



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DATE: March 14, 2012
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Timothy Frye, Preservation Coordinator, (415) 575-6822
RE: Presentation on Certified Local Government
Annual Report October 2010- September 2011

The following Annual Report to the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) outlines the Certified Local Government (CLG) activities of the Planning Department and of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) from October 2010 through September 2011. This report is provided to the HPC and the OHP on an annual basis and is a requirement of the City and County of San Francisco's CLG agreement with the OHP.

The Department will present the highlights of the report and obtain any comments from the HPC prior to forwarding to the OHP.

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Historic Preservation Commission

Certified Local Government Annual Report

October 1, 2010 – September 30, 2011

CITY and COUNTY of SAN FRANCISCO

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94104



A row of colorful Victorian houses in San Francisco, known as the 'Painted Ladies'. The houses are multi-story with gabled roofs, bay windows, and ornate architectural details. The colors range from light blue and green to yellow and red. A person is walking on the sidewalk in front of the houses, and a car is parked on the street. The sky is clear and blue.

Attachment 1: Resumes & Qualifications Forms

Historic Preservation Commissioners:

[Commission President Charles Chase](#)

[Commission Vice President Courtney Damkroger](#)

[Commissioner Alan Martinez](#)

[Commissioner Karl Hasz](#)

[Commissioner Diane Matsuda](#)

[Commissioner Andrew Wolfram](#)

[Commissioner Richard Johns](#)



Attachment 2: Resumes & Qualifications Forms

Planning Department Staff:

Senior Preservation Planner [Tina Tam](#)

Preservation Coordinator [Tim Frye](#)

Preservation Planners: [Mary Brown](#)

[Shelley Caltagirone](#)

[Moses Corrette](#)

[Pilar LaValley](#)

[Michael Smith](#)

[Richard Sucre](#)

[Tara Sullivan](#)

Attachment 3: [Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment 4: [Attendance Records](#)

**Attachment 5: Current [Articles 10](#) and [Article 11](#) of the
Planning Code**



Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

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.

The Email button at the end of the form will open Outlook with the form attached. Insert the address woodward@parks.ca.gov . 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 & County of San Francisco*

Report Prepared by: *Timothy Frye, Preservation Coordinator*

Date of commission/board review: *3/21/12*

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.

On November 4, 2008, Proposition J was passed by the voters of San Francisco. This proposition amended the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco Section 4.105 (Planning Commission) and added Section 4.135, establishing the Historic Preservation Commission. This past CLG reporting year was the first full reporting year of having a Historic Preservation Commission.

In July 2010, the Planning Commission initiated Planning Code text changes, including revisions to Articles 10 and 11. The intent of the revisions to Articles 10 and 11 were to incorporate the Historic Preservation Commission into the Planning Code, with a follow-up ordinance that would make substantial changes to these Articles in 2011. The Planning Commission passed Resolution No. 18157 on August 5, 2010, recommending the changes to Articles 10 and 11 to the Board of Supervisors. The Historic Preservation Commission held thirteen public hearings from July 21, 2010 through December 6, 2010 to review Articles 10 and 11, ultimately

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

passing Resolutions No. 657 on October 6, 2010, and 660 on December 1, 2010, recommending changes to the Board of Supervisors.

Beginning on August 17, 2012, the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the City Attorney's approved as-to-form versions of Articles 10 and 11, as well as considered making further modifications prior to its consideration by the Board of Supervisors. The Historic Preservation Commission continued its review during its regularly scheduled hearings on September 7, September 21, October 5, October 19, and November 2, 2012. While outside this reporting period, on October 19, 2012 the Historic Preservation Commission adopted Resolution No. 666 recommending amendments to Article 10 to the Board of Supervisors. On November 2, 2012 the Historic Preservation Commission passed Resolution No. 667 recommending amendments to Article 11 to the Board of Supervisors.

On September 7, 2012 San Francisco District 8 Supervisor, Scott Wiener, submitted the first of a series of memos to the Historic Preservation Commission to consider additional amendments to Articles 10 and 11. After the Historic Preservation Commission passed its own Resolutions regarding Articles 10 and 11, it continued its review to address Supervisor Wiener's memos at its January 18, 2012 hearing, outside of this reporting period.

2. Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal code.
[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/planningcode?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\\$sync=1](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/planningcode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sync=1)

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

1. During the reporting period, did you have a local register program to create local landmarks/local districts (or a similar list of designations) created by local law? Yes No

2. If the answer is yes, then, during the reporting period, what properties/districts have been locally designated?

Property Name/Address	Date Designated	Number of Contributors in District	Date Recorded by County Recorder
None	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.

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 -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

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

Property Name/Address	Date Removed
None	Type here.

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](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/index.htm) AND [Urban Design Element: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/15_Urban_Design.htm](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 the 2009-2010 CLG Annual Report, the Draft Preservation Element was presented for public review at the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board in a series of hearings between 2007 and 2008. The Draft Preservation Element was presented to the Historic Preservation Commission on June 3, 2009 for their comments. While the Department has solicited comments from the HPC, we have yet to present the draft document to the Planning Commission. As of the date of this report, the Department has been unable to secure funding to complete the CEQA review of this General Plan Element. However, should we become successful in securing funds in the near future, we intend to bring the document to the Planning Commission for their review and comment, and produce a final draft. The final draft will then be ready for Environmental Review and eventually endorsement and adoption by the Historic Preservation Commission. Following adoption by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission, the Element will be brought before the Board of Supervisors for final adoption.*

D. Review Responsibilities

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

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

All projects subject to design review go the commission.

Some projects are reviewed at the staff level without commission review. What is the threshold between staff-only review and full-commission review? *During the reporting period between October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011, the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed 94 applications for Certificates of Appropriateness and 4 applications for Major Permits to Alter. In May of 2011, the Historic Preservation Commission delegated the review and approval of minor scopes of work for Article 10 properties to Planning Department staff, called Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness. This authority was granted for one year and expires or must be extended in May of 2012. On October 6, 2010, the Historic Preservation Commission delegated the review and approval of minor scopes of work for Article 11 properties to Planning Department staff, called Minor Permits to Alter. During the reporting period Planning Department staff reviewed and approved 15 Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness and 134 Minor Permits to Alter. The total number of Article 10 and 11 permits reviewed during the reporting period is 109 Certificates of Appropriateness (both Administrative and Regular) and 138 Permits to Alter (both Major and Minor). In addition, the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed a number of projects in February, April, June, and September 2011 to provide 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.*

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, 2010 through September 30, 2011, the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed & commented on 5 Draft Environmental Impact Reports (DEIR) and 1 Negative Declaration. Planning Department Preservation staff prepared 133 Historic Resource Evaluation Responses*

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

(HRER), 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 to it 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 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 76 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 this reporting period, the Historic Preservation Commission received and commented on 2 Section 106 projects and MOAs.*

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
------	-------------------------	----------------	----------------	---------------

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

Alan Martinez	Historic Architect	1/13/2009	12/31/2012	awmartinez@earthlink.net
Andrew Wolfram	Historic Architect	7/10/2009	12/31/2014	andrew.wolfram@perkinswill.com
Charles Edwin Chase	Architectural Historian	1/13/2009	12/31/2012	c.chase@argsf.com
Richard Johns	Historian	2/2/2011	12/31/2014	rsejohns@yahoo.com
Courtney Damkroger	Preservation Professional	1/13/2009	12/31/2012	cdamkroger@hotmail.com
Karl Hasz	General Contractor	1/13/2009	12/31/2014	karlhasz@gmail.com
Diane Matsuda	At Large	5/04/2009	12/31/2012	dianematsuda@hotmail.com
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all members.

