

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

INSTRUCTIONS: This a Word form with expanding text fields and check boxes. It will probably open as Read-Only. Save it to your computer before you begin entering data. This form can be saved and reopened.

Because this is a WORD form, it will behave generally like a regular Word document except that the font, size, and color are set by the text field.

- Start typing where indicated to provide the requested information.
- Click on the check box to mark either yes or no.
- To enter more than one item in a particular text box, just insert an extra line (Enter) between the items.

Save completed form and email as an attachment to Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov. You can also convert it to a PDF and send as an email attachment. Use the Acrobat tab in WORD and select Create and Attach to Email. You can then attach the required documents to that email. If the attachments are too large (greater than 10mb total), you will need to send them in a second or third email.

Name of CLG *City and County of San Francisco*

Report Prepared by: *Tim Frye, Preservation Coordinator*

Date of commission/board review: *February 5, 2014*

Minimum Requirements for Certification

I. Enforce Appropriate State or Local Legislation for the Designation and Protection of Historic Properties.

A. Preservation Laws

1. What amendments or revisions, if any, are you considering to the certified ordinance? Please forward drafts or proposals.
REMINDER: Pursuant to the CLG Agreement, OHP must have the opportunity to review and comment on ordinance changes prior to adoption. Changes that do not meet the CLG requirements could affect certification status.

None

2. Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal code. Type here.

Article 10: Preservation of Historical Architectural and Aesthetic Landmarks:

[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article10preservationofhistoricalarchite?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article10preservationofhistoricalarchite?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca)

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

Article 11: Preservation of Buildings and Districts of Architectural Historical, and Aesthetic Importance in the C-3 Districts
[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article11preservationofbuildingsanddistr?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article11preservationofbuildingsanddistr?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca)

B. New Local Landmark Designations (Comprehensive list of properties/districts designated under local ordinance)

1. During the reporting period, October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2013, what properties/districts have been locally designated?

Property Name/Address	Date Designated	Number of Contributors in District	Date Recorded by County Recorder
<i>Doelger Building, 320-326 Judah Street</i>	<i>May 10, 2013</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>July 24, 2013 (submitted)</i>
<i>Twin Peaks Bar, 401 Castro Street</i>	<i>February 6, 2013</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>March 14, 2013 (submitted)</i>
<i>Sam Jordan's Bar, 4004 Third Street</i>	<i>February 6, 2013</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>July 23, 2013 (submitted)</i>
<i>Duboce Park Landmark District</i>	<i>July 12, 2013</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>July 23, 2013 (submitted)</i>
<i>Market St. Masonry Landmark District</i>	<i>April 17, 2013</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>May 14, 2013 (submitted)</i>

REMINDER: Pursuant to California Government Code § 27288.2, "the county recorder shall record a certified resolution establishing an historical resources designation issued by the State Historical Resources Commission or a local agency, or unit thereof."

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

2. What properties/districts have been de-designated this past year? For districts, include the total number of resource contributors.

Property Name/Address	Date Removed
N/A	N/A

C. Historic Preservation Element/Plan

1. Do you address historic preservation in your general plan? No
 Yes, in a separate historic preservation element. Yes, it is included in another element.

Provide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s) of the General Plan.

General Plan Priority Policies: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/index.htm

Urban Design Element: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/15_Urban_Design.htm

2. Have you made any updates to your historic preservation plan or historic preservation element in your community's general plan? Yes No If you have, provide an electronic link. Type here.

3. When will your next General Plan update occur? **As stated in previous CLG Annual Reports, the Draft Preservation Element is pending review and comment by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission, as well as required CEQA review. The Planning Department will budget in FY2014-15 to initiate the public engagement portion of the project and prepare an initial study to fulfill obligations under CEQA. Following the completion of CEQA review the document will be presented to the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission for recommendation prior to final adoption by the Board of Supervisors.**

D. Review Responsibilities

1. Who takes responsibility for design review or Certificates of Appropriateness?

All projects subject to design review go the commission.

