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Mayor's Office Budget Instructions

**Budgetary Focus**

Prioritize housing, shelter, and services for those in need

Healthy and vibrant neighborhoods

**Financial Joint Report**

Two-year deficit of ($419.5M)

Slowing revenue growth

Rising employee costs

**No New Positions**

Planning is not requesting any new positions

**General Fund Support Reduction**

(3.5%) reduction in adjusted General Fund Support in each budget year
Budget Transparency Legislation

- New requirements for Departments in the FY20-22 Budget Cycle
- Must hold one public meeting regarding budget before February 14th
- Allow public comment and collection of written feedback before, during, and after the meeting
  - Written feedback can be sent to Deborah.Landis@sfgov.org
- Controller will create and maintain a centralized website for relevant budget documents
10 Year Volume & Current Year Projection
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- Building Permits
- Referrals
- Enforcement
- Planning Cases

Graph showing yearly volumes with projections for the current year.
# Revenue Budget FY20-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues (All Funds)</th>
<th>FY19-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY20-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>FY21-22 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>$42,890,072</td>
<td>$45,101,622</td>
<td>$45,377,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Special Revenues</td>
<td>$1,938,500</td>
<td>$2,560,000</td>
<td>$1,030,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Impact Fees</td>
<td>$3,191,392</td>
<td>$4,187,150</td>
<td>$3,887,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Recovery</td>
<td>$2,132,371</td>
<td>$2,194,937</td>
<td>$2,163,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$5,513,149</td>
<td>$7,802,784</td>
<td>$8,598,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$55,665,484</td>
<td>$61,846,493</td>
<td>$61,057,944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Expenditure Budget FY20-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>FY19-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY20-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>FY21-22 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Fringe</td>
<td>$38,655,168</td>
<td>$40,725,334</td>
<td>$41,851,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$656,755</td>
<td>$656,755</td>
<td>$656,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Services</td>
<td>$3,139,484</td>
<td>$4,273,127</td>
<td>$4,563,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$555,065</td>
<td>$621,065</td>
<td>$471,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>$10,475</td>
<td>$10,220</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>$5,366,988</td>
<td>$7,663,140</td>
<td>$5,614,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services of Other Departments</td>
<td>$7,281,549</td>
<td>$7,896,852</td>
<td>$7,900,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,665,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,846,493</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,057,944</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Work Program Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/15</td>
<td>Draft budget and work program review with the Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23</td>
<td>Draft budget and work program review with the Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05</td>
<td>Request recommendation of approval of the budget and work program with the Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/13</td>
<td>Request approval of the budget and work program with the Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/21</td>
<td>Budget Submission to the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01</td>
<td>Mayor's Proposed Budget is published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>Budget considered at Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THANK YOU

Deborah Landis
Deputy Director of Administration
San Francisco Planning

Deborah.Landis@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org
Deliverable: Public Informational Handout
Why this project?

- Provide clarification for the public
- Facilitate communication between stakeholders (artists, property owners, community)
- Provide Planning guidance for projects involving murals
- Provide staff direction
Public Informational Handout

- Help inform the public about the steps and approvals required to paint murals on private property in SF
- Definitions (murals, signs, graffiti, etc.)
- FAQs
- Required planning approvals
- Recommended best practices
- Resources
What city agencies are involved with murals?

- Planning Department
- San Francisco Arts Commission
- Public Works
What does the code say?

- HPC review =
  - Anywhere in an Article 10 or 11 district and
  - Scope of work DOES NOT meet requirements of delegation
  - **No COA needed (HPC still must give advice to SFAC prior to SFAC approval)**

- SFAC review =
  - Any mural proposed for public property, regardless of historic status
  - Any mural that uses public funds, regardless of historic status
  - **Full COA needed (SFAC still must give advice to HPC prior to HPC approval)**
In sum...

- Always check the historic status of the property a new mural is proposed for on PIM.
- If it’s in an Article 10 or 11 district → contact Planning.
- For any new mural on public property or publicly funded → SFAC has final approval.
Thank you!
ORDINANCE NO. \[Planning Code - Landmark Designation - 4767-4773 Mission Street]\n
Ordinance amending the Planning Code to designate 4767-4773 Mission Street (Royal Baking Company), Assessor’s Block No. 6084, Lot No. 021, as a Landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

NOTE: Unchanged Code text and uncodified text are in plain Arial font. Additions to Codes are in single-underline italics Times New Roman font. Deletions to Codes are in strikethrough italics Times New Roman font. Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font. Board amendment deletions are in strikethrough Arial font. Asterisks (* * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

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

Section 1. Findings.

(a) CEQA and Land Use Findings.