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? All Historic Preservation Commissioners meet the requirements of the City Charter Section 4.135 of the Administrative Code.
2. If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled? N/A

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? *The Department has one Preservation Planner vacancy that we anticipate to fill in 2012. The Preservation Planner left the Department for a position in the private sector.*

Name/Title	Discipline	Dept. Affiliation	Email Address
------------	------------	-------------------	---------------

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

Avery, Linda	Commission Secretary	4/20/1981	Linda.Avery@sfgov.org
Brown, Mary	Planner II	2/1/2008	Mary.Brown@sfgov.org
Caltagirone, Shelley P.	Planner III	6/18/2007	Shelley.Caltagirone@sfgov.org
Corrette, Moses	Planner III	6/19/2000	Moses.Corrette@sfgov.org
Frye, Tim	Planner IV	4/24/2006	Tim.Frye@sfgov.org
LaValley, Pilar	Planner III	11/13/2008	Pilar.LaValley@sfgov.org
Skrondal, Elizabeth	Historic Resources Survey Team	1/2/2007	Elizabeth.Skrondal@sfgov.org
Smith, Michael E.	Planner III	1/1/2000	Michael.E.Smith@sfgov.org
Sucre, Richard	Planner III	12/13/2010	Richard.Surce@sfgov.org
Sullivan, Tara	Planner III	1/6/2006	Tara.Sullivan@sfgov.org
Tam, Tina	Planner IV	3/1/2000	Tina.Tam@sfgov.org
Yuen, Margaret	Commission Secretary Assistant	10/26/2006	Margaret.Yuen@sfgov.org

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all new staff.

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.

Commissioner/Staff	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
HPC met twice monthly. See Attachment 4 - attendance chart for Commissioners and staff members.	<input type="checkbox"/>											
Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											
Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											
Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											
Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											
Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											
Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											
Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											
Type here.	<input type="checkbox"/>											

D. Training Received

Indicate what training each commissioner and staff member has received. Remember it is a CLG requirement is that all commissioners and staff to the commission attend at least one training program relevant to your commission each year. It is up to the CLG to determine the relevancy of the training.

Commissioner/Staff Name	Training Title & Description	Duration of Training	Training Provider	Date
Alan Martinez	California Preservation Foundation Conference	6 hours	California Preservation Foundation/ Santa Monica	May 14-16, 2011
Andrew Wolfram	California Preservation Foundation Conference	3 days	California Preservation Foundation	April 2011
Charles Chase	Building Disaster Resident Communities	2 hours	American Institute of Architects/San Francisco	Dec. 9, 2011
	How to Present to Boards and Commissioners	1 hour	Architectural Resources Groups/AIA Training Provider	February 9, 2011
	Repair of Historic Wood	1 hour	ARG Conservation Services/AIA Training Provider	February 11, 2011
	Environmental Benefits of	1.5 hours	California Preservation	May 16, 2011

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

Richard Johns Courtney Damkroger Karl Hasz Diane Matsuda	Reuse	1.5 hours	Foundation	June 17, 2011
	Survey LA: Implementing a New Methodology for Historic Resource Surveys	1.5 hours	California Preservation Foundation	June 17, 2011
	GIS & Survey – New Tool, Approaches & Initiatives	1 hour	California Preservation Foundation	
	none			
	Webinar on the Federal Historic Tax Credits			
	none			
	none			
Mary Brown	The Cultural Landscape: Preservation and Sustainable Practice;	Weekly for 7 weeks	Landscape Architecture Certificate Program at U.C. Berkeley Extension	July – August, 2011
	Understanding Design Guidelines;	1 day	California Preservation Foundaton	August 18, 2011
	National Trust Annual Preservation Conference, Austin, Texas	4 days	National Trust	October 2010
Moses Corrette	Santa Monica, “ Preservation on the Edge”	4 days	California Preservation Foundation	May 2011
Shelley Caltagirone	California Preservation Foundation Annual Conference	4 days	California Preservation Foundation	May 15-18, 2011
Tim Frye	California Preservation Foundation Conference	3 days		
Pilar LaValley	California Preservation Foundation Conference	3 days	CPF, various presentations, tours	May 14-17, 2011 May 14-17, 2011
Richard Sucre	California Preservation Conference, Santa Monica;	2 days	CPF, various presenters/speakers	May 12-15, 2011
	Understanding Design; Guidelines, San Francisco	1 day	California Preservation Foundation	August 18, 2011
	Historic Register Designation	1 day	California Preservation Foundation	November 10,

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

Tina Tam	& Documentation, San Francisco American Planning Association National Conference – Boston, MA;	4 days	California Preservation Foundation	2011 April 9-12, 2011
Michael Smith Tara Sullivan	National Preservation Conference – Buffalo, NY	4 days	Modern Architecture in Historic Context, Women in Planning Director Positions Frank Loyd Wright Historic Restoration and Rehabilitation Projects	October 19-22, 2011
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.