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

☒ Some projects are reviewed at the staff level without commission review. What is the threshold between staff-only review and full-commission review? *Authorized by Section 1006.2 of the Planning Code, the Historic Preservation Commission in Motion No 181, identified scopes of work to Article 10 City Landmarks deemed minor and eligible for Planning Department Preservation staff review through an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness. Authorized by Section 1111.1 of the Planning Code, the Historic Preservation Commission in Motion No. 212, identified scopes of work to Significant and Contributory Buildings within the C-3 zoning district, or any building located within Conservation District, deemed minor and eligible for Planning Department Preservation staff review through a Minor Permit to Alter. Copies of the delegating Motions and the projects that qualified for administrative approval are include in Attachment A. During the reporting period of October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013, the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed 25 applications for Certificates of Appropriateness and 12 applications for Major Permits to Alter. During the reporting period Planning Department Preservation staff reviewed and approved 37 Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness and 64 Minor Permits to Alter. The number of Article 10 and 11 permits reviewed during the reporting period is 62 Certificates of Appropriateness (both Administrative and Regular) and 76 Permits to Alter (both Major and Minor). In addition, the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed a number of projects a number of projects over the reporting period. The ARC provides applicants with early feedback and advice on the design components of their projects.*

2. California Environmental Quality Act

- What is the role of the staff and commission in *providing input* to CEQA documents prepared for or by the local government? *The Planning Department acts as the lead agency for the City and Country of San Francisco in preparation of CEQA documents. Planning Department Preservation staff consults with the Environmental Review Officer in the evaluation of properties to determine eligibility as historical resources for the purposes of CEQA and the identification of any potential impacts. Working in consultation with the Environmental Planning Division of the Department, Preservation staff prepares and reviews CEQA documents and brings them through the public review and certification process. During the reporting period of October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013, the Planning Department Preservation staff received 260 referrals for historic review associated with environmental evaluation applications. Of those referrals, 215 required completion of a historic resource evaluation report by Planning Department Preservation staff.*

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* CEQA documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? *The Historic Preservation Commission provides review and comment on CEQA documents where potential significant impacts to historical resources have been identified. Its comments are forwarded to the Environmental Review Officer and to the Planning Commission for consideration during the public review and certification process. During the reporting period of October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013, the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed & commented on 1 Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Planning Department Preservation staff prepared 215 Historic Resource Evaluation Responses (HRER) and Preservation Team Review (PTR) forms, which involved determining eligibility of properties as historic resources under CEQA, and analyzing potential impacts of proposed projects to properties that were determined to be historic resources under CEQA.*

4. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

- What is the role of the staff and commission in *providing input* to Section 106 documents prepared for or by; the local government? *On January 19, 2007 a Programmatic Agreement was executed among the City and County of San Francisco, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Advisory Council) regarding properties affected by the City's use of funds subject to Part 58 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The Programmatic Agreement contains stipulations that ensure the City's responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act are carried out in accordance with the appropriate regulations for all undertakings that may have an effect on properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The Mayor's Office of Housing administers Part 58 activities in the City and County of San Francisco.*
- What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* Section 106 documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? *The determination of eligibility is made by the Planning Department based upon information provided by the Certifying Officer. The Planning Department documents its review of the undertaking on Form B, Section 106 Review Form. If the State Office of Historic Preservation has not made a previous determination of eligibility for the resource, the Planning Department proceeds to do so. Additionally, Form B documents the effect of the Undertaking on the resource, regardless of the resource's eligibility for inclusion in the National Register. The effect is classified as not adverse, not adverse with mitigations, or adverse. Depending*

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

upon the Planning Department's assessment of the effect of the Undertaking, MOH implements, modifies, or abandons the Undertaking. The Mayor's Office of Housing maintains requests for Determinations of Eligibility and Section 106 Review Forms on site. During the reporting period the Planning Preservation staff reviewed 6 Section 106 referrals. For those projects that may have an impact on historic or cultural resources, the Historic Preservation Commission has the authority to review and comment upon any agreement proposed under the National Historic Preservation Act where the City is a signatory prior to any approval of action on such agreement. During the reporting period of October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013, the Historic Preservation Commission received and commented on 3 Section 106 projects.

