File No. 110785 Committee Item No. 3
Board Item No. 3

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Economic Development **Date** September 12, 2011

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** 9/27/11

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	**Motion**
☐	☐	**Resolution**
☒	☒	**Ordinance**
☒	☒	**Legislative Digest**
☐	☐	**Budget Analyst Report**
☐	☐	**Legislative Analyst Report**
☐	☐	**Youth Commission Report**
☐	☐	**Introduction Form (for hearings)**
☒	☒	**Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report**
☐	☐	**MOU**
☐	☐	**Grant Information Form**
☐	☐	**Grant Budget**
☐	☐	**Subcontract Budget**
☐	☐	**Contract/Agreement**
☐	☐	**Form 126 – Ethics Commission**
☐	☐	**Award Letter**
☐	☐	**Application**
☒	☐	**Public Correspondence**

OTHER **(Use back side if additional space is needed)**

☒	☒	Planning Commission Resolution No. 18406
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Alisa Miller **Date** September 9, 2011
Completed by: Alisa Miller **Date** September 15, 2011

An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 25 pages.
The complete document can be found in the file.

[Planning Code - Zoning - Establishing Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings]

Ordinance amending the San Francisco Planning Code by: 1) adding Section 139 to establish standards for bird-safe buildings to help reduce injury and mortality in birds caused by certain types of new construction, replacement facades, and building features; 2) amending Section 145.1 to allow for exceptions to transparency and fenestration requirements to meet Standards for bird-safe buildings; and 3) adopting findings, including environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1.

NOTE: Additions are *single-underline italics Times New Roman*; deletions are ~~*strike-through italics Times New Roman*~~. Board amendment additions are double-underlined; Board amendment deletions are ~~strikethrough normal~~.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco (hereinafter "Board") hereby finds and determines that:

(a) General Findings.

(1) Over thirty years of research has proven certain building features, such as location near open space, reflective/transparent glass, lighting, and other design elements, to be biologically significant in causing death or injury to birds. Studies have determined that annual bird fatalities in North America from window collisions may be as high as 1 billion birds per year and that building collisions are a threat of significant magnitude to affect the viability of bird populations, leading to local, regional, and national declines.

(2) The majority of these deaths are foreseeable and avoidable through a variety of different building design modifications including, but not limited to, the use of fritting, frosting, screens, architectural features (overhangs, louvers, awnings), ultra-violet glass, angling and

film and art treatment of glass, and lighting modifications. It is anticipated that more options will continue to be developed through new research and creative design.

(3) San Francisco has almost 400 different bird species, located along the Pacific Flyway, and has numerous open spaces. Bird groups, local animal control agencies, and building owners have noted bird strikes at San Francisco buildings.

(4) On October 8, 2009, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") requested that the Department present information on Bird-Friendly Building Standards as developed by cities within North America and in other countries. Information was provided at this hearing by the Department and the American Bird Conservancy.

(5) On February 5, 2009, the Commission received information from the Department on San Francisco's "Lights Out for Birds" program in response to a Commissioner's request.

(4) In October 2010, the Department released a draft document entitled "Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings" that summarizes major research, presents design recommendations, and proposes a three-tiered approach to the problem that includes: 1) establishment of building requirements for the most hazardous conditions; 2) use of an educational checklist to educate project sponsors and their future tenants on potential hazards; and 3) creation and expansion of voluntary programs to encourage more bird-safe practices, including acknowledging those who pursue certification through a new program for "bird-safe building" recognition.

(5) On October 14, 2010, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the draft document titled "Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings." The Commission heard and considered testimony presented to it at the public hearing and further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, the Department, and other interested parties.

(6) At the October 14, 2010 hearing, the Commission directed the Department to collect public comment through the end of 2010, consider revisions to the document based on the comments received, and return in 2011 with a draft Ordinance for the Commission's consideration that would implement proposed controls and adopt a final "Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings" document.

(b) General Plan, Planning Code and Environmental Findings.

(1) At a duly noticed public hearing on July 14, 2011, in Resolution No. 18406, the Commission adopted the policy document titled "Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings Spring 2011" and recommended approval of the draft Ordinance that would amend the Planning Code to implement this Commission policy. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 110785 and is incorporated herein by reference.

(2) The Planning Commission in Resolution No. 18406 found that the proposed Planning Code amendments contained in this Ordinance were, on balance, consistent with the City's General Plan and with Planning Code Section 101.1(b). In addition, the Commission recommended that the Board adopt the proposed Planning Code amendments. The Board finds that the proposed Planning Code amendments contained in this Ordinance are consistent with the City's General Plan and with Planning Code Section 101.1(b) for the reasons set forth in said Resolution.

(3) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board finds that the proposed Ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience and welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 18406, which reasons are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

(4) Environmental Findings. The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is

on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 110785 and is incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. The San Francisco Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section 139, to read as follows:

*SEC. 139. **STANDARDS FOR BIRD-SAFE BUILDINGS.***

*(a) **Purpose.** The purpose of this Section is to establish Bird-Safe Standards for new building construction and replacement facades to reduce bird mortality from circumstances that are known to pose a high risk to birds and are considered to be "bird hazards". The two circumstances regulated by this Section are 1) location-related hazards, where the siting of a structure creates increased risk to birds and 2) feature-related hazards, which may create increased risk to birds regardless of where the structure is located. Location-related hazards are created by structures that are near or adjacent to large open spaces and/or water. When structures are located in such an area, the portion of the structure most likely to sustain bird-strikes requires façade treatments. Even if a structure is not located near a locational hazard, particular building features also may create a hazard for birds. Structures that create such a feature-related hazard are required to treat all of the feature-related hazard. While these controls do not apply retroactively, the purpose of these controls is to ensure that new construction that is bird-safe and to decrease existing bird-hazards over time.*

*(b) **Definitions.***

*(1) **Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment.** Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment may include fritting, netting, permanent stencils, frosted glass, exterior screens, physical grids placed on the exterior of glazing or UV patterns visible to birds. To qualify as Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment vertical elements of window patterns should be at least 1/4 inch wide at a minimum spacing of 4 inches or horizontal elements at least 1/8 inch wide at a maximum spacing of 2 inches.*

*(2) **Bird Hazard**. Specific circumstances that create a hazard for birds due to either the location of the building or due to specific building features that increase the risk of bird-building collisions as described under (c) below.*

*(c) **Controls**. The following Bird-Safe Standards shall apply to: 1) new construction, 2) building additions that create a Bird Hazard, or 3) the replacement of 50% or more of the glazing on an existing Bird Hazard. Additions to existing buildings subject to this subsection are required only to treat the new building addition. Bird Hazards consist of: 1) location-related hazards and 2) feature-related hazards and the standards specified below shall apply to structures that present these hazards.* These controls shall apply to all structures subject to this Section regardless of whether the ownership or use is public or private.