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
Please refer to Attached chart.			

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

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.

Area	Context Based-yes/no	Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive	Acreage	# of Properties Surveyed	Date Completed	Date Submitted to OHP
Please refer to Attached chart.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.

How are you using the survey data? *The Department uses survey data to develop a wide range of preservation measures that may include: nominations to historic registers; historic design guidelines and standards; transfer-of-development-rights programs; rehabilitation/reuse case studies; and economic incentives programs. Preservation measures that are selected for further development and implementation will be those that are determined to be most effective in achieving preservation actions within the framework of the overall goals and objectives of the General Plan and Area Plans.*

C. Corrections or changes to Inventory

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

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

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

A. Public Education

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

Item or Event	Description	Date
Please refer to attached chart.		Type here.

V. National Park Service Baseline Questionnaire for new CLGs (certified after September 30, 2010).

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 CLG inventory as of September 30, 2010? 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 report year. Type here.

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

1. As of September 30, 2010, 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
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, 2010? Type here.

C. Local Tax Incentives Program

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

1. As of September 30, 2010, 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, 2010? *Type here.*

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

1. As of September 30, 2010, 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, 2010? *Type here.*

E. Local Design Review/Regulatory Program

1. As of September 30, 2010, 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, 2010? *Type here.*

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

1. As of September 30, 2010, 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
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, 2010?

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

Type here.

VI. Additional Information for National Park Service Annual Products Report for CLGs (certified before September 30, 2010).

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, 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
Showplace Square, Inner Mission North, South Mission, South of Market, and Glen Park Surveys	Approximately 3,024 historic properties, including contributors to eligible districts.

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

(This information is captured under I.B. above.)

C. Local Tax Incentives Program

1. During the reporting period did you have a Local Tax Incentives Program, such as the Mills Act? Yes No

2. If the answer is yes, how many properties have been assisted under the program(s)?

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
None during the reporting period.	Type here.

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

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

1. During the reporting period, did you have a local government historic preservation grants/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)? Type here.

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
Type here.	Type here.

E. Design Review/Local Regulatory Program

1. During the reporting period, 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, then, during the reporting period, how many historic properties did your local government review for compliance with your local government’s Historic preservation regulatory law(s)? The total number of Certificates of Appropriateness and the total number of Permits to Alter reviewed during the reporting period was 243.

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

1. During the reporting period, 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

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

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
Type here.	Type here.

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

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

- A. What is the current status of preservation in your community? *Discussions around the balance of historic preservation policies with other City policies, as well as issues surrounding the conservation of neighborhood character remain the two most critical planning issues of concern to the Board of Supervisors and its constituency.*
- B. What are the most critical preservation planning issues? *Since the creation of the Historic Preservation Commission, there has been a steady increase in discussions about San Francisco's Historic Preservation Program and how historic preservation policies are balanced with the City's other priority policies. In May of 2011, at the request of San Francisco District 8 Supervisor, Soctt Wiener, the Board of Supervisors convened an informational hearing on the status of San Francisco's Historic Preservation program and its impact on other City policies, such as affordable housing, pedestrian safety, recreation and open space, etc. The Planning Department presented at the hearing along with the representatives from the Mayor's Office of Housing, Recreation and Parks Department, Metropolitan Transit Authority, and San Francisco Public Libraries. Since the hearing, SPUR, a local not-for-profit planning and policy organization, and San Francisco Architectural Heritage have convened a task force to address the issues raised at the hearing. Some topics include, Historic Resource Surveys, Community Outreach and Education, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and, CEQA. As the taskforce continues its discussion, the Planning Department participates in task force meetings and provides technical assistance regarding the topics. Another critical preservation planning issue is the review of amendments to Articles 10 & 11. Please see Section IA for more information.*
- C. What is the single accomplishment of your local government this year that has done the most to further preservation in your community? *The Historic Preservation Commission, under the authority given to it in the Charter, adopted scopes of work and procedures for the review and approval of "Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness" in Article 10 and "Minor Permits to Alter" in Article 11 Conservation Districts at the staff level. These procedures were adopted in the fall of 2010 and the spring of 2011, and have expedited the review and approval routine permit applications that meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The delegation allows the Historic Preservation Commission to focus on larger, more complex projects, as well as pressing policy issues, such as the proposed amendments to Articles 10 and 11. Over the past year the Planning Department has also substantially increased its outreach to the public. This outreach has become a well-received component for the proposed Landmark Districts identified on the Landmark Designation Work*