II. Establish an Adequate and Qualified Historic Preservation Review Commission by State or Local Legislation.

A. Commission Membership

Name	Professional Discipline	Date Appointed	Date Term Ends	Email Address
Aaron Jon Hyland	Historical Architect	02/26/2013	12/31/2016	aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com
Andrew Wolfram	Historical Architect	02/02/11	12/31/2014	andrew@tefarch.com
Jonathan Pearlman	Architectural Historian	03/12/2013	12/31/2016	jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com
Richard Johns	Historian	02/02/2011	12/31/2014	RSEJohns@yahoo.com
Ellen Johnck	Preservation Professional	03/12/2013	12/31/2016	ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com
Karl Hasz	General Contractor	02/02/2011	12/31/2014	karl.hasz@platinumstructuresinc.com
Diane M. Matsuda	At Large	02/26/13	12/31/2016	diane@johnburtonfoundation.org

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all members. [See Attachment D](#)

1. If you do not have two qualified professionals on your commission, why have the professional qualifications not been met and how is professional expertise being provided? Type here.

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

2. If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled? Type here.

B. Staff to the Commission/CLG staff

1. Is the staff to your commission the same as your CLG coordinator? Yes No

2. If the position(s) is not currently filled, why is there a vacancy? Type here.

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for staff.

Name/Title	Discipline	Dept. Affiliation	Email Address
Bendix, Brittany	Planner II, Current Planning	01/01/2013	brittany.bendix@sfgov.org
Brown, Mary	Planner III, Historic Resources Survey	02/01/2008	mary.brown.@sfgov.org
Caltagirone, Shelley	Planner III, Current Planning	06/18/2007	shelley.caltagirone@sfgov.org
Frye, Tim	Planner IV, Preservation Coordinator	04/24/2006	tim.frye@sfgov.org
Hilyard, Gretchen	Planner III, Current Planning	02/13/2012	halyard.gretchen@sfgov.org
Lammers, Jonathan	Planner III, Current Planning	06/03/2013	jonathan.lammers@sfgov.org
LaValley, Pilar	Planner III, Current Planning	11/13/2008	pilar.lavalley@sfgov.org
Parks, Susan	Planner II, Current Planning	03/03/2012	susan.parks@sfgov.org
Skrondal, Elizabeth	Administration, Current and Survey	01/02/2007	elizabeth.skrondal@sfgov.org
Sucre, Richard	Planner III, Current Planning	12/13/2010	richard.sucre@sfgov.org
Tam, Tina	Planner IV, Senior Preservation Planner	03/01/2000	tina.tam@sfgov.org
Vanderslice, Allison	Planner III, Current & Environmental Planner	12/03/2012	allison.vanderslice@sfgov.org
Vu, Doug	Planner III, Current Planning	03/19/2012	doug.vu@sfgov.org
Wong, Kelly	Planner III, Current Planning	01/22/2014	kelly.wong@sfgov.org
Yegazu, Lily	Planner III, Current Planning	12/26/2012	lily.yegazu@sfgov.org
Yuen, Margaret	Commission Staff	10/26/2006	margaret.yuen@sfgov.org

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

C. Attendance Record

Please complete attendance chart for each commissioner and staff member. Commissions are required to meet four times a year, at a minimum.

Commission Members	Oct/12		Nov/12		Dec/12		Jan/13		Feb/13		Mar/13		Apr/13		May/13		Jun/13		July/13		Aug/13		Sept/13	
	3	17	7	21	5	19	2	16	6	20	6	20	3	17	1	15	5	19	3	17	7	21	4	18
Chase	X	X	X	A	X	X	Term Ended																	
Damkroger	X	X	X	X	X	X	Term Ended																	
Martinez	X	X	X	X	X	A	Term Ended																	
Hasz	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hyland	Sworn in 2/26/13 replacing Martinez										X	X	X	X/X	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Matsuda	X	X	A	X	A	X	C	X	X	A	X	A	X	X	C	X	X	X	C	X	X	C	C	X
Wolfram	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	X/X	X	X	X/X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Johns	X	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	A	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	A	X	X	A	A	A	A
Pearlman	Sworn in 3/12/13 replacing Chase										X	A	X/X	X	X	X/X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ellen Johnck	Sworn in 3/12/13 replacing Damkroger										X	X	X	N	X	X	X	N	X	X	N	N	X	X
Adminstrators	C						C						C						C		C			
Rahaim	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Joslyn	X	X	X	X	X	X	E	X	X	X	X	X	X	E	X	X	E	X	X	E	E	X	X	X
Avery	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ionin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Staff	L						L						L						L		L			
Bendix	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Brown	X	X	X	X	X	X	L	X	X	X	X	X	X	L	X	X	L	X	X	L	L	X	X	X
Caltagirone	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Frye	X	X	X	X	X	X	E	X	X	X	X	X	X	E	X	X	X	E	X	X	E	E	X	X
Hilyard	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lammers	X	X	X	X	X	X	D	X	X	X	X	X	X	D	X	X	D	X	X	D	D	X	X	X
LaValley	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Parks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Smith	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

Brown, Mary	Society of Architectural Historians Annual Conference	5 days	Society of Architectural Historians	11/2013
	Webinar: Materials conservation - Masonry	1 hour	California Preservation Foundation	9/3/2013
Caltagirone, Shelley	2012 National Preservation Conference: Spokane	4 days	National Trust	10/31/12-11/3/12
	Community Summit: Sustaining San Francisco's Living History	1 day	San Francisco Heritage	6/15/13
Frye, Tim	None			
Hilyard, Gretchen	CEQA Workshop	1 day	California Preservation Foundation	7/24/13
Lammers, Jonathan	GIS Quick Start	1 semester	City College of San Francisco	Aug.-Sept. 2013
LaValley, Pilar	None (FMLA Leave)			
Parks, Susan	Public Outreach and Engagement Workshop	1 day	City of San Francisco & Davenport Institute	7/31/13
	GIS Quick Start	1 semester	City College	Aug.-Sept. 2013
	2013 California Preservation Foundation Conference, Orange County	3 days	California Preservation Foundation	5/1/13 - 5/3/13
Sucre, Richard	2013 California Preservation Foundation Conference, Orange County	3 days	California Preservation Foundation	5/1/13 - 5/3/13
	CEQA and Historic Resources	1 day	California Preservation Foundation	7/24/13

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

Sucre, Richard (Cont'd)	Assessing Integrity & the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation	1 day	California Preservation Foundation	7/25/13
Tam, Tina	2013 California Preservation Foundation Conference, Orange County	5 days	Various	5/1/13 - 5/5/13
Vanderslice, Allison	California Preservation Foundation 2013 Conference	3 days	California Preservation Foundation	5/1/13 - 5/3/13
Vu, Doug	Fire Protection in Historic Buildings	90 minutes	California Preservation Foundation	1/29/13
	Improving Acoustics in Historic Buildings	90 minutes	California Preservation Foundation	2/12/13
	Role of the Building Official in Protecting Historic Properties	90 minutes	California Preservation Foundation	3/12/13
	Treatment of Exiting System in Historic Buildings	90 minutes	California Preservation Foundation	4/9/13
	SOI Standards for Rehabilitation & Assessing Historic Integrity	7.5 hours	California Preservation Foundation	7/25/13
Wong, Kelly	CEQA and Historic Resources Workshop	1 day	California Preservation Foundation	7/24/13
	2013 California Preservation Foundation Conference, Orange County	3 days	California Preservation Foundation	5/1/13 - 5/3/13
	Conservation of Metal Finishes in Modern Architecture Workshop	2 days	Association for Preservation Technology International	10/11/13-10/12/13

