics in the San Francisco Planning Department’s CEQA environmental checklist. Key environmental topics that will be addressed in the EIR are listed below.

- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Cultural Resources
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Wind and Shadow
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Biological Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources
- Hydrology, Water Quality, and Sea Level Rise
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral and Energy Resources
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
In addition, the EIR will include an analysis of the comparative environmental impacts of feasible alternatives to the proposed project that would reduce or avoid significant impacts of the project while still meeting most of the project objectives. Alternatives to be considered include a no project alternative, which considers reasonably foreseeable conditions at the project site if the proposed project is not implemented, as well as partial and full historic preservation alternatives, which consider alternative project scenarios that would partially and/or fully preserve the historic resources that would be demolished under the proposed project. Other alternatives will be evaluated as necessary, depending on the results of the impact analyses of the various environmental topics listed above.

FINDING

This project may have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report is required. This determination is based upon the criteria of the state CEQA Guidelines, sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effects) and 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and upon the magnitude and nature of proposed project construction and operations as described in the above project description.

PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code section 21083.9 and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines section 15206, a public scoping meeting will be held to receive oral comments concerning the scope of the EIR. The meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 15, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. at the project site located at 420 23rd Street, San Francisco, California. To request a language interpreter or to accommodate persons with disabilities at the scoping meeting, please contact the staff contact listed above at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Written comments will also be accepted at this meeting and until 5:00 p.m. on December 1, 2017. Written comments should be sent to Melinda Hue, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103; by fax to 415-558-6409 (Attn: Melinda Hue); or by email to melinda.hue@sfgov.org.

If you work for a responsible state agency, we need to know the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering a permit or other approval for this project. Please include the name of a contact person in your agency.

Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Planning Commission or the Planning Department. All written or oral communications, including submitted personal contact information, may be made available to the public for inspection and copying upon request and may appear on the department’s website or in other public documents.

Date Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer