

SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
HDMT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT CHECKLIST

Background

In March of 2007, the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFPDH) released the Healthy Development Measurement Tool--an evidence-based metric to evaluate public health objectives in land use planning. SFPDH staff have subsequently applied the HDMT to a number of projects. Recognizing that a significant amount of resources can be required to apply the HDMT in a comprehensive and in depth manner, SFPDH has created a "checklist" format of the HDMT that can be more routinely and easily applied to development projects by community organizations, developers and other stakeholders.

The "HDMT Development Checklist" is a voluntary stand-alone assessment tool that helps evaluate specific attributes of development projects. Importantly, responses to checklist items should be considered in light of specific neighborhood needs and conditions. Although not included in this checklist, the HDMT provides extensive indicator data to help understand the baseline neighborhood conditions where a specific development project is taking place. Similar to the HDMT organization of development targets, this project checklist is organized by Element, Community Health Objective, and Community Health Indicator. *Benchmark development targets* represent actions that if taken, would correspond to achievement or improvement of the community health objective and indicator. In many cases, *minimum development targets* are included to reflect minimum actions that are feasible and achievable for development.

Similar to the rest of the HDMT, the HDMT Development Checklist is undergoing frequent revision. A draft version was launched in September 2007 and the first version (HDMT Version 1.01) was launched in November 2007. Subsequent edits of the HDMT Development Checklist will be noted in the Version numbers. Specifically, minor revisions to the development checklist will be noted as Version 1.02, 1.03, etc. Major revisions will be noted as Version 2.01. Please see the bottom left corner of this document to see the current version number. If regularly using the HDMT or the HDMT Checklist, please make sure to check the "News Archives" and "Corrections" sections of the HDMT website for any updates about revised data, indicators, development targets, or other parts of the HDMT website.

Using the Checklist

To use the checklist, review each development target and check the appropriate box to indicate whether the development project meets the target. Categories of response include:

- § **Yes, benchmark or minimum development target met** - this is checked when a project clearly meets an HDMT development target.
- § **No, benchmark or minimum development target not met** - this is checked when a project does not meet a development target, either by not discussing the development target issue or because the project's specifications clearly do not meet the development target.
- § **Insufficient information to evaluate the project** - this is checked when the project does not provide sufficient information to evaluate the development target. Generally, this column is checked if a project mentions an issue, but does not provide specific details regarding implementation. If a project does not discuss an issue at all, this would not be the correct column to check.
- § **Not applicable to the project ("N/A")** - this is checked when a development target is not applicable or not relevant to the specific project being evaluated. For example, the development target focuses on green businesses, but the project under evaluation is residential only, with no commercial development being included.

Caveats

Please note that several development targets have not been finalized and are under revision. Users of the HDMT Development Checklist should also be aware of several limitations and caveats:

- The checklist is primarily geared towards assessing large-scale residential development projects. Development targets that are applicable to other kinds of projects (i.e., commercial, institutional) are so noted by an asterisk.
- While the HDMT may be applied to development at all scales, not all criteria may be applicable to a specific project. For example, some targets are applicable to a limited class of projects (e.g., schools, health facilities, active farm land).
- Available information on a project may not permit specific evaluation of the target, particularly where the target is a specific numerical goal.
- The checklist does not include development criteria for all indicators in the HDMT. In instances where indicators cannot be improved upon by clear and direct development actions, we have not included development targets.
- This checklist is not a new form of environmental regulation or a set of enforceable standards. Similar to LEED, the checklist encourages voluntary efforts to improve development.

For more information on the Healthy Development Measurement Tool, please visit www.TheHDMT.org.

Or contact Lili Farhang at 415.252.3988 or lili.farhang@sfdph.org.

Environmental Stewardship		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective ES.1 Decrease consumption of energy and natural resources							
ES.1.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project Green Point Rated ¹ at 35% above California Energy Commission Title 24 ² energy efficiency standards? <i>Minimum:</i> Is the project Green Point Rated ¹ at 15% above California Energy Commission Title 24 ² energy efficiency standards?						
ES.1.b							
ES.1.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project use available water conserving techniques (including native plant selection, irrigation efficiency, water-efficient plumbing fixtures, rainwater harvesting and/or greywater systems) in all significant water uses?						
ES.1.d	<i>Benchmark #1:</i> Does the project divert all non-hazardous construction and demolition debris for recycling and/or salvage? AND						
	<i>Benchmark #2:</i> Does the project use salvaged, refurbished or reused materials and fixtures such that the sum of these constitutes at least 10% of the total value of materials for the project based on cost? <i>Minimum #2:</i> Does the project use salvaged, refurbished or reused materials and fixtures such that the sum of these constitutes at least 5% of the total value of materials for the project based on cost?						
ES.1.e	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide facilities and services for users to recycle and compost waste?						
ES.1.f	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project contribute 25% of project energy demand via onsite renewable generation? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project contribute 10% of project energy demand via onsite renewable generation?						
Objective ES.2 Restore, preserve and protect healthy natural habitats							
ES.2.a	<i>Benchmark #1:</i> Is the project located at a distance greater than 100 feet from existing shorelines of water bodies--seas, lakes, rivers, streams and tributaries--and wetlands?						
	<i>Benchmark #2:</i> If adjacent to shoreline or shoreline open space, is the project sited to protect maximum feasible public views and public access to the shoreline?						
ES.2.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> In addition to the minimum, does the project preserve or restore 20% of the development parcel area to a natural condition with regard to flora?						

Environmental Stewardship		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
	<i>Minimum:</i> Does the project protect and restore natural native habitats / natural resource areas by not developing or altering land deemed to be significant natural resource areas?						
ES.2.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project meet or achieve a standard of 10 acres of open space per 1,000 population in the planning area? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project replace existing open space used in the course of development at a 1:1 replacement ratio?						
ES.2.d	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide a continuous row of appropriately spaced trees at all streets adjacent to the project?						
ES.2.e	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project use porous pavement materials on drives, sidewalks, parking lots and plazas?						
ES.2.f	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project establish and maintain rooftop gardens on at least 25% of usable roof space? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project contribute to the promotion of green roofing by designing and building roof structures for rooftop gardens?						
Objective ES.3 Promote food access and sustainable urban and rural agriculture							
ES.3.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> If the project is built on a parcel with active farming land, does the project maintain or preserve land for active farming?						
ES.3.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project within one mile of a regular farmer's market?						
ES.3.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide a community supported agriculture drop-off site?						
ES.3.d	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project create and maintain a community garden on-site or provide safe access to off-site community garden resources within ¼ mile?						
Objective ES.4 Promote productive reuse of previously contaminated sites							
ES.4.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> If built on brownfield contaminated land, is project site contamination mitigated to residential reuse standards? <i>Minimum:</i> If built on brownfield contaminated land, is the project site contamination mitigated to standards appropriate for the intended use?						
Objective ES.5 Preserve clean air quality							

Environmental Stewardship		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
ES.5.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project avoid locating sensitive uses ³ where greater than 100,000 vehicles per day are within 500 feet of use or, if the project is sited in a location where greater than 100,000 vehicles per day are within 500 feet of a sensitive use, does the project provide an HVAC system with filtration to reduce/mitigate infiltration of vehicle emissions?						
ES.5.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project avoid locating sensitive uses ³ in close proximity to stationary sources of air pollution? (Note: the 2005 CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook provides guidance for buffers for selected stationary sources)						
ES.5.c	<i>Benchmark #1:</i> If within 500 feet of a truck route, does the project avoid placing sensitive uses ³ adjacent to a truck route, or, if the project is sited in a location where a designated truck route is within 500 feet of a sensitive use, does the project provide an HVAC system with filtration to reduce/mitigate infiltration of vehicle emissions? AND						
	<i>Benchmark #2:</i> Does commercial development greater than 50,000 sq. feet provide adequate on site truck parking?						
Objective ES.6 Maintain safe levels of community noise							
ES.6.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project consistent with the General Plan's noise-land use compatibility guidance ⁴ OR does the project mitigate the effects of ambient noise in interior and exterior spaces?						
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHECKS IN EACH COLUMN							N/A

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective ST.1 Decrease private motor vehicles trips and miles traveled							
ST.1.a	Does the project incorporate strategies that would significantly reduce its contribution to new regional vehicle miles traveled by:						
ST.1.b	1) Density, residential:						
ST.1.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project designed with a residential density at or above 25 dwelling units per net residential acre (or at or above 40 dwelling units per net residential acre for projects $\leq 1/2$ mile from regional mass transit stops including rail, ferry, or bus service)?						
	2) Parking, residential zoning:						
	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide structured parking at a ratio less than or equal to one space for every two households? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project provide structured parking at a ratio less than or equal to three spaces for every four households?						
	3) Parking, pricing:						
	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project address parking through at least 4 of the following pricing strategies? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project address parking through at least 2 of the following pricing strategies?						
	§ On-street parking priced for a target utilization rate of 85%						
	§ Variable rate parking pricing (e.g. it costs more per hour the longer you park)						
	§ Coordinated off-street and on-street parking pricing (to increase utilization of off-street parking)						
	§ Unbundled parking (charging for parking costs separate from residential/commercial property/rental costs, making parking costs transparent and optional instead of a hidden cost)						
	§ Parking cash-out policies (allowing employees to choose between receiving subsidized parking or the equivalent amount of money that would be used for the parking space)						

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
	<p>4) Transportation demand management policies and programs: <i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide at least 5 of the following transportation demand management strategies? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project provide at least 2 of the following transportation demand management strategies?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Carpool matching programs § Car-Sharing services § Dedicated employee or resident transportation coordinator § Financial incentives for walkers and bicyclists § Free transit passes § Guaranteed ride home § Preferential carpool/vanpool parking § Provision of bus schedules, bike maps, other transportation alternatives § Secure bike parking § Showers/changing facilities for employees § Telecommuting 						
ST.1.d	<p>Does the project incorporate strategies that would significantly reduce motor vehicle collisions in the area by:</p> <p>1) Traffic calming: <i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project include at least 4 of the following traffic calming interventions to slow traffic speeds? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project include at least 2 of the following traffic calming interventions to slow traffic speeds?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Bollards (short vertical posts) § Channelization islands (raised island that forces traffic in a particular direction, such as right-turn-only) § Chicanes (curb bulges or planters on alternating sides, forcing motorists to slow down) § Curb extensions, planters, or centerline traffic islands that narrow traffic lanes § Horizontal shifts (a lane centerline that curves or shifts) § Median islands (raised island in the road center) 						

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Mini-circles (small traffic circles at intersections) § Pavement treatments (special pavement textures (e.g. bricks) and markings to designate special areas) § Perceptual design features (e.g. patterns painted into road surfaces that encourage drivers to reduce their speeds) § Reductions in the number and width of traffic lanes (particularly on arterials) § Roundabouts (medium to large circles at intersections) § Rumble or warning strips § Semi-diverters, partial closures (restricts entry/exit to/from neighborhood and limits traffic flow at intersections) § Speed humps § Speed tables, raised crosswalks § Street closures (closing off streets to through vehicle traffic at intersections or midblock) § Street Trees (create a sense of enclosure and improve the pedestrian environment) § Tighter corner radii (a tighter radius forces drivers to reduce speed) § Woonerfs (streets with mixed vehicle and pedestrian traffic, where motorists are required to drive at very low speeds) 						
Objective ST.2 Provide affordable and accessible transportation options							
ST.2.a	Does the project incorporate strategies that would result in a significant increase in trips made by public transportation by:						
ST.2.b	1) Transit:						
ST.2.c	<i>Benchmark #1:</i> Is the project within ½ mile of regional transit (e.g., BART, Cal Train) OR does the project include dedicated shuttle trips to regional transit, with timing and frequency based on estimates of area demand?						
ST.2.d	<i>Benchmark #2:</i> Is the project within 1/4 mile of local transit?						
	2) Density:						
	<i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project designed with a residential density at or above 25 dwelling units per net residential acre (or at or above 40 dwelling units per net residential acre for projects ≤1/2 mile from regional mass transit stops including rail, ferry, or bus service)?						

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
3) Parking, residential zoning: <i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide structured parking at a ratio less than or equal to one space for every two households? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project provide structured parking at a ratio less than or equal to three spaces for every four households?							
4) Parking, pricing: <i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project address parking through at least 4 of the following pricing strategies? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project address parking through at least 2 of the following pricing strategies? § On-street parking priced for a target utilization rate of 85% § Variable rate parking pricing (e.g. it costs more per hour the longer you park) § Coordinated off-street and on-street parking pricing (to increase utilization of off-street parking) § Unbundled parking (charging for parking costs separate from residential/commercial property/rental costs, making parking costs transparent and optional instead of a hidden cost) § Parking cash-out policies (allowing employees to choose between receiving subsidized parking or the equivalent amount of money that would be used for the parking space)							
5) Transportation demand management policies and programs: <i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide at least 5 of the following transportation demand management strategies? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project provide at least 2 of the following transportation demand management strategies? § Carpool matching programs § Car-Sharing services § Dedicated employee or resident transportation coordinator § Financial incentives for walkers and bicyclists § Free transit passes							

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
	§ Guaranteed ride home § Preferential carpool/vanpool parking § Provision of bus schedules, bike maps, other transportation alternatives § Secure bike parking § Showers/changing facilities for employees § Telecommuting						
ST.2.e	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project subsidize public transit passes for households earning <200% of the poverty line?						
Objective ST.3 Create safe, quality environments for walking and biking							
ST.3.a	Does the project incorporate strategies that would significantly reduce bicycle collisions in the area by:						
ST.3.d	1) Bicycle environment: <i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project include bicycle lanes and/or paths linked to the city's existing bicycle network?						
	2) Traffic calming: <i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project include at least 4 of the following traffic calming interventions to slow traffic speeds? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project include at least 2 of the following traffic calming interventions to slow traffic speeds? § Bollards (short vertical posts) § Channelization islands (raised island that forces traffic in a particular direction, such as right-turn-only) § Chicanes (curb bulges or planters on alternating sides, forcing motorists to slow down) § Curb extensions, planters, or centerline traffic islands that narrow traffic lanes § Horizontal shifts (a lane centerline that curves or shifts) § Median islands (raised island in the road center)						

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Mini-circles (small traffic circles at intersections) § Pavement treatments (special pavement textures (e.g. bricks) and markings to designate special areas) § Perceptual design features (e.g. patterns painted into road surfaces that encourage drivers to reduce their speeds) § Reductions in the number and width of traffic lanes (particularly on arterials) § Roundabouts (medium to large circles at intersections) § Rumble or warning strips § Semi-diverters, partial closures (restricts entry/exit to/from neighborhood and limits traffic flow at intersections) § Speed humps § Speed tables, raised crosswalks § Street closures (closing off streets to through vehicle traffic at intersections or midblock) § Street Trees (create a sense of enclosure and improve the pedestrian environment) § Tighter corner radii (a tighter radius forces drivers to reduce speed) § Woonerfs (streets with mixed vehicle and pedestrian traffic, where motorists are required to drive at very low speeds) 						
ST.3.b ST.3.c ST.3.e	<p>Does the project incorporate strategies that would result in a significant increase in trips made by walking <i>and</i> reduce or prevent pedestrian injury collisions in the area by:</p> <p>1) Pedestrian environment:</p> <p><i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project incorporate at least 8 interventions from the following list? OR Does the project achieve a one grade level improvement in the Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index⁵ score (in the acceptable range)? (<i>see ST.3.e., below</i>)</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Does the project incorporate at least 4 interventions from the following list? OR Does the project maintain or ensure the Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index⁵ score (in the acceptable range)?</p>						

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
§ Corner bulb-outs § Median refuge islands § Pedestrian scale design on building frontages § Pedestrian scale lighting § Pedestrian specific building entrances § Public art in streetscape § Public seating in streetscape § Restaurants and retail - at least one per block § Safe routes to schools or other key pedestrian destinations, including senior facilities, health care, grocery stores, and public transit stops/stations § Sidewalks free of impediments (so that people may walk safely) § Sidewalks that are at least 5 feet wide and at least 8 feet wide when there is not a sidewalk buffer along arterial streets § Sidewalks with a continuous curb with appropriately placed curb cuts for people with disabilities (an exception being pedestrian-oriented, Woonerf streets) § Signalized crosswalks (preferably with a countdown signal - especially when more than 2 lanes of traffic) § Street segments with 4 or fewer driveway cuts § Street trees							
2) Pedestrian safety analysis: <i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project: a) identify areas (intersections, streets, small areas) where pedestrian injury collisions have occurred in or near the project area OR b) identify where potential future conflicts exist in or near the project area (e.g., when new residents or employees are being introduced to an area with a previously low population and/or high traffic volumes on streets) AND target pedestrian environment improvements to those areas?							

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
<p>3) Traffic calming:</p> <p><i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project include at least 4 of the following traffic calming interventions to slow traffic speeds?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Does the project include at least 2 of the following traffic calming interventions to slow traffic speeds?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Bollards (short vertical posts) § Channelization islands (raised island that forces traffic in a particular direction, such as right-turn-only) § Chicanes (curb bulges or planters on alternating sides, forcing motorists to slow down) § Curb extensions, planters, or centerline traffic islands that narrow traffic lanes § Horizontal shifts (a lane centerline that curves or shifts) § Median islands (raised island in the road center) § Mini-circles (small traffic circles at intersections) § Pavement treatments (special pavement textures (e.g. bricks) and markings to designate special areas) § Perceptual design features (e.g. patterns painted into road surfaces that encourage drivers to reduce their speeds) § Reductions in the number and width of traffic lanes (particularly on arterials) § Roundabouts (medium to large circles at intersections) § Rumble or warning strips § Semi-diverters, partial closures (restricts entry/exit to/from neighborhood and limits traffic flow at intersections) § Speed humps § Speed tables, raised crosswalks § Street closures (closing off streets to through vehicle traffic at intersections or midblock) § Street Trees (create a sense of enclosure and improve the pedestrian environment) § Tighter corner radii (a tighter radius forces drivers to reduce speed) § Woonerfs (streets with mixed vehicle and pedestrian traffic, where motorists are required to drive at very low speeds) 							

Sustainable Transportation		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
ST.3.f	Benchmark: Does the project use traffic calming devices to reduce speed to less than 20 mph on interior streets?						
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHECKS IN EACH COLUMN							N/A

Public Infrastructure		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective PI.1 Assure affordable and high quality childcare for all neighborhoods							
PI.1.a*	<i>Benchmark:</i> If the project is over 10,000 square feet, does it: § build a childcare facility on-site OR § establish a relationship with a non-profit to provide a childcare facility in San Francisco OR § pay \$1 per square foot of commercial or residential space developed into the Child Care Capital Fund ⁶ (managed by DCYF)?						
PI.1.b*	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide reduced rent for licensed childcare providers' childcare home or center facility?						
PI.1.c	No identified development target.						
PI.1.d*	<i>Benchmark:</i> If a new or planned child care facility, is it designed to rate a 5 or above on the FPG Child Development Institute's Child Care Environment Rating Scale (ECERS, ITERS, FFCERS, or SACERS) ⁷ ?						
Objective PI.2 Assure accessible and high quality educational facilities							
PI.2.a	<i>Benchmark #1:</i> For residential uses, is the project within 1/2 mile of a public elementary school with adequate capacity or does the project allocate a site appropriate for adequate neighborhood school facilities based on expected future population? AND <i>Benchmark #2:</i> Does land use siting ensure public school students' public transit commute is less than 30 minutes?						
PI.2.d							
PI.2.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> If the project is a new, remodeled or expanded school facility, is it planned as a multi-use facility involving a collaborative of organizations? <i>Minimum:</i> If the project is a new, remodeled or expanded school facility, does the school integrate community services and uses and incorporate additional community serving uses (i.e., pre-school, after-schools, community recreational facility, neighborhood park, community serving non-profit)?						
PI.2.c							
PI.2.f							
PI.2.e	No identified development target.						
PI.2.g	<i>Benchmark:</i> If the project is a new, remodeled or expanded school facility, does the school include the provision of fully functioning kitchens so that school meals are served on site?						