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

Wong, Kelly (Cont'd)	Association for Preservation Technology Annual Conference	5 days	Association for Preservation Technology International	10/11/13 - 10/15/13
Yegazu, Lily	2013 California Preservation Foundation Conference, Orange County	3 days	California Preservation Foundation	5/1/13 - 5/3/13
	GIS Training	20 hours	California Preservation Foundation	8/21/13 - 9/18/13
	CEQA and historic Resources - An Overview	1.5 hour webinar	California Preservation Foundation	7/23/13
	CEQA and Historic Resources	1 day	California Preservation Foundation	7/24/13
	The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Assessing History Integrity	1 day	California Preservation Foundation	7/25/13
	Improving Acoustics in Historic Buildings			
	The Role of the Building Official in Protecting Historic Properties	1.5 hour webinar	California Preservation Foundation	2/12/13
		1.5 hour webinar	California Preservation Foundation	3/12/13

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

III. Maintain a System for the Survey and Inventory of Properties that Furthers the Purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act

A. Historical Contexts: initiated, researched, or developed in the reporting year

NOTE: California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts to OHP. If you have not done so, submit a copy (PDF or link if available online) with this report.

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted to OHP
<i>Sunset District Residential Builders, 1925-1950, Historic Context Statement</i>	Focused on builder tract developments constructed in San Francisco's Sunset District neighborhood from 1925-1950. Adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission in April 2013.	The document provided an evaluative framework for the associated historic resource survey and continues to provide contextual information relevant to individual building evaluations.	April 3, 2013
<i>Neighborhood Commercial Buildings, 1865-1965, Historic Context Statement</i>	Focused on evolution of neighborhood commercial storefronts in San Francisco, including identification of styles, storefront components, character-defining features, significance, and integrity thresholds.	The draft document was used to assist with development of the storefront design guidelines and to provide contextual information relevant to individual commercial building evaluations. It is currently used as framework for the historic resource survey of neighborhood commercial buildings in western San Francisco.	September 30, 2013 (draft)
<i>Central Corridor Historic Context Statement</i>	Focused on commercial and institutional buildings constructed in the SoMa neighborhood from 1849 to the 1970s.	The draft document provided an evaluative framework for the associated historic resource survey and continues to provide contextual information relevant to individual building evaluations.	N/A

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted to OHP
<i>African American Historic Context Statement</i>	Focused on the African American experience in San Francisco. When complete, the document will provide the foundation for the identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of historic properties associated with African American history in San Francisco.	Under development (consultant)	N/A
<i>LGBT Historic Context Statement</i>	Focused on the LGBT experience in San Francisco. The final document will provide the foundation for the identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of historic properties associated with LGBT history in San Francisco	Under development (consultant)	N/A
<i>Corbett Heights Historic Context Statement</i>	This neighborhood-based historic context statement is focused on buildings and infrastructure found in the small Corbett Heights neighborhood.	Under development (consultant)	N/A
<i>Residence Parks Historic Context Statement</i>	This thematic context statement is focused on nine master-planned residence parks built pre-1940 including: Jordan Park, West Clay Park, Forest Hill, St. Francis Wood, Ingleside Terraces, Lincoln Manor, Sea Cliff, and Balboa Terrace.	Under development (consultant)	N/A

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

B. New Surveys or Survey Updates (excluding those funded by OHP)

NOTE: The evaluation of a single property is not a survey. Also, material changes to a property that is included in a survey, is not a change to the survey and should not be reported here.