*(1) **Location-Related Standards**. These standards apply to buildings located inside of open spaces two acres and larger dominated by vegetation, including vegetated landscaping, forest, meadows, grassland, or wetlands, or open water (hereinafter an Urban Bird Refuge). These standards also shall apply to buildings less than 300 feet from an Urban Bird Refuge if such buildings are in an unobstructed line to the refuge. The standards are as follows:*

*(A) **Facade Requirement**. Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment is required such that the Bird Collision Zone, as defined below, facing the Urban Bird Refuge consists of no more than 10% untreated glazing. Building owners are encouraged to concentrate permitted transparent glazing on the ground floor and lobby entrances to enhance visual interest for pedestrians. The Bird Collision Zone shall mean the portion of buildings most likely to sustain bird-strikes from local and migrant birds in search of food and shelter and includes:*

(i) The building façade beginning at grade and extending upwards for 60 feet, or

(ii) Glass facades directly adjacent to landscaped roofs 2 acres or larger and extending upwards 60 feet from the level of the subject roof.

(B) **Lighting**. Minimal lighting shall be used. Lighting shall be shielded. No uplighting shall be used. Event searchlights are be prohibited on property subject to these controls.

(C) **Wind Generation**. Wind generators in this area shall ~~be vertical access generators that present a solid blade appearance~~ comply with the Planning Department's permitting requirements, including any monitoring of wildlife impacts that the Department may require.

(2) **Feature-Related Standards**. Feature-related hazards include free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet and larger in size. Feature-related hazards can occur throughout the City. Any structure that contains these elements shall treat 100% of the glazing on Feature-Specific hazards.

(3) **Exceptions**. Certain exceptions apply to this Section as set forth below.

(A) **Certain Exceptions for Location-Related Standards to be Applied to Residential Buildings within R-Districts.**

(i) **Limited Glass Façade**. Residential buildings within R-Districts that are less than 45 feet in height and have an exposed façade comprised of less than 50% glass are exempt from new or replacement façade glazing requirements included in Section 139(c)(1) Location-Related Standards.

(ii) **Substantial Glass Façade**. Residential buildings that are less than 45 feet in height but have a façade with surface area composed of more than 50% glass, shall provide glazing treatments as described in Section 139(c)(1)(A) for 95% of all large, unbroken glazed segments that are 24 square feet and larger.

(B) **General Exceptions for Historic Buildings**. Treatment of replacement glass facades for structures designated as City landmarks or within landmark districts pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code, or any building Category I-IV or Category V within a Conservation District pursuant to Article 11 of the Planning Code, shall conform to Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties. Reversible treatment methods such as netting, glass films, grates,

and screens are recommended. Netting or any other method demonstrated to protect historic buildings from pest species that meets the Specifications for Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment stated above also may be used to fulfill the requirement.

*(C) **General Waivers and Modifications.** The Zoning Administrator may either waive the requirements contained within Section 139(c)(1) and Section 139(c)(2) or modify such requirements to allow equivalent Bird-Safe Glazing Treatments upon the recommendation of a qualified biologist.*

Section 3. The San Francisco Planning Code is hereby amended by amending Section 145.1, to read as follows:

SEC. 145.1. **STREET FRONTAGES, NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL, RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND MIXED USE DISTRICTS.**

(a) **Purpose.** The purpose of this Section is to preserve, enhance and promote attractive, clearly defined street frontages that are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and which are appropriate and compatible with the buildings and uses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts, Commercial Districts, Residential-Commercial Districts, Mixed Use Districts.

(b) **Definitions.**

(1) **Development lot.** A "development lot" shall mean:

(A) Any lot containing a proposal for new construction, or

(B) Building alterations which would increase the gross square footage of a structure by 20 percent or more, or

(C) In a building containing parking, a change of more than 50 percent of the building's gross floor area to or from residential uses, excluding residential accessory off-street parking.

(2) **Active use.** An "active use", shall mean any principal, conditional, or accessory use which by its nature does not require non-transparent walls facing a public street or involves the storage of goods or vehicles.

(A) Residential uses are considered active uses above the ground floor; on the ground floor, residential uses are considered active uses only if more than 50 percent of the linear residential street frontage at the ground level features walk-up dwelling units which provide direct, individual pedestrian access to a public sidewalk, and are consistent with the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines, as adopted and periodically amended by the Planning Commission.

(B) Spaces accessory to residential uses, such as fitness or community rooms, are considered active uses only if they meet the intent of this section and have access directly to the public sidewalk or street.

(C) Building lobbies are considered active uses, so long as they do not exceed 40 feet or 25% of building frontage, whichever is larger.

(D) Public Uses described in 790.80 and 890.80 are considered active uses except utility installations.

(c) **Controls.** The following requirements shall generally apply, except for those controls listed in subsections (1) Above Grade Parking Setback and (4) Ground Floor Ceiling Height, which only apply to a "development lot" as defined above.

In NC-S Districts, the applicable frontage shall be the primary facade(s) which contain customer entrances to commercial spaces.