Public Infrastructure		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
PI.2.h	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> If the project is a new, remodeled, or expanded school facility, does the school provide green space equal to 40% of the project's site area for a school garden?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> If the project is a new, remodeled, or expanded school facility, does the school provide green space equal to 20% of the project's site area for a school garden?</p>						
Objective PI.3 Increase park, open space and recreation facilities							
PI.3.a	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> In addition to the minimum, does the project contribute funding (via impact fee or community benefits agreement) towards existing open space or to the construction of new open space or parks facilities?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Is the project within ¼ mile access of a neighborhood or regional park (a park larger than 1/2 acre)?</p>						
PI.3.b	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> In addition to the minimum, does the project contribute funding (via impact fee or community benefits agreement) towards construction of a new recreation facility and/or programming for new/existing recreation facility?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Is the project within ¼ mile of a recreational facility?</p>						
PI.3.c PI.3.d	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project contribute funding (via impact fee or community benefits agreement) towards parks maintenance and/or programming to improve park accessibility and quality?</p>						

Public Infrastructure		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective PI.4 Assure spaces for libraries, performing arts, theatre, museums, concerts, and festivals for personal and educational fulfillment							
PI.4.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> In addition to the minimum, does the project involve local artists, artisans, craftspeople and others in the design of open space, signage, street furniture or public facilities, fund public art, or include space for art and cultural activities within the development? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project protect and maintain existing art work on site in accordance with applicable state and federal laws AND/OR create space for murals, public art, or public performances?						
PI.4.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project contribute 1% of total construction costs to the creation of public art or public performance on-site OR into a public fund for arts purposes? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project contribute .5% of total construction costs to the creation of public art or public performance on-site OR into a public fund for arts purposes?						
PI.4.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> In addition to the minimum, does the project include and fund implementation or expansion plans for adequate public library facilities based on expected future population? <i>Minimum:</i> Is the project located within 1/2 mile of a public library?						
PI.4.d	No identified development target.						
PI.4.e	<i>Benchmark:</i> If project is a new art/cultural facility, is it sited within ½ mile of existing or proposed regional transit stop?						
PI.4.f	<i>Benchmark #1:</i> If the project is new commercial use larger than 50,000 sq feet or new residential larger than 50 units, were local artists/artisans or neighborhood cultural councils consulted about how the pedestrian-level design of the building could promote/reinforce the neighborhood's cultural vitality and identity? AND						

Public Infrastructure		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
	<p><i>Benchmark #2:</i> Were local artists, artisans, or fabricators hired to create at least four of the following to incorporate culturally appropriate, functional art and/or architectural opportunities for the display of artwork:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊗ artistically designed, energy efficient, pedestrian-scale lighting ⊗ kiosk or community bulletin board to publicize arts/community events ⊗ artistically designed parks and playgrounds ⊗ mini public spaces or niches for art displays or performances ⊗ stairs ⊗ benches ⊗ bike racks ⊗ designated graffiti walls ⊗ tree grates/guards ⊗ grills on windows, garage, and/or front door ⊗ sculptured sidewalks or sidewalk tiles (with removable, slip resistant squares that are decorated with patterns/tiles but can be moved and replaced when PUC needs underground access) <p><i>Minimum #2:</i> Were local artists, artisans, or fabricators hired to create at least two of the above to incorporate culturally appropriate, functional art and/or architectural opportunities for the display of artwork?</p>						
Objective PI.5 Assure affordable and high quality public health facilities							
PI.5.a	No identified development target.						
PI.5.b	No identified development target.						
PI.5.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> If a new hospital or major clinical care facility, is it located within ½ mile of a regional transit stop or does it provide free public shuttle service from regional transit services such as BART?						

Public Infrastructure		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective PI.6 Assure access to daily goods and service needs, including financial services and healthy foods							
PI.6.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> For residential uses, is the project within ½ mile of a full-service grocery store/supermarket?						
PI.6.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> For residential uses, is the project within ½ mile of a produce market or small food market?						
PI.6.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project within ½ mile of an area that has 6 out of 10 common public services that contribute to neighborhood completeness?						
	<i>Minimum:</i> Is the project within ½ mile of an area that has 4 out of 10 common public services that contribute to neighborhood completeness? Neighborhood public services includes: School, parks/playground/plaza, post office, library, places of worship, public hospital or clinic, recreation center, community garden, public art, community center with youth and/or senior programming.						
PI.6.d	<i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project within ½ mile of an area that has 9 out of 15 common retail services that contribute to neighborhood completeness?						
	<i>Minimum:</i> Is the project within ½ mile of an area that has 6 out of 15 common retail services that contribute to neighborhood completeness? Neighborhood serving retail includes: Restaurant, coffee shop/cafe, gym/fitness center, drug store/pharmacy, hardware store, bank or credit union, laundromat/dry cleaner, hair salon/barber, auto repair/gas station, bike shop/repair, grocery store/supermarket, fruit/produce store, childcare, entertainment (i.e. video store, movie theater, performance theater, music venue), nursing home.						
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHECKS IN EACH COLUMN							N/A