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

Program. It has proved to be an effective tool in an effort to improve and facilitate communication City Agencies, Commissions, and the public. Outreach activities also include "Ask a Planner" nights at local cafes in or near to Landmark Districts where homeowners may meet with a Preservation Planner after core work hours to answer general preservation questions or specific Planning Code or project-related issues.

- D. What recognition are you providing for successful preservation projects or programs? *The Planning Department does not currently have a recognition program.*
- E. How did you meet or not meet the goals identified in your annual report for last year? *The Planning Department was able to complete the Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan Surveys, streamline and update the CEQA historic resource evaluation process, and obtain outside funding for historic preservation work activities. The Department is still working with all interested parties in the revisions/amendments to Articles 10 & 11 of the Planning Code as well as the revised storefront and sign design standards for Article 11 properties. The Planning Department is working towards bringing two Article 10 landmarks and one Article 10 Landmark District to the Historic Preservation Commission before the end of Fiscal year 2011 (June 30, 2011).*
- F. What are your local historic preservation goals for 2011-2012? *1) Work with all interested parties towards the adoption of a revised Articles 10 and 11 Planning Code; 2) Continue to work on the Historic Preservation Commission's Landmark Designation Work Program to bring properties forward for consideration of Landmark designation, either individually or as a district; 3) Increase the number of Mills Act contracts within San Francisco by streamlining the contract process and reducing application fees.*
- G. 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? *Development of community outreach strategies and materials regarding the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.*
- H. 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
----------------------------	-------------------------

Certified Local Government Program -- 2010-2011 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011)

Type here.	Type here.
------------	------------

I. 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
- Minutes from commission meetings
- Drafts of proposed changes to the ordinance
- Drafts of proposed changes to the General Plan
- Public outreach publications

Email Form

Email to lwoodward@parks.ca.gov

**San Francisco Planning Department
Historical Context Statements & Surveys**

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted
<i>Showplace Square Historic Context</i>	<i>The context statement focuses on the architectural and economic development of Showplace Square/northeast Mission, an industrial and commercial area. The document was produced by the Department.</i>	<i>The context statement guides Department survey activities within the Eastern Neighborhoods Showplace Square/Potrero and Mission Area planning area.</i>	<i>August 17, 2011</i>
<i>Glen Park Area Context</i>	<i>The context statement focuses on the architectural development of the core of the Glen Park neighborhood. The document was produced by the firm of Carey & Co. in conjunction with the Area Plan EIR.</i>	<i>The context statement guides Department survey activities within the Glen Park planning area.</i>	<i>October 19, 2011</i>