(1) **Above-Grade Parking Setback.** Off-street parking at street grade on a development lot must be set back at least 25 feet on the ground floor and at least 15 feet on floors above, from any facade facing a street at least 30 feet in width. Parking above the ground level shall be entirely screened from all public rights-of-way in a manner that

accentuates ground floor uses, minimizes mechanical features and is in keeping with the overall massing and architectural vocabulary of the building. In C-3 Districts, parking above the ground level, where permitted, shall also be designed to facilitate conversion to other uses by maintaining level floors and a clear ceiling height of nine feet or equal to that of the adjacent street-fronting active uses, whichever is greater. Removable parking ramps are excluded from this requirement.

The following shall apply to projects subject to this section:

(A) when only one parking space is permitted, if a space is proposed it must be within the first 25 feet of the building;

(B) when two or more parking spaces are proposed, one space may be within the first 25 feet of the building;

(C) when three or more parking spaces are proposed, all parking spaces must be set back at least 25 feet from the front of the development.

(2) **Parking and Loading Entrances**. No more than one-third of the width or 20 feet, whichever is less, of any given street frontage of a new or altered structure parallel to and facing a street shall be devoted to parking and loading ingress or egress. In NC-S Districts, no more than one-third or 50 feet, whichever is less, of each lot frontage shall be devoted to ingress/egress of parking. Street-facing garage structures and garage doors may not extend closer to the street than a primary building facade unless the garage structure and garage door are consistent with the features listed in Section 136 of this Code. The total street frontage dedicated to parking and loading access should be minimized, and combining entrances for off-street parking with those for off-street loading is encouraged. The placement of parking and loading entrances should minimize interference with street-fronting active uses and with the movement of pedestrians, cyclists, public transit, and autos. Entrances to off-street parking shall be located at least six feet from a lot corner located at the intersection of

two public rights-of-way. Off-street parking and loading entrances should minimize the loss of on-street parking and loading spaces. Off-street parking and loading are also subject to the provisions of Section 155 of this Code. In C-3 Districts, so as not to preclude the conversion of parking space to other uses in the future, parking at the ground-level shall not be sloped, and the floor shall be aligned as closely as possible to sidewalk level along the principal pedestrian frontage and/or to those of the street-fronting commercial spaces and shall have a minimum clear ceiling height of 14 feet or equal to that of street-fronting commercial spaces, whichever is greater. Removable parking ramps are excluded from this requirement.

(3) **Active Uses Required.** With the exception of space allowed for parking and loading access, building egress, and access to mechanical systems, space for active uses as defined in Subsection (b)(2) and permitted by the specific district in which it is located shall be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and 15 feet on floors above from any facade facing a street at least 30 feet in width. Building systems including mechanical, electrical, and plumbing features may be exempted from this requirement by the Zoning Administrator only in instances where those features are provided in such a fashion as to not negatively impact the quality of the ground floor space.

(4) **Ground Floor Ceiling Height.** Unless otherwise established elsewhere in this Code:

(A) Ground floor non-residential uses in UMU Districts shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 17 feet, as measured from grade.

(B) Ground floor non-residential uses in all C-3, C-M, NCT, DTR, Chinatown Mixed Use, RSD, SLR, SLI, SSO, MUG, MUR, and MUO Districts shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet, as measured from grade.

(C) Ground floor non-residential uses in all RC districts, C-2 districts, RED districts, and NC districts other than NCT, shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14

feet, as measured from grade except in 40-foot and 50-foot height districts, where buildings shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 10 feet.

(5) **Street-Facing Ground-Level Spaces**. The floors of street-fronting interior spaces housing non-residential active uses and lobbies shall be as close as possible to the level of the adjacent sidewalk at the principal entrance to these spaces. Street-facing ground-level spaces housing non-residential active uses in hotels, office buildings, shopping centers, and other large buildings shall open directly onto the street, rather than solely into lobbies and interior spaces of the buildings. Such required street-facing entrances shall remain open to the public during business hours.

(6) **Transparency and Fenestration**. Frontages with active uses that are not residential or PDR must be fenestrated with transparent windows and doorways for no less than 60 percent of the street frontage at the ground level and allow visibility to the inside of the building. The use of dark or mirrored glass shall not count towards the required transparent area. *Buildings located inside of, or within an unobstructed line of less than 300 feet of an Urban Bird Refuge, as defined in Section 139(c)(1), shall follow glazing requirements within Section 139(c) of this Code.*

(7) **Gates, Railings, and Grillwork**. Any decorative railings or grillwork, other than wire mesh, which is placed in front of or behind ground floor windows, shall be at least 75 percent open to perpendicular view. Rolling or sliding security gates shall consist of open grillwork rather than solid material, so as to provide visual interest to pedestrians when the gates are closed, and to permit light to pass through mostly unobstructed. Gates, when both open and folded or rolled as well as the gate mechanism, shall be recessed within, or laid flush with, the building facade.

(d) **Exceptions for Historic Buildings**. Specific street frontage requirements in this Section may be modified or waived by the Planning Commission for structures designated as

landmarks, significant or contributory buildings within a historic district, or buildings of merit when the Historic Preservation Commission advises that complying with specific street frontage requirements would adversely affect the landmark, significant, contributory, or meritorious character of the structure, or that modification or waiver would enhance the economic feasibility of preservation of the landmark or structure.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: _____
John D. Malamut
Deputy City Attorney

FILE NO. 110785

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Planning Code - Zoning - Establishing Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings]

Ordinance amending the San Francisco Planning Code by adding Section 139 to establish Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings to help reduce injury and mortality in birds caused by certain types of new construction, replacement facades, and building features; amending Section 145.1 to allow for exceptions to transparency and fenestration requirements to meet Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings; and adopting findings, including environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1.

Existing Law

The San Francisco Planning Code regulates various aspects of building design, including facades and fenestration, within the City and County of San Francisco.

Amendments to Current Law

This legislation would create Planning Code Section 139 to establish standards for bird-safe building design in order to reduce injury and mortality in birds. The design controls would apply to certain types of new construction, replacement facades, and some building features. The Ordinance also would amend Section 145.1 to allow for exceptions to the transparency and fenestration requirements consistent with the standards for bird-safe buildings. This Ordinance also would adopt environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1.