Adequate and Healthy Housing		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective HH.1 Preserve and construct housing in proportion to demand with regards to size, affordability, and tenure							
HH.1.a	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project contribute to local unmet affordable housing need according to the Regional Housing Needs Determination, in addition to legal requirements under inclusionary or redevelopment law⁸?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Does the project meet the local inclusionary zoning and redevelopment law requirements⁸ without public subsidy?</p>						
HH.1.b							
HH.1.c							
HH.1.f							
HH.1.g							
HH.1.i							
HH.1.d	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project match the number of bedrooms in each unit replaced or renovated and meet the unit size and bedroom needs of current local residents?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Does the project match the number of bedrooms in each unit replaced or renovated?</p>						
HH.1.e	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project contribute to a mix of tenure options?						
HH.1.h	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project designed with a residential density at or above 25 dwelling units per net residential acre (or at or above 40 dwelling units per net residential acre for projects <1/2 mile from regional mass transit stops including rail, ferry, or bus service)?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Does the project maintain the current level of residential density in the planning area?</p>						
Objective HH.2 Protect residents from involuntary displacement							
HH.2.a	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project contribute to local unmet affordable housing need according to the Regional Housing Needs Determination⁸, in addition to legal requirements under inclusionary or redevelopment law?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> If the project results in the demolition or loss of deed restricted, public, inclusionary, or rent-controlled housing, does the project replace the demolished/lost housing stock at a 1:1 ratio?</p>						
HH.2.b							
HH.2.c							

Adequate and Healthy Housing		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective HH.3 Increase spatial integration by ethnicity and economic class							
HH.3.a HH.3.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project contribute to local unmet affordable housing need according to the Regional Housing Needs Determination, in addition to legal requirements under inclusionary or redevelopment law ⁸ ?						
	<i>Minimum:</i> Does the project meet the local inclusionary zoning ⁸ and minimum unit size distribution requirements without public subsidy?						
Objective HH.4 Healthy quality housing							
HH.4.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project design include effective health-oriented building design measures to prevent illness and injuries, for example, to improve indoor air quality and reduce moisture?						
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHECKS IN EACH COLUMN							N/A

Healthy Economy		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective HE.1 Increase high-quality employment opportunities for local residents							
HE.1.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> Do 75% of new jobs created by the project pay entry level wages greater than or equal to the self-sufficiency standard ⁹ ?						
HE.1.b	<i>Minimum:</i> Do 60% of new jobs created by the project pay entry level wages greater than or equal to the self-sufficiency standard ⁹ ?						
HE.1.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> If covered by jobs-housing linkage fee requirement (Planning Code Sec. 313), does the project support local housing for its employees by paying 125% of the jobs-housing linkage fee required by City ordinance ⁹ ?						
HE.1.d	<i>Minimum:</i> Does the project support local housing for its employees by paying a jobs-housing linkage fee (Planning Code Section 313) required by City ordinance ⁹ ?						
HE.1.e	<i>Benchmark:</i> If the project demolishes or redevelops commercial space available for PDR uses, does it replace that space at a 1:1 ratio? <i>Minimum:</i> If the project demolishes or redevelops commercial space available for PDR uses, does it replace that space at a level that meets zoning requirements?						
HE.1.f	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide work opportunities to individuals with a GED/high school diploma?						
Objective HE.2 Increase jobs that provide healthy, safe and meaningful work							
HE.2.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> Do 100 % of the short and long term jobs provided by the project provide health insurance?						
HE.2.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Do 100% of the jobs provided by the project provide sick day benefits?						
HE.2.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> If the project anticipates commercial tenants in industries with above average occupational injury rates, does the project include design features to help mitigate injuries and facilitate tenant's injury and illness prevention plans?						
HE.2.d	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project support the retention of jobs in local industries?						
HE.2.e	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide opportunities for job training programs either directly, or through a community benefits agreement?						

Healthy Economy		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
HE.2.f	<i>Benchmark:</i> Do 80% of the jobs provided by the project provide retirement benefits?						
Objective HE.3 Increase equality in income and wealth							
HE.3.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project have the likelihood of decreasing income inequality?						
HE.3.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide long-term employment opportunities?						
Objective HE.4 Benefits and protects natural resources and the environment							
HE.4.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project include support for or prioritize businesses with green business practices?						
HE.4.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project support the retention and development of locally owned businesses by providing favorable rent or lease terms to locally-owned businesses as a community benefit? <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project support the retention and development of locally owned businesses by giving first priority to locally owned businesses or by creating permanent lease terms favorable to locally-owned businesses?						
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHECKS IN EACH COLUMN							N/A

Social Cohesion		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
Objective SC.1 Promote safe neighborhoods free of crime and violence							
SC.1.a	<i>Benchmark:</i> If the project is in an area where alcohol outlet density is greater than 2 times the citywide density (greater than or equal to 36 outlets per square mile), does the project disallow new retail alcohol sales?						
SC.1.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Is the project within a 5 minute response time by a nearby fire station?						
SC.1.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project address at least two benchmarks/minimums in each of the four violence prevention related categories below: <i>Minimum:</i> Does the project address at least one benchmark/minimums in each of the four violence prevention related categories below:						
	1) Healthy Infrastructure and Environmental Design Related: § Improves Pedestrian Environmental Quality (ST.3.e) § Subsidize public transit passes for households earning <200% of the poverty line (ST.2.e) § Increase the number of trips made by walking or biking (ST.2.b) § Reduce the number of pedestrian injuries and/or bicycle collisions (ST.2.c and ST.2.d) § Use traffic calming devices to reduce speeds on interior streets to less than 20 MPH (ST.2.f) § Contributes a minimum of one street tree per housing unit (SC.4.a) § Meets city standards for adequacy of sidewalk and street lighting (SC.4.b) § Ensure access to neighborhood or regional parks (PI.3.a) § Ensure access to recreational facilities (PI.3.b) § Fund park maintenance and programming (PI.3.c and PI.3.d) § Zones to limit number of alcohol, tobacco and firearm outlets (SC.1.a) § Zones to promote beneficial services and institutions, like grocery stores, stores selling recreational and art supplies, medical clinics, community centers, etc. (PI.6)						

Social Cohesion		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
	<p>2) Education/Youth Opportunity Related</p> <p>§ Promote schools as multi-use community centers and facilities by funding school infrastructure development explicitly for use as multi-use facilities (PI.2..b, PI.2.c, PI.2..d)</p> <p>§ Support arts and other activities in recreation centers, parks, schools, etc. (PI.4.a)</p> <p>§ Fund cultural events using local parks, recreation and open spaces (PI.4.b)</p>						
	<p>3) Anti-Segregation/Social Cohesion Related</p> <p>§ Create a community/recreation center that can be used for support groups, community policing station, job skills development, tutoring/mentoring, and/or afterschool programming (PI.3.b)</p> <p>§ Promote community engagement throughout planning process (SC.3)</p> <p>§ Organize periodic town hall meetings between police, elected officials, and current residents to discuss the impact of new development and ways to improve neighborhood safety (SC.2)</p> <p>§ Construct environments (e.g., public plazas and pocket parks) that facilitate social interactions (HH.3)</p>						
	<p>4) Economic Opportunity Related</p> <p>§ Promote reliable and affordable transportation to jobs (ST.2)</p> <p>§ Hire locally for construction, retail, maintenance, landscaping, etc. (HE.4.b)</p> <p>§ Provide self-sufficiency wage and benefits (HE.2)</p> <p>§ Preserve PDR jobs (HE.1.d)</p>						
Objective SC.2 Increase participation in social decision-making process							
SC.2.a	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project create a meeting room or other sheltered public space with the appropriate lavatory and other facilities that could be used as an election voting station, community meetings, afterschool programming, tutoring/mentoring, senior center or other social program?</p>						

Social Cohesion		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
SC.2.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide funding or physical space for the creation and/or continued programming of a neighborhood clean-up committee, a neighborhood crime prevention committee, or other neighborhood-oriented committee that seeks to promote social engagement and healthy communities?						
Objective SC.3 Assure equitable and democratic participation throughout the planning process							
<p><i>Note: Unlike other sections of the Development Checklist that can be evaluated using the project plan and HDMT data, evaluation of community participation in the planning process must be completed through interviews with project developers, planners, and community members to determine achievement of development targets. The following questions should be asked of multiple stakeholders to assess achievement.</i></p>							
SC.3.a	<i>Benchmark #1:</i> Did the planning process ensure adequate opportunities for the community to comment on development plans through a number of meetings that: 1) were open to the public, 2) had time specifically allocated for public dialogue related to the project, and 3) were fair and transparent in the amount of time each constituent was allowed to speak? AND						
	<i>Benchmark #2:</i> If the project triggered an EIR process, were 4 or more of the following outreach activities conducted to engage the public? e.g., town hall meeting, charette, promotion of social citizenship, consensus conference, mailings to affected communities, community surveys, development of community advisory board and/or citizen planning committee, planning workshops, focus groups, public hearings, open houses, panel discussions, neighborhood meetings, small in-home meetings, planning fairs, referendum						
SC.3.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Was there appropriate language AND cultural translation services available for the demographics of the affected community? e.g., translated for youth, low literacy or non-English populations.						
SC.3.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> Were efforts made to ensure that expert content (i.e. technical language and terms) is made accessible to lay audiences?						