Survey Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted
<i>Showplace Square Survey</i>	<i>The study area covers approximately 124 blocks and includes the Showplace Square Area Plan and the northeast portion of the Mission Area Plan. The general boundaries of the study area are: 13th Street and Bryant Street to the north; 20th Street to the south; Folsom Street and Shotwell Street to the west; and 7th Street and Pennsylvania Street to the west</i>	<i>The survey guides Department survey activities within the Eastern Neighborhoods Showplace Square/Potrero and Mission Area planning area.</i>	<i>August 17, 2011</i>
<i>Inner Mission North 1853-1943, Survey Update</i>	<i>The study area covers approximately 30 square blocks and includes the northwest portion of the Mission Area Plan and a small portion of the Market & Octavia Area Plan. The general boundaries of the study area are: Duboce Avenue and Market Street to the north; 20th Street to the south; Folsom Street and Shotwell Street to the east; and Dolores Street to the west.</i>	<i>The survey guides Department survey activities within the Eastern Neighborhoods Mission planning area.</i>	<i>June 1, 2011</i>
<i>South of Market (SoMa) Survey</i>	<i>The study area includes approximately 60 blocks and covers the Eastern Neighborhoods East SoMa Area Plan and the Western SoMa Community Plan. The general boundaries of the survey area are Mission and Folsom Streets to the north; Bryant and Townsend Streets to the south, The Embarcadero to the east, and 13th and 7th Streets to the west</i>	<i>The survey guides Department survey activities within the Eastern Neighborhoods Mission planning area.</i>	<i>January 19, 2011</i>
<i>South Mission Survey</i>	<i>The survey area includes approximately 100 blocks and covers the southern portion of the Eastern Neighborhoods Mission Area Plan. The general boundaries of the survey area are 20th Street to the north (as well as several blocks north of 20th Street between Florida Street and Potrero Avenue), Cesar</i>	<i>The survey guides Department survey activities within the Eastern Neighborhoods Mission planning area.</i>	<i>November 17, 2010</i>

Survey Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted
	<i>Chavez Street to the south, Potrero Avenue to the east, and Guerrero Street to the west.</i>		
<i>Glen Park Area Survey</i>	<i>T The study area covers approximately 11 City blocks included in the Glen Park Community Plan. The general boundaries of the study area are: Chenery Street to the north; Bosworth St., Joost St. and San Jose Avenue to the south; Elk Street to the west; and Natick Street to the east.</i>	<i>The survey guides Department survey activities within the Glen Park planning area.</i>	<i>October 19, 2011</i>

San Francisco Planning Department Public Outreach, Education and Training

Date	Location	Topic	Planners	Quadrant	Requested By
01/28/11	SF Planning Dept, 1650 Mission St	Lecture: Inge Horton's Bay Area Women Architects	All	All	SF Planning Dept
04/20/11	Women's Building, 3543 18th St	Inner Mission North HRS Public Workshop	MW, TF, RS, NMC	SE	SF Planning Dept
04/23/11	Women's Building, 3543 18th St	Inner Mission North HRS Public Workshop	MW, TF	SE	SF Planning Dept
05/25/11	ReCology, 900 7th St	Showplace Square HRS Public Workshop	NMC, TF, RS	SE	SF Planning Dept
06/08/11	Upper Noe Recreation Center	Community Meeting: SF Planning Dept Preservation Program Overview	RS, MS	SW	Noe Valley Neighborhood Assc.
07/13/11	Coldwell Banker Main Office, 1699 Van Ness	Community Meeting: SF Planning Dept Preservation Program Overview	RS, TF	NE	Coldwell Bankers Realtors
07/16/11	Duboce Park	Duboce Park Walking Tour	MB, NMC	NW	SF Planning Dept
07/18/11	Harvey Milk Center, 50 Scott St	Community Meeting: Duboce Park Landmark District	MB, TF	NW	SF Planning Dept
08/16/11	Harvey Milk Center, 50 Scott St	Community Meeting: Duboce Park Landmark District	MB, TF	NW	SF Planning Dept
08/30/11	Duboce Park Café	Ask-A-Planner Night: Duboce Park Historic District	MB, TF	NW	SF Planning Dept
09/20/11	CPMC Hospital, Davies Campus	Community Meeting: Review of Proposed Landmark Designation Ordinance	MB, TF	NW	SF Planning Dept
09/27/11	Duboce Park Café	Ask-A-Planner Night: Duboce Park Historic District	MB	NW	SF Planning Dept