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

July 21, 2011

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2010.0182TU: Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings**

BOS File No: 110705 **(pending)**
Planning Commission Recommendation: ***Approval***

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On July 14, 2011 the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance.

The proposed Ordinance initiated by the Commission would create or amend the following Sections within the Planning Code (hereinafter "Code") to: a) reduce building-related hazards for San Francisco's resident and migrant bird species; b) establish consistent building standards for creating bird-safe buildings; and c) provide certain exemptions from these requirements.

- **Create Section 139 Standards for Bird Safe Buildings** to:
  a. Identify geographical areas in San Francisco that due to the location may present increased hazards for birds. Certain treatments would be required in the vicinity of these areas.
  b. Identify certain building features, which in and of themselves create special hazards for birds.
- **Amend Section 145.1 - Street Frontages, Neighborhood Commercial, Residential-Commercial, Commercial, And Mixed Use Districts** to:
  a. Provide for exceptions to the existing transparency and fenestration requirements for buildings near sensitive habitat.

The proposed changes have been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Sections 15307 and 15308.

At the July 14th, hearing, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed Ordinance. Please find attached documents relating to the Commission's action. If you have any questions or require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

AnMarie Rodgers
Manager of Legislative Affairs

cc:
Mayor's Office, Jason Elliot
Land Use Chair, Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Cohen
Supervisor Wiener

Attachments (one copy of the following):
Planning Commission Resolution No. 18406
Planning Commission Executive Summary for Case No. 2010.0182TU
Draft Ordinance (original)

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Planning Commission Resolution No. 18406

Proposed Commission Policy and Planning Code Amendment

HEARING DATE: JULY 14, 2011

Project Name:	**Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings**
Case Number:	2010.0182TU
Staff Contact:	Erika Lovejoy, Senior Planner erika.lovejoy@sfgov.org, 415-575-9026
Reviewed by:	AnMarie Rodgers, Manager Legislative Affairs anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org, 415-558-6395

Recommendation: **Approval with Modifications**

ADOPTING A PLANNING COMMISSION POLICY DOCUMENT TITLED, "JULY 2011 STANDARDS FOR BIRD-SAFE BUILDINGS". THIS POLICY DOCUMENT WILL GUIDE THE COMMISSION AND DEPARTMENT IN REVIEW OF BUILDINGS WITH THE GOAL OF REDUCING BUILDING-RELATED HAZARDS FOR BIRDS IN SAN FRANCISCO.

RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND PLANNING CODE TO ACHIEVE THE FOLLOWING: A) REDUCE BUILDING-RELATED HAZARDS FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S RESIDENT AND MIGRANT BIRD SPECIES; B) ESTABLISH CONSISTENT BUILDING STANDARDS FOR CREATING BIRD-SAFE BUILDINGS; AND C) PROVIDE CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS FROM THESE REQUIREMENTS. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CREATING SECTION 139; AMENDING SECTION 145.1; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE SECTION 302 FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on February 5, 2009, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") received information from Planning Department staff (hereinafter "staff") on San Francisco's "Lights Out for Birds Program" in response to a Commissioner request; and

WHEREAS, on October 8, 2009, the Commission requested that staff present information on Bird-Friendly Building Standards Informational Presentation by Christine Sheppard, PhD, Bird Collisions Campaign Manager of the American Bird Conservancy, Washington, DC; and

WHEREAS, on October 14, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider a draft document titled "Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings"; and

WHEREAS, at the October 14, 2010 hearing, the Commission requested the following:

1. Collect public comment on the draft "Standards For Bird-Safe Buildings" document through the end of 2010;
2. Consider revisions to the document based upon comments received;
3. Prepare a draft ordinance for the Commission's consideration in early 2011 that would implement proposed controls; and
4. Prepare a final "Standards For Bird-Safe Buildings" policy for the Commission's consideration;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider initiation of the proposed Ordinance on June 23, 2011; and

WHEREAS, at that hearing the Commission adopted Resolution Number 18383 to Initiate said amendments to the Planning Code and to announce their intent to consider adoption of the both the draft Ordinance and the draft Policy document on or after July 14, 2011;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.3, the Planning Department has provided appropriate notice for a potential public hearing to consider adoption on or after July 14, 2011;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that vast evidence has demonstrated that bird collisions with buildings are a real threat that can be significantly reduced through design. The issue of bird-safe design is increasingly of interest to the people of San Francisco and across the country. Bird-safe design has been raised as an issue during recent entitlement hearings and CEQA review. By defining the most hazardous conditions and codifying effective and appropriate controls, the Commission seeks to decrease bird causalities and to increase certainty in the development process.

WHEREAS, The Commission finds that there are two circumstances that warrant regulation: 1) location-related hazards where the siting of a structure creates increased risk to birds, and 2) feature-related hazards which may create increased risk to birds regardless of where the structure is located.

WHEREAS, Location-related hazards are created by structures that are near or adjacent to large open spaces and/or water.

WHEREAS, Even if a structure is not located near a locational hazard, particular building features also may create a hazard for birds.

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under Sections 15307 and 15308 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

WHEREAS, the proposed legislation and policy document are intended to resolve the aforementioned issues; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance and policy document; and

MOVED, that the Commission hereby ***adopts*** this Resolution to:

1) recommend approval of the draft Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors with the following modification: The requirements for bird-safe glazing as defined in §139(b)(1) should be revised to read "Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment may include fritting, netting, permanent stencils, frosted glass, exterior screens, physical grids placed on the exterior of glazing or UV patterns visible to birds. To qualify as Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment, vertical elements of ~~the~~ window patterns ~~shall~~ should be at least 1/4 inch wide at a minimum spacing of 4 inches, ~~and~~ or horizontal elements at least 1/8 inch wide at a maximum spacing of 2 inches. ~~No qualified glazing shall have a visible light reflectance exceeding 10%.~~"; and

2) adopt as Commission Policy the document titled, "July 2011 Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings".