Social Cohesion		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
	<i>Minimum:</i> Was information about the proposed project, policy, or plan (including proposed timeline, request for qualifications or request for proposals, existing general or specific plans, environmental impact reports, transcripts of meetings and hearings, letters documenting financial and other transactions related to property and documentation of publicity) made publicly available in an easily located and navigable website, AND in hard copy at the city planning office, local library, and other public locations?						
SC.3.d	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Were the communities potentially affected (geographically, economically, politically or culturally) by the proposed project targeted for outreach (if needed in the appropriate language) in at least 5 of the following 8 locations? Local newspapers, local public library and City Hall, local radio stations, community television public announcements, local churches, local community or recreational facilities, local schools, local clinics</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Were the communities potentially affected (geographically, economically, politically or culturally) by the proposed project targeted for outreach (if needed in the appropriate language) in at least 3 of the 8 locations listed above?</p>						
SC.3.e	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Did the planning process incorporate at least 5 of the following 9 methods to promote community participation in meetings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § vary meeting time and location § provide childcare § provide food § provide transportation to/from the meeting for low income families, seniors and persons with disabilities § provide simultaneous language translation § conduct educational outreach to encourage public participation § hire local community liaisons to help outreach to community § be fair and transparent about who gets to speak and for how long § publicly recognize each comment made by community members <p><i>Minimum:</i> Did the planning process incorporate at least 3 of the 9 methods above to promote community participation in meetings?</p>						

Social Cohesion		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
SC.3.f	<p><i>Benchmark #1:</i> Did decision-makers provide written explanation of why or why not each public comment was included or not included in the final policy, project or plan?</p> <p><i>Minimum #1:</i> Did decision-makers provide written explanation of why specific public concerns frequently raised in the planning process were not included in the final policy, project or plan?</p>						
	<p>AND</p> <p><i>Benchmark #2:</i> If the project is commercial greater than 50,000 square feet or residential greater than 50 units, were representatives of six or more city agencies (such as departments of parks and recreation, transportation, schools, public health, public works, mayor's office, housing, etc) present at community meetings to hear community concerns voiced in the planning process?</p> <p><i>Minimum #2:</i> If the project is commercial greater than 50,000 square feet or residential greater than 50 units, were representatives of four or more city agencies present at community meetings to hear community concerns voiced in the planning process?</p>						
SC.3.g	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Was the community benefits agreement, impact fee or other legally binding financial contribution created in a way that (1) involved community members in the determination of how funds should be allocated, (2) provided appropriate language translation, (3) comprehensively considered the needs and potential impacts on the existing community, and (4) created at least 3 opportunities for community input?</p> <p><i>Minimum:</i> Was there a community benefits agreement, impact fee or other legally binding financial contribution created by which the existing community will receive financial or infrastructure benefits from new development as compensation for increased demand for services/on infrastructure?</p>						
Objective SC.4 Improve accessibility, beauty and cleanliness of public spaces							
SC.4.a	<p><i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide a continuous row of appropriately spaced trees at all streets adjacent to the project?</p>						

Social Cohesion		Yes		No	Insufficient Info to Evaluate	N/A to Project	Relevant Information
		Bench- mark	Mini- mum				
SC.4.b	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does the project provide lighting fixtures on streetscapes within or adjacent to the project at current city standards for adequacy of sidewalk and street lighting?						
SC.4.c	<i>Benchmark:</i> If a commercial project over 25,000 sq ft in a commercial business district, does the project provide public toilets?						
SC.4.d	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does building design for the project include all feasible measures to prevent or minimize wind downdrafts and other adverse wind affects on sidewalks and plazas?						
SC.4.e	<i>Benchmark:</i> Does building design for the project include all feasible measures to maximize sunshine on sidewalks and plazas?						
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHECKS IN EACH COLUMN							N/A

ENDNOTES for HDMT Development Checklist

Objective & Indicator	Endnote Number	Explanation
ES.1.a ES.1.b	1	For definition of Green Point Rated, see: http://www.thehdm.org/objective.php?element_id=1&objective_id=1
ES.1.a ES.1.b	2	For definition of CA Energy Commission's Title 24 Energy Standards, see: http://www.thehdm.org/objective.php?element_id=1&objective_id=1
ES.5.abc	3	According to the CA Air Resources Board Guidelines, sensitive uses include schools, park and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential communities. For more information, see: http://www.thehdm.org/objective.php?objective_id=55
ES.6.a	4	The noise-land use compatibility guidance is in the Environmental Protection Section of the General Plan: http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning_index.asp?id=41423 .
ST.3.e	5	For definition of Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index, see: http://www.thehdm.org/objective.php?element_id=2&objective_id=8
PI.1.a	6	For definition of Child Care Capital Fund, see: http://dcyf.org/Content.aspx?id=1444
PI.1.d	7	For definition of childcare environmental quality scale, see: http://www.thehdm.org/objective.php?element_id=4&objective_id=12
HH.1.abcfgl; HH.2.abc; HH.3.ab	8	For definition of Regional Housing Needs Determination, inclusionary zoning, and redevelopment law, see: http://www.thehdm.org/objective.php?element_id=5&objective_id=18
HE.1.a.b HE.1.c.d	9	For definition of CA self-sufficiency standard and jobs-housing linkage fee, see: http://www.thehdm.org/objective.php?element_id=6&objective_id=22