(1) The Planning Department has determined that the Planning Code amendment proposed in this ordinance is subject to a Categorical Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., "CEQA") pursuant to Section 15308 of California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq., the Guidelines for implementation of the statute for actions by regulatory agencies for protection of the environment (in this case, landmark designation). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. ________________ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board of Supervisors affirms this determination.
Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed landmark designation of 4767-4773 Mission Street, Assessor’s Block No. 6084, Lot No. 021 ("Royal Baking Company"), will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set forth in Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. _________, recommending approval of the proposed designation, which is incorporated herein by reference.

The Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed landmark designation of the 4767-4773 Mission Street is consistent with the General Plan and with Planning Code Section 101.1(b) for the reasons set forth in Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. _________.

(b) General Findings.

(1) Pursuant to Charter Section 4.135, the Historic Preservation Commission has authority "to recommend approval, disapproval, or modification of landmark designations and historic district designations under the Planning Code to the Board of Supervisors."

(2) The Landmark Designation Fact Sheet was prepared by SF Heritage and Planning Department Preservation staff. All preparers meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for historic preservation program staff, as set forth in Code of Federal Regulations Title 36, Part 61, Appendix A. The report was reviewed for accuracy and conformance with the purposes and standards of Article 10 of the Planning Code.

(3) The Historic Preservation Commission, at its regular meeting of _______, reviewed Planning Department staff’s analysis of the historical significance of 4767-4773 Mission Street pursuant to Article 10 as part of the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet dated _________.

Historic Preservation Commission
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
(4) On November 19, 2019, the Board of Supervisors introduced a Resolution to initiate designation of 4767-4773 Mission Street as a San Francisco Landmark pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code. Said draft resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 191189 and is incorporated herein by reference.

(5) On February 5, 2020, after holding a public hearing on the proposed initiation, the Historic Preservation Commission initiated the proposed landmark designation of the 4767-4773 Mission Street by Resolution No. __________. Said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. __________.

(6) On __________, 2020, after holding a public hearing on the proposed designation and having considered the specialized analyses prepared by Planning Department staff and the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet, the Historic Preservation Commission recommended designation of 4767-4773 Mission Street as a landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code by Resolution No. __________. Said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. __________.

(7) The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that 4767-4773 Mission Street has a special character and special historical, architectural, and aesthetic interest and value, and that its designation as a Landmark will further the purposes of and conform to the standards set forth in Article 10 of the Planning Code. In doing so, the Board hereby incorporates by reference the findings of the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet.

Section 2. Designation.

Pursuant to Section 1004 of the Planning Code, 4767-4773 Mission Street (Royal Baking Company), Assessor's Block No. 6084, Lot No. 021, is hereby designated as a San Francisco Landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code. Appendix A to Article 10 of the Planning Code is hereby amended to include this property.
Section 3. Required Data.

(a) The description, location, and boundary of the Landmark site consists of the City parcel located at 4767-4773 Mission Street (Royal Baking Company), Assessor’s Block No. 6084, Lot No. 021, in San Francisco’s Excelsior neighborhood.

(b) The characteristics of the Landmark that justify its designation are described and shown in the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet and other supporting materials contained in Planning Department Record Docket No. 2019-022536DES. In brief, 4767-4773 Mission Street is eligible for local designation as it is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of San Francisco history and it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. Specifically, designation of 4767-4773 Mission Street is proper given its association with the history of the Italian-American community of San Francisco and that community’s early twentieth-century suburban expansion to the Excelsior District and for its association with San Francisco’s important twentieth century macaroni and bread-baking industries. Designation of 4767-4773 Mission Street is also proper given it is architecturally significant as a distinctive example of Storybook and Art Deco-style commercial architecture.

(c) The particular features that shall be preserved, or replaced in-kind as determined necessary, are those generally shown in photographs and described in the Landmark Designation Fact Sheet, which can be found in Planning Department Docket No. 2019-022536DES, and which are incorporated in this designation by reference as though fully set forth. Specifically, the following exterior features shall be preserved or replaced in kind:

All exterior elevations, form, massing, structure, rooflines, architectural ornament, and materials of 4767-4773 Mission Street identified as:

1. 4769 Mission Street

   (A) Two-story height;
(B) Primary west façade;
(C) Window and door openings;
(D) Flat roof with clay tile-clad parapet, decorative chimneys, shed roof dormer window opening;
(E) Multi-light casement wood window units, wood sills and trim;
(F) Stucco cladding;
(G) Shallow front gable; and
(H) Stone veneer bulkhead cladding.

(2) 4773 Mission Street

(A) Two-story massing;
(B) Primary west façade;
(C) Stucco cladding;
(D) Window and door openings;
(E) Pitched roof with three-pointed crown parapet:
(F) Decorative fins, speedlines and rounded corners;
(G) Recessed areas above outer bays;
(H) Painted Royal Baking Co. sign and shallow ornamental arch;
(I) Ceramic and terrazzo floor tile and recessed entry; and
(J) Green and yellow ceramic tile cladding bulkheads and piers.

Section 4. Effective Date.

This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not
sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the
Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

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

By:
ANDREA RUIZ-ESQUIDE
Deputy City Attorney
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