California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts, to OHP. If you have not done so, submit a copy (electronic format preferred) with this report.

Survey Area	Context Based-yes/no	Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive	Acreage	# of Properties Surveyed	Date Completed	Date Submitted to OHP
Central Corridor Survey Area	Y	Intensive	354	63	Draft 12/2/2013	N/A
Civic Center Survey	Y	Intensive	25	Landscape features located within an eight-block area.	In-Progress	N/A

How are you using the survey data? Type here.

C. Corrections or changes to Inventory

Property Name/Address	Additions/Deletions to Inventory	Status Code Change From - To	Reason	Date of Change
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

IV. Provide for Adequate Public Participation in the Local Historic Preservation Program

A. Public Education

What public outreach, training, or publications programs has the CLG undertaken? Please provide copy of (or an electronic link) to all publications or other products not previously provided to OHP.

Item or Event	Description	Date
See Attachment B	Type here.	Type here.

V. National Park Service Baseline Questionnaire for new CLGs (certified after September 30, 2012).

NOTE: OHP will forward this information to the NPS on your behalf. Guidance for completing the Baseline Questionnaire is located at www.nps.gov/hps/clg/forms.html.

A. CLG Inventory Program

1. What is the net cumulative number of historic properties in your inventory as of September 30, 2013? This is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or your best estimate of the number) in your inventory from **all** programs, local, state, and Federal. Type here.

Program Area	Number of Properties
Type here.	Type here.

B. Local Register (i.e., Local Landmarks and Historic Districts) Program

1. As of September 30, 2013, did your local government have a local register program to create local landmarks/local historic districts (or a similar list of designations created by local law? Yes No

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

2. If the answer is yes, what is the net cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties (i.e., contributing properties) locally registered/designated as of September 30, 2013? Type here.

C. Local Tax Incentives Program

1. As of September 30, 2013, did your local government have a local historic preservation tax incentives program (e.g. Mills Act)? Yes No
2. If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties whose owners have taken advantage of those incentives as of September 30, 2013? Type here.

D. Local "Bricks and Mortar" Grants/Loans Program

1. As of September 30, 2013, did your local government have a locally-funded, historic preservation grants/loan program for rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? Type here.
2. If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties assisted by these grants or loans as of September 30, 2013? Type here.

E. Local Design Review/Regulatory Program

1. As of September 30, 2013, did your local government have a historic preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance requiring Commission/staff review of 1) local government undertakings and/or 2) changes to or impacts on properties with a historic district? Yes No
2. If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties that your local government has reviewed under that process as of September 30, 2013? Type here.

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

1. As of September 30, 2013, did your local government by purchase, donation, condemnation, or other means help to acquire or acquire itself some degree of title (e.g., fee simple interest or an easement) in historic properties?
 Yes No

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

2. If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties with a property interest acquisition assisted or carried out by your local government as of September 30, 2013?

Type here.

VI. Additional Information for National Park Service Annual Products Report for CLGs (certified before October 1, 2012).

NOTE: OHP will forward this information to NPS on your behalf. **Please read** “Guidance for completing the Annual Products Report for CLGs” located at www.nps.gov/hps/clg/forms.html.

A. CLG Inventory Program

During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) how many historic properties did your local government add to the CLG inventory? This is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or your best estimate of the number) added to your inventory **from all programs**, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting year. These might include National Register, California Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG surveys, and local designations.

Program area	Number of Properties added
Type here.	Type here.

B. Local Register (i.e., Local Landmarks and Historic Districts) Program

1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) did you have a local register program to create local landmarks and/or local districts (or a similar list of designations) created by local law? Yes No
2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been added to your register or designated since October 1, 2012?

C. Local Tax Incentives Program

1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) did you have a Local Tax Incentives Program, such as the Mills Act? Yes No

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

2. If the answer is yes, how many properties have been added to this program since October 1, 2012?

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
Mills Act	10 applications pending approval by the Board of Supervisors in December 2013

D. Local “bricks and mortar” grants/loan program

1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) did you have a local government historic preservation grant and/or loan program for rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? Yes No

2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) after October 1, 2012? Type here.