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. **Issues related to Bird-Safe Buildings.** The Commission finds that:
   - Vast evidence has demonstrated that bird collisions with buildings are a real threat that can be significantly reduced through design. The issue of bird-safe design is increasingly of interest to the people of San Francisco and across the country. Bird-safe design has been raised as an issue during recent entitlement hearings and CEQA review. By defining the most hazardous conditions and codifying effective and appropriate controls, the Commission seeks to decrease bird causalities and to increase certainty in the development process.
   - There are two circumstances that warrant regulation: 1) location-related hazards where the siting of a structure creates increased risk to birds and 2) feature-related hazards which may create increased risk to birds regardless of where the structure is located.

- Location-related hazards are created by structures that are near or adjacent to large open spaces and/or water.
- Even if a structure is not located near a locational hazard, particular building features may also create a hazard for birds.
- The proposed legislation and policy document are intended to resolve the aforementioned issues; and

2. **General Plan Compliance.** This Resolution is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

I. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1
ACHIEVE A PROPER BALANCE AMONG THE CONSERVATION, UTILIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NATURAL RESOURCES.
POLICY 1.1 Conserve and protect the natural resources of San Francisco.
POLICY 1.2 Improve the quality of natural resources.
POLICY 1.3 Restore and replenish the supply of natural resources.
POLICY 1.4 Assure that all new development meets strict environmental quality standards and recognizes human needs.

OBJECTIVE 3
MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF THE BAY, OCEAN, AND SHORELINE AREAS.
POLICY 3.2 Promote the use and development of shoreline areas consistent with the General Plan and the best interest of San Francisco.

OBJECTIVE 8
ENSURE THE PROTECTION OF PLANT AND ANIMAL LIFE IN THE CITY.
POLICY 8.2 Protect the habitats of known plant and animal species that require a relatively natural environment.
POLICY 8.3 Protect rare and endangered species.

OBJECTIVE 12
ESTABLISH THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AS A MODEL FOR ENERGY MANAGEMENT.
POLICY 12.1 Incorporate energy management practices into building, facility, and fleet maintenance and operations.

Discussion: The Introduction to the Environmental Protection Element parallels the issues at play in developing controls to ensure San Francisco's buildings are bird-safe. As stated in the Introduction, "The Environmental Protection Element addresses the impact of urbanization ... on the natural environment. In highly urban San Francisco environmental protection is not primarily a process of shielding untouched areas from the initial encroachment of a man-made environment. The scales already are and will continue to be balanced toward the side of development. The challenge in San Francisco is to achieve a more sensitive

balance, repairing damage already done, restoring some natural amenity to the city, and bringing about productive harmony between people and their environment. An important purpose, therefore, of an environmental protection element is to give natural environment amenities and values appropriate consideration in urban development along with economic and social considerations."

II. URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT
OBJECTIVE 2
CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

POLICY 2: Limit improvements in other open spaces having an established sense of nature to those that are necessary, and unlikely to detract from the primary values of open space.

Discussion: Part of the value of our open space is the opportunity to feel connection with nature. To ensure that San Francisco's open spaces with bird habitat that provide the opportunity for birdwatching, the City should ensure that nearby buildings compliment this activity.

III. RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

POLICY 2.13 Preserve and protect significant natural resource areas.

Discussion: The health of birds often reflects the health and trends of the land, air, and water upon which we humans also depend. People rely on birds for such services as pest control and keeping natural systems in balance. By eating insects, weed seeds, and nuisance rodents, birds provide us with free ecological services. The City can help ensure that we continue to reap these benefits by taking efforts to protect the migratory birds that visit and those that live here year round.

II. COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT
OBJECTIVE 1
MANAGE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CHANGE TO ENSURE ENHANCEMENT OF THE TOTAL CITY LIVING AND WORKING ENVIRONMENT.

Discussion: According to "Birding in the United States: A Demographic and Economic Analysis by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, "...birdwatchers generated $85 billion in overall economic output, including $13 billion in federal and state income taxes, and supported more than 863,000 jobs."

3. **Planning Code Section 101 Findings.** The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance will not disrupt existing neighborhood-serving retail. Future opportunities for employment in such buildings will not be affected by the proposal.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed amendments will not have an impact on housing in Neighborhood Commercial Districts. Controls are in place in section 317 of the Planning Code that severely restricts the conversion of housing units to commercial units. New retail that is established in areas where these controls would apply would still be able to provide transparency on the ground floor where it is most important.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed amendments will have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The proposed amendments will not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

The proposed amendments would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

Preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake is unaffected by the proposed amendments. Any new construction or alteration associated with a use would be executed in compliance with all applicable construction and safety measures.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

Landmarks and historic buildings would be unaffected by the proposed amendments. Should a landmark or historic building trigger the requirements of the proposed Ordinance, the controls have been written to preserve the historic character and be compliant with City controls and guidelines for historic buildings as well as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas would be unaffected by the

proposed amendments. If anything, the proposal would require new development to be more compatible with our parks and open space.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Resolution on July 14, 2011.

Linda Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Miguel, Moore, Olague, Sugaya

NAYS: Antonini

ABSENT: Borden

ADOPTED: July 14, 2011

File 110785: Support: Establishing Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings

Board of Supervisors to: Carmen Chu, David Campos, David Chiu, Eric L Mar, John Avalos, Ross Mirkarimi, Sean Elsbernd, Malia Cohen, 09/12/2011 01:49 PM

From: Ruth_Ostroff@fws.gov
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: Erika.Lovejoy@sfgov.org, Marie_Strassburger@fws.gov, Sheila.Nickolopoulos@sfgov.org, nweeden@goldengateaudubon.org
Date: 09/09/2011 04:11 PM
Subject: Support: Establishing Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings

September 9, 2011

To:
Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689
Via E-mail: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org:

Regarding:
Board of Supervisor's meeting September 12, 2011: Land Use Committee agenda item #3. 110785 [Planning Code - Zoning - Establishing Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings] - **Support**

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On behalf of the US Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Southwest Region's Migratory Birds Program, I am writing to express our appreciation for what the City has done and continues to do for migratory birds in the region. As you may know, San Francisco was selected this spring as one of the ten new cities throughout the United States to receive funding as part of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Urban Conservation Treaty for Migratory Birds (Urban Bird Treaty) grant program. The Bird-Safe Buildings project will support a public education effort that will pro-actively increase awareness of the issues of bird safety and buildings for homeowners and businesses alike.

The Urban Bird Treaty program was created in 1999 to help municipal governments conserve birds that reside, nest in or overwinter or migrate through their cities. The treaties are a partnership agreement between a U.S. city and the Fish and Wildlife Service to conserve migratory birds through education, habitat improvement, and bird conservation actions. This project, in collaboration with Golden Gate Audubon, will help to implement the City of San Francisco's "Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings" policy, which we support. Few American cities have taken active measures to protect birds and decrease building collision and San Francisco is positioning itself at the forefront of urban efforts to mitigate the hazards posed to birds in an urban environment.

It has been, and continues to be, a pleasure working with the San Francisco Planning Department staff on this project.

If you have any questions, please contact me. My contact information is included below.

Sincerely,

Ruth Ostroff

****

Ruth Ostroff
Assistant Coordinator, Central Valley Joint Venture
Migratory Birds Program
US Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 8
2800 Cottage Way, W-1916
Sacramento, CA 95825

Phone: 916-414-6460
Fax: 916-414-6512
ruth_ostroff@fws.gov
www.cvjv.org

September 7, 2011

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Mar and Wiener,

I am an avid birder, nature guide, Audubon conservation member, bird rescuer and San Francisco resident who opposes the legislation entitled "Standards for Bird-Safe Building" that is before you today.

You are being asked to approve a boiler-plate document developed in New York City that was intended to reduce the occurrence of bird collisions in that city. Over the last century New York City has recorded a history of such collisions, occurring mainly during extreme weather conditions.

Our City Planning department has not grounded its proposal with empirical data that shows that San Francisco has a similar problem. Original data has not been collected, nor are there local historical datasets that show this pattern. The Bay Area is the home to at least eight scientific organizations dedicated to bird conservation who have not reported such a trend. Professional ornithologists agree that each site or habitat is unique and requires independent investigation in regard to this issue.

Good legislation requires proof that a systematic problem exists and that the proscriptions and prescriptions enacted into law are real remedies. Without baseline statistics that measure if this problem exists today we will never know if these new codes have any positive (or negative) effect on bird mortality. You may be turning a myth into a legal fact.

This question should be turned over to local and bona fide scientists, not amateur conservation lobbying groups seeking publicity, as has been done here. If our buildings are killing hundreds of thousands of birds annually the evidence should be easy to report. Residents and businesses should be accurately informed about which neighborhoods and against what building types these birds are colliding.

With this evidence in hand I hope you then will do everything possible to protect birds from this threat.

A successful conservation movement needs the support of the public who should not be asked to bear artificial or symbolic burdens.

I have included (below) more data in my responses to the SF Planning Department's October and June drafts of the "Safe Buildings" proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Drechsler
740 Rhode Island St.
San Francisco, CA 94107
(415)641-7076

July 10, 2011

Regarding: "Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings" (SBSB)
Public Review Draft – June 11, 2011

Dear Planning Department Commissioners,

In December of 2010 I wrote to you opposing the October 2010 version of the "SBSB" plan because it lacked empirical data that described either the degree or characteristics of bird mortality caused by collisions with structures in San Francisco. Instead, the document relied on statistics, photographs and anecdotal accounts from research conducted in New York, Chicago and Toronto.

I am an avid birder, nature guide, wildlife hospital volunteer, Audubon conservation member and frequent bird rescuer. I worry about birds in this city and believe we should do things to make their lives easier and safer.

But I continue to oppose this plan because it still does not use locally collected data to demonstrate how, when and where birds collide with structures in San Francisco. All other cities referenced have done their "due diligence" by demonstrating to their residents the nature and severity of bird collisions. These cities have shown respect for the process of governance and for their citizens who will have to abide by new building codes.

These cities have also demonstrated respect for the conservation movement by demanding proof through a scientific process. San Franciscans who are lobbying for new building codes should be required to provide professionally collected evidence that demonstrates that a systematic problem exists and how new codes would correct these problems.

What is particularly troubling about the June 11 revision of the SBSB is how hard it strains to twist what little new data has been collected in order to prove its point.

For instance two new pieces of misleading information has been added to the revised document. They are: 1) Statistics collected by San Francisco Animal Care and Control (ACC) and 2) Acknowledgement of the tragedy that killed 3000 birds in Beebe, AK on New Year's Eve, 2011.

According to the SBSB document SF/ACC has reported collecting 938 birds in a two year period (469/year). It does not state where these birds were found or how they died. The (false) implication made by the SBSB report is that every dead bird found in San Francisco died from a collision with a building or window. In reality these birds died from a dozens of different causes.

As a volunteer I monitor four acres in San Francisco where over 250 dead birds are found each year. I have photographs of their bodies. Not a single one of these birds died as a result of a colliding with a building.

As a wildlife rehabilitation volunteer I see birds whose injuries run the gamut of causes: car accidents; poisoning; infectious disease (viral, bacterial, fungal); bodies drained by ticks, flees, lice and mites; greased and oiled; attacked by predatory birds; attacked by mammals; birds fallen out of nests; abandoned by parents and (yes) ones that have collided with something. The use of ACC's mortality statistic is, in this context, misleading and inappropriate and should not be part of training material.

SBSBs reference to the mass bird deaths in Arkansas is even more puzzling. The causes of their death in the small, darkened town of "Beebe" (pop. 5,500) is the opposite of how the SBSB wants us to believe that birds die due to collisions. Beebe does not have tall buildings. On New Year's Eve, 2011, celebration fireworks frightened roosting Blackbirds into the air. According to reports birds slammed into parked cars, trees, unlighted utility towers and the roofs of residential houses. Birds died not because of tall modern buildings, glass windows or confusing lights, but rather because they could not see where they were flying.

How does this cause of death in Beebe square with the SBSBs desire for a "Lights Out" San Francisco? Even more ironic is the fact the houses where collisions did occur would have been exempt from the restrictions proposed in the SBSB (p. 32) because they are residences and (presumably) less than 45' tall.

During the Fall bird migration of 2008 "The Golden Gate Audubon Society" conducted a six week study of bird collisions among the tall buildings of downtown San Francisco ("Gull", Vol. 93, No.9, Dec. 2008). They have never published the results of this study or divulged any of its data. Further, no subsequent study was undertaken.

The Bay Area is home to more dedicated avian conservation organizations than anywhere else in the country. (PRBO, CAS, GGRO, SFBBO, IBRCC, etc.). None of these organizations have supplied studies, data or weighed in on this issue.

This is baffling to me. Your department has identified two theoretical (building) hazards to migrating and resident birds: "feature related" and "location related" hazards. I cannot understand why, prior to publishing SBSB, you did not first identify a set of buildings in the most hazardous locations containing hazardous features. You could then have enlisted (Audubon?) volunteers to monitor bird strikes in these neighborhoods. This would have provided useful baseline statistics to support the theme of SBSB.

One implication I read from your document is that you consider bird strikes to be a global law of nature; and that its existence need not be (re)proved in every locale. Many ornithologists who study bird collisions disagree with this premise.

In the conclusion to his 2005 report about bird collisions at the Empire State Building ("Night Moves: Nocturnal Bird Migration from the Top of the Empire State Building"), Dr.Robert Decandido quotes his colleague, Dr. Joelle Gehring from Central Michigan University:

"Fewer avian collisions occur at tall structures near cities, but we do not know why. What we do know now is that each site is unique because of its location, the number of species of birds passing through the area in migration, wind/weather patterns, type and intensity of lighting used, etc."

We need to uncover the unique nature of the neighborhoods and districts of San Francisco before laws, codes or voluntary programs are enacted. Laws should be based on the truths we discover in the field.

Without baseline statistics that describe the bird collision problem today the city will never know if the remedial measures described in SBSB are successful or not. We will never know if our efforts are doing more harm than good.

Sincerely,

Richard Drechsler
740 Rhode Island St.
San Francisco, CA 94107
415-641-7076

December 28, 2010

Regarding: "Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings" (SBSB)
Public Review Draft, October 2010

Dear Planning Department Commissioners,

Let me admit from the outset that I am a birder, nature guide, wildlife hospital volunteer and frequent bird rescuer. I worry about birds.

But I believe that there are many problems with this report because its information, conclusions and recommendations are not grounded by data collected in San Francisco. The authors frequently assume that the "bird-glass" collision problem is a "physical law" and occurs in the same way and degree in San Francisco as it does in New York City, Toronto and Chicago: Hence the many references to these cities.

This report cannot lead us, empirically, to offending buildings or neighborhoods or quantify the extent of bird mortality there. It seems as though the "Recommendations and Guidelines" section (P. 27) is merely trying to address a theoretical or even a political problem. And because there is no real local data to evaluate, much of the information presented is anecdotal. The report tries to leverage unrelated references, such as the tragedy of Altamont Pass (P. 23), in order to persuade readers.

In the month since I read this report I have attempted to find supporting empirical evidence for its theories. I would like to give two examples to show why it is important to tailor your research to the physical and natural ecology of San Francisco.

The first main theme of this report is that large institutional buildings with facades of glass or ones that are illuminated (from inside or out) confuse a bird's navigational senses that lead to collisions. The paper does not talk about or show smaller houses or other residential structures that may also threaten birds. Omitting residences and residential neighborhoods from this discussion may work in the case of Manhattan (that has very few single family residences) but it does not describe San Francisco.

An example of this is the discussion (P. 15) about the deaths of three raptors; fledgling Peregrine Falcons who are born on roofs or ledges and learn to fly between tall buildings and in narrow air space. Their sad deaths while learning to fly does not tell the full story of the life of raptors in San Francisco.

San Francisco's local "Golden Gate Raptor Observatory" (GGRO) tracks injured and dead raptors that are identified by an aluminum band fitted on their leg. They "band" these birds in the Marin Headlands, just across the Golden Gate Bridge.

During the last five years the GGRO has collected information about approximately 330 of their raptors who have died. Of these, 25 (7 %) were found dead or mortality injured in

San Francisco. One or two birds were found in the downtown (high-rise) district and none were classified as victims of high-rise building collisions.

Further reading of GGRO's records shows many raptors flying into the windows, patio doors and into the interior of small residences. Residential structures are a bird safety factor in San Francisco, but are not discussed in "SBSB".

The second theme of "SBSB" is that birds are most vulnerable during their two seasonal Fall/Spring migrations. The report specifies dates of special concern for these two seasons. No data is supplied to support the establishment of either set of dates.

One source of data to help gauge the nature of seasonal injuries to birds exists in wildlife hospital intake records. Data from one local hospital, collected for 19 years, show a large decline in mortality and injury during the period that your "SBSB" report calls "Fall Migration".

The "SBSB" report claims that adults and hatch-year birds (250 species) that migrate over San Francisco can get hurt or killed by offending buildings. Actually, injuries during "Fall Migration" are half what they are during the prior season. Injuries during "Spring Migration" are also less than in the summer. The "SBSB" report does not address the causes of injury or locations of collisions during the season when injury and death are greatest.

In sum, I do not believe that these guidelines should be distributed until local, professionally administered studies are complete. Studies need to measure and report on dangers to birds from all of San Francisco's major building types, during all seasons.

The bay area is the home of at least four research groups specifically focused on bird conservation (SFBBO, PRBO, GGRO and SCPBRG). None of these groups have participated in the writing of your report. They should be involved.

Finally, my concern is that by not having comparative baseline statistics the city will never know if its bird safety recommendations are effective. Hard data will help you educate property owners and convince some of the many lives that they can help to save.

Sincerely yours,

Richard Drechsler
740 Rhode Island St.
San Francisco, CA
(415)641-7076

Nancy E. Smith
884 Chestnut Street
San Francisco, CA 94133
smithany@msn.com

September 8, 2011

Supervisors Malia Cohen, Eric Mar, and Scott Wiener
c/o Ms. Alisa Somera, Clerk, Land Use and Economic Development Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
email alisa.somera@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing in support of the proposed Standards for Bird Safe Buildings in San Francisco, the subject of your Committee's hearing on September 12.

Given our City's location on the Pacific Flyway, the dangers to migrant and local bird populations of collisions with buildings, and the widespread interest in birding among City residents and visitors, I encourage you to support the proposed Standards.

I am unable to attend your hearing, but did attend the hearing before the Planning Commission and read its supporting documentation. I believe the Standards will significantly benefit bird populations and our community.

Sincerely,

Nancy E. Smith

110785

AMERICAN BIRD CONSERVANCY

Shaping the future for birds

Supervisors Eric Mar, Malia Cohen and Scott Wiener
c/o Ms. Alisa Somera
Clerk for the Land Use and Economic Development Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

August 29, 2011

Dear Supervisors,

On behalf of American Bird Conservancy (ABC) I urge the Commission to approve the proposed San Francisco Standards for Bird-safe Buildings on September 12.

ABC is a 501(c)(3), non-profit organization dedicated to the conservation of native birds and their habitats throughout the Americas. ABC is the only U.S.-based group dedicated solely to overcoming the greatest threats facing native birds in the Western Hemisphere—safeguarding the rarest bird species, restoring habitats, and reducing threats, while unifying and strengthening the bird conservation movement. ABC is also the leading force in ongoing efforts to protect birds from collisions with the only national bird collisions program.

As you may know, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued a comprehensive report on bird populations in the United States showing that nearly one third of the nation's 800 bird species are endangered, threatened or in significant decline. Sadly, building collision is one of the greatest man-made killers of birds. In fact, it is estimated that three hundred million to one billion birds or more die each year from collisions with glass on buildings—from office buildings to residential homes. Millions of birds depend on the San Francisco Bay estuary system, not only during migration but throughout the winter, which is why ABC named it one of 500 Globally Important Bird Areas in the United States.

ABC believes the San Francisco Bird-Safe Building Standard will prevent hundreds of thousands of needless bird deaths and make San Francisco a leader in the global effort to reverse trends of increasing bird mortality that are causing bird populations to decline.

San Francisco's Standards are forward-thinking, creating zones of relative risk to direct the most serious efforts to the areas where birds are most threatened. As recognized by the code, many commonly used techniques, such as using fritted glass or louvers to control light and heat gain, also reduce bird collisions. Lighting strategies that protect birds also save energy without negatively impacting building operations or safety. Again, we urge the Committee to pass the Standard, as written, without delay.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this request. If I can be of any assistance on this issue, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Christine Sheppard, PhD
Bird Collisions Campaign Manager

1731 Connecticut Avenue, NW, 3rd Floor • Washington, D.C. 20009
Tel: 202-234-7181 • Fax: 202-234-7182 • abc@abcbirds.org • www.abcbirds.org

110785

SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892

San Francisco Bay Chapter
Serving Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin and San Francisco Counties

September 6, 2011

Supervisors Eric Mar, Malia Cohen and Scott Wiener
c/o Ms. Alisa Somera, Clerk for the Land Use and Economic Development Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Sent by email alisa.somera@sfgov.org

RE: Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings

Dear Supervisors Mar, Cohen and Wiener:

The Sierra Club urges you to approve the Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings that will come before your committee on September 12. These Standards were recently approved by the San Francisco Planning Commission and deserve your support.

It has now been scientifically documented that billions of birds a year are killed by collisions with buildings. Many of us have witnessed birds striking the windows of our houses or offices; certainly I have on a number of occasions. Such collisions are sadly the largest cause of bird mortality in the United States. The good news is that there are solutions to this sad situation. Window treatments and architectural designs can greatly reduce the likelihood of bird strikes. The Planning Department and Commission are to be congratulated on developing and approving standards that would implement this new knowledge.

This is not just a "bird" issue. Birds play a key role in our environment. They significantly reduce troublesome and dangerous insect populations such as mosquitoes and agricultural pests as well as acting as pollinators for some plant species.

Again, we urge you to approve these Standards for Bird-safe Building.

Yours,
Arthur Feinstein, Chair
Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
2530 San Pablo Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94702

110765

I support Bird-Safe building standards
Kimberly Jannarone to: alisa.somera 09/04/2011 01:31 PM

Supervisors Eric Mar, Malia Cohen and Scott Wiener
c/o Ms. Alisa Somera
Clerk for the Land Use and Economic Development Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

I'm writing to say I strongly support strong standards for bird-safe buildings in San Francisco. I've known for years about the extraordinary number of birds--perhaps as many as one billion--killed each year by colliding with buildings. These deaths are a terrible waste. And they can be reduced dramatically by a range of techniques.

Safer forms of window glass, guidelines for shuttered windows, and identification of buildings that are particularly dangerous to flying birds are all reasonable steps to take to mitigate these useless death.

Thank you for considering my comments.

-Kimberly Jannarone
Duboce Park
san Francisco

Please support the Standards for Bird Safe Buildings in San Francisco
leewaysf
to:
alisa.somera
09/07/2011 04:51 PM
Show Details

1 Attachment

image001.gif

The American Bird Conservancy (ABC) and Golden Gate Audubon hailed the passage by the San Francisco Planning Commission of new Bird Safe Building Standards.

Kindest Regards, lee Rudin

Unless someone like you cares a whole awful lot, Nothing is going to get better. It's not. Dr. Seuss ***"The Lorax"***

Please consider the environment before printing this email. Thank you.