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
N/A	Type here.

E. Design Review/Local Regulatory Program

1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) did your local government have a historic preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance requiring Commission and/or staff review of 1) local government undertakings and/or 2) changes to, or impacts on, properties with a historic district? Yes No

2. If the answer is yes then, since October 1, 2012, how many historic properties did your local government review for compliance with your local government’s historic preservation regulatory law(s)? The number of Article 10 and 11 permits reviewed during the reporting period is 62 Certificates of Appropriateness (both Administrative and Regular) and 76 Permits to Alter (both Major and Minor).

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) did you have a local program to acquire (or help to acquire) historic properties in whole or in part through purchase, donation, or other means? Yes No

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) since October 1, 2012?
Type here.

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
N/A	Type here.

VII. In addition to the minimum CLG requirements, OHP is interested in a Summary of Local Preservation Programs

- A. What are the most critical preservation planning issues? **At its September 18, 2013 hearing the HPC discussed the recommendations outlined in the July 2013 SPUR and San Francisco Architectural Heritage joint policy report examining the San Francisco's preservation planning, review, and decision-making processes. The report recommends measures to fully integrate preservation into land use planning, including improvements to the processes for conducting surveys, creating historic districts and reviewing proposed changes to historic resources. While many of the recommendations have been implemented since the initial conversations regarding the report, the HPC requested Planning Department Preservation staff to respond to the remaining recommendations and present to the HPC at a future hearing. At that time the HPC may take action to prioritize any of the outstanding recommendations and request an implementation plan. It should be noted that the Planning Department provided technical assistance to the SPUR/Heritage Task Force throughout the development of the report. While the Planning Department is in general support of the recommendations in the report, there are several recommendations that warrant further discussion. A second critical preservation planning issue for the Planning Department is overall permit and entitlement volume. San Francisco continues to experience a high level of permit and entitlement activity, and associated CEQA review. Currently, Planning Department policy allows for priority processing of permits and entitlements for designated properties; however, with the high level of permit and entitlement activity, there is still considerable processing time. As a result the Planning Department has increased Preservation staff through temporary and permanent positions. We continue**

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

to monitor our performance and response to this increased activity, especially our response time for CEQA determinations.

- B. What is the single accomplishment of your local government this year that has done the most to further preservation in your community? **While it was a busy year for the City's preservation program, the Planning Department's community outreach and engagement efforts through the Community Ambassador Program, the Duboce Park Landmark District, and the Sunset Neighborhood Historic Context Statement and Survey did the most to further preservation in San Francisco. Staff utilized creative techniques to engage community members on preservation topics and to provide technical assistance when requested. Mills Act "Clinics", "Ask-a-Planner" nights at local cafes, historic walking tours, and preservation-themed activities at local events broadened the range of participants and opportunities for contact. Of note, page 12 of the July 2013 SPUR Heritage Report commented on the Planning Department's outreach work stating, "Public outreach strategies employed for recent survey work in the Sunset District...provide an excellent model for early and effective community engagement. The Planning Department's outreach approach can be tailored to meet the needs of different communities." As a goal for 2013-2014 the Planning Department will work to build on this success and develop additional methods for robust community participation and engagement on San Francisco historic preservation topics.**
- C. What recognition are you providing for successful preservation projects or programs? **The Planning Department does not currently have a recognition program.**
- D. How did you meet or not meet the goals identified in your annual report for last year? **1) Promote the Mills Act program to increase local participation - While outside this reporting period, the Department, in close coordination with the Assessor-Recorder's Office reviewed and forwarded 10 Mills Act Applications for final adoption to Board of Supervisors. The approval of the 10 contracts, mostly from the recently designated Duboce Park Landmark District, represents the single greatest increase in the program since its initiation in 1996. This brings San Francisco's Mills Act Program to a total of 17 contracts. 2) Develop tools to improve the review process regarding the permits and entitlements for designated properties for the public, decision-makers, and the Planning Department – in response to the high**

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

volume of permit and entitlement activity the Planning Department hired several preservation planners and streamlined points of contact for CEQA review for known and potential historic resources, including greater coordination with archeology staff. The Planning Department continues to monitor its review and response time in effort to further reduce processing timeframes. The HPC also expanded its delegation to Planning Department Preservation staff to eliminate hearing and notification process for qualifying scopes of work deemed routine and in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. 3) Working with the Department of Building Inspection and other City agencies, formalize Planning Department follow-up procedures for work completed through a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Permit to Alter – the Planning Department is now authorized to staff a permanent position to serve as a technical resource for the Code Enforcement Team on historic preservation matters. Such support consists of investigation of alleged violations of the Planning Code; preparation of written notices to facilitate correction of violations; providing technical assistance and development of design recommendations to correct violations according to best preservation practices; monitoring conditions of approval and accurate inspection of complex projects to determine conformity with detailed approval documents, such as Building Permits, Certificate of Appropriateness and Permits to Alter. The goal is to staff the position by winter 2014. 4) Develop innovative techniques to improve community participation in Planning Department and Historic Preservation Commission historic preservation efforts – This past year a team of 19 planners, including 4 preservation planners were selected as ambassadors to the Planning Department, responsible for engaging the general public through attendance at community events. The ambassadors attended 7 comment events in 2013 to discussion local planning issues, such as permits, legislation, and historic preservation. 5) Seek funding for a design guidelines document to address application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards within the San Francisco context – Over the summer and fall of 2013 two Department interns completed an exhaustive audit of all existing department design guidelines and background research on established best practices in local application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Department continues to seek additional funding to support additional phases of the project.

- E. *What are your local historic preservation goals for 2013-2014?* 1) Continue to promote the Mills Act program to increase local participation, including hosting of “How-To” clinics for the public; 2) Initiate public and commission review of Draft Preservation Element in preparation of CEQA analysis; 3) Refine environmental review process to provide clarity and streamline review procedures for historic

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

resources. Provide training (internally and externally) regarding reclassification of buildings from “Potential Historic Resource” properties to either “Known Historic Resource” or “Not a Resource”, HRE requirements, CEQA Checklist and etc.; 4) Develop innovative techniques to improve community participation in Planning Department and Historic Preservation Commission efforts; 5) Continue efforts to fund a design guidelines document to address application of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards within the San Francisco context.

F. So that we may better serve you in the future, are there specific areas and/or issues with which you could use technical assistance from OHP? **Closer review coordination between OHP staff and Planning Department Preservation staff on local projects taking advantage of the 20% Rehabilitation Tax Credit.**

G. In what subject areas would you like to see training provided by the OHP? How you like would to see the training delivered (workshops, online, technical assistance bulletins, etc.)?

Training Needed or Desired	Desired Delivery Format
Type here.	Type here.

H. Would you be willing to host a training working workshop in cooperation with OHP? Yes No

XII Attachments

Resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for **all** commission members/alternatives and staff
[See Attachment D](#)

Minutes from commission meetings
[See Attachment E](#)

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

Drafts of proposed changes to the ordinance

Article 10: Preservation of Historical Architectural and Aesthetic Landmarks:

[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article10preservationofhistoricalarchite?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article10preservationofhistoricalarchite?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca)

Article 11: Preservation of Buildings and Districts of Architectural Historical, and Aesthetic Importance in the C-3 Districts

[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article11preservationofbuildingsanddistr?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article11preservationofbuildingsanddistr?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca)

Drafts of proposed changes to the General Plan

No Change

Public outreach publications

Historic Preservation Bulletins

<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1827>

Email to Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov