The historic old United States Mint at 5th and Mission continues to face an uncertain future. The Treasury Department closed “The Granite Lady,” which was home to the Old Mint Museum for ten years, in 1994, citing the high costs of maintaining the 120-year old building. In response, the National Trust placed this National Historic Landmark (so designated in 1966) on its list of America’s 11 most endangered historic places.

Mayor Jordan quickly appointed a committee of community leaders to study possible new uses for the Old Mint, and Friends of the Mint, a nonprofit community organization, began raising money to fund planning for its reuse. The mayor’s committee recommended development of an Old Mint Gold Rush Museum, with a cafe and a retail shop.

With a change of administration in City Hall soon after, the plans went into limbo. The Treasury Department has since transferred the property to the General Services Administration (GSA), the Federal Government’s landlord, which is now prepared to dispose of the building as surplus property.

The City of San Francisco is seeking to acquire the Old Mint but has not identified (at least, not publicly) its plans for the use of the building. It will, however, likely pursue a partnership with a private developer in an arrangement similar to that for the Ferry Building. Disposal of historic federal properties requires a Section 106 Review, which has begun in San Francisco with the State Office of Historic Preservation, the President’s Advisory Council, the National Park Service, the National Trust, California Preservation, the Landmarks Board and Heritage, among others, as participants in the process.

When asked how it arrived at the decision to dispose of the mint, especially in light of the President’s 1996 Executive Order encouraging federal agencies to locate their facilities in historic inner city properties, the GSA cited the high cost of rehabilitation and seismic and other upgrades. They contend that it would be too expensive for any use government could make of the Old Mint.

Because it is a National Historic Landmark, any transfer of the Old Mint will include covenants or other restrictions to ensure its preservation, such as requiring use of the State Historic Building Code and rehabilitation or restoration according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The City and the GSA are in discussion over the language for such a transfer.

The last time the government declared the mint surplus, in 1968, real estate speculators were eager to acquire it, with an eye to demolishing it and developing the site. No such threats loom at this time. However, uncertainty surrounding the future use and treatment of this important resource, which is said to require substantial seismic upgrade, is a source of concern, particularly if the City decides to include it, as it did the Emporium, in the voracious Yerba Buena Redevelopment Area.

President Nixon took the old mint out of the speculative real estate arena, in 1972, when he transferred it to the Bureau of the Mint for “restoration and public enjoyment.” Following an interior restoration, the building reopened, in 1973, as a museum and the West Coast office of the Bureau’s numismatic sales division.

—continued on page 11, column 1
Comments from the Executive Director

Buildings and Process in the Neighborhoods: A Question of Integrity

In the last issue of Heritage News, I commented on the consequences of the City’s failure to follow established process for the Emporium project. The erosion of San Francisco’s historic resources happens every day, and not only with large newsworthy projects like the Emporium development or the loss of the Jewish Community Center at California and Presidio, that now seems likely. It also happens on a small scale in our commercial and residential neighborhoods. Two recent examples illustrate how minor alterations have the potential for a negative cumulative effect, and how a prospective demolition energized neighborhood participation.

First, a recent case before the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board approved the removal of original windows for vinyl replacements from a contributing building within the Alamo Square Historic District. Absent any vocal neighborhood concern, the board reasoned the building had already been altered with the application of stucco, and, therefore, another change was not any more significant.

Heritage argued that an individual alteration may seem inconsequential, but questioned the cumulative effect on the building and the continued loss of quality and character-defining features of the surrounding historic district. The previous poor decision to stucco warranted another to allow replacement windows. One has to question how many changes an individual structure can tolerate before it is deemed non-contributory and its demolition permitted.

Second is the case of 2694 McAllister, at Willard Street, a small residential structure built in 1885. Proposed development of an adjacent site focused neighborhood attention on the potential loss of this, an adjacent structure and two grand trees. Active and involved neighbors working with the property owners/developers and San Francisco’s Zoning Administrator, Larry Badiner, found a way to allow future development and preservation of the historic residence.

A cooperative endeavor resulted in a variance that included conservation and preservation easements to protect the landscape and buildings. The Friends of the Urban Forest and San Francisco Architectural Heritage are working with the property owners to fulfill the easement requirements of the zoning variance. The net result will be a positive preservation effort, saving the historic qualities while providing for appropriate new residential development.

The moral, if there is one, is that historic neighborhoods and districts need to be recognized. There must be consistent application of established zoning, planning and design regulations intended to protect what we like about our residential neighborhoods and commercial historic districts, if we are to maintain their livability and extend the life of our buildings. It requires concerned, active participation by neighbors and the support of established private sector organizations to find positive solutions. No longer can we expect elected or appointed boards and commissions to listen to singular voices.

Charles Edwin Chase, AIA
Executive Director
Planning Commission Denies Demolition Permit

In September, the Planning Commission took discretionary review in the case of 1306 Tenth Avenue and denied the project sponsor’s application for demolition.

Neighbors who had filed for the review solicited Heritage’s assistance. We supported the request to deny demolition in a letter to the commissioners, citing Proposition M priority planning policies in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code that call for preservation of existing housing and neighborhood character. Heritage suggested that the project sponsor consider rehabilitation of the existing building and a rear addition to achieve the development objective.

Although not individually of high architectural significance, the two-story over garage residence does contribute to the streetscape and is contextually important as one of a group of three nearly identical residences built by the same developer. Records indicate a water connection for the property in June 1904, and the 1905 Sanborn Map shows all three structures in place (1306, 1310 and 1314 Tenth Avenue).

That date is early for this portion of the Inner Sunset, whose development intensified only after the 1906 earthquake and fire led to resettlement in the city’s suburban neighborhoods. The builders of the three residences were Eugene B. Hallett and William S. Gee, prolific residential developers in the Richmond and Sunset districts.

Architecturally, 1306 Tenth Avenue, like its two neighbors, closely resembles a classical American “Four Square,” a modest type of house constructed throughout American cities and suburbs from the early 20th century into the early ’30s. The reserved exterior features include Classical Revival dentil moldings and simple brackets that run around the house at the hip roof line, and brackets at the dormer roof. More elaborate moldings may have originally framed the windows, possibly removed when asbestos siding was applied.

Samuels Clock Back in Action

At 12:30, on November 20, the media joined a small crowd gathered at the Samuels Clock at 856 Market Street. The mayor appeared to unveil the stately street timepiece (San Francisco Landmark #77), restored to working order after many years by Jack Wittenmyer and his band of volunteers, the Market Street Timekeepers, with the support of the Flood Building management. In setting the pendulum in motion, Mayor Brown paid tribute to the civic spirit of the Timekeepers and Mr. James Flood, and invoked the memory of Herb Caen, long a champion of the clock’s cause.

Agreement Preserves House and Trees on McAllister

Two small 19th century houses and two noble trees on outer McAllister Street have recently become the subject of a compromise preservation agreement. Heritage reviewed the house at 2686 McAllister Street when the owner applied for a demolition permit earlier this year. Upon discovering that the cottage had undergone unsympathetic interior alteration and suffered considerable structural deterioration under previous ownership, we raised no objection to its demolition, even though it appears in the survey published in 1968 as Here Today.

Plans to develop the property raised neighborhood concern that two large trees, a bay and a buckeye, on the adjacent lot—2694 McAllister—that have overgrown the site might have to be removed or might suffer damage during construction. The owner’s wish to develop 2694 also drew the interest of preservationists wishing to protect the saltbox house, a type rare in San Francisco characterised by a long roof pitch at the rear.

The owners of the two properties themselves proposed a solution that addresses community concerns. This would include locating the new building at 2686 McAllister about 37 feet back from the front property line and providing access to the construction site over the rear portion of the property at 2694, in order better to protect the trees during construction. Subdividing the property at 2694 into two lots will allow the owner to build a new two-unit residential building fronting on Willard Street and make it feasible to rehabilitate the saltbox house on the corner and preserve both trees.

This creative solution requires a rear yard variance for both properties, which the Planning Department granted this fall. At the request of the Little House Committee, a group that advocates preservation of historic cottages in the city’s neighborhoods, the Planning Department included as a condition of the variances the granting of preservation easements for the house and for the two trees at 2694 McAllister. Heritage has indicated its willingness to accept an easement on the house, and Friends of the Urban Forest would hold the easement on the trees.
Landmarks Board Settles on Work Program for 2000-2001

In October, the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board made a final determination of its work program for the fiscal year, 2000-2001. Since we last reported on this in the July/August issue of Heritage News, the board has digested input from many sources to arrive at a list of 13 properties to be considered for landmark designation.

The final program illustrates the board’s concern to recognize more sites that reflect the city’s cultural diversity and to increase designations in neighborhoods currently underrepresented on the list of landmarks. In the latter category are the sundial and gates at Ingleside Terrace (whose consideration was requested by the home owners), a historic 19th century fire house in Ocean View (also owner-proposed), the Royal Bakery on outer Mission Street and the Glen Park Bart Station, the only contemporary building on the list.

Three sites have associations with San Francisco’s Japanese American community. They are the Japanese Language School at 2031 Bush Street, the Minichi Kokubei Newspaper, 1746 Post Street, and the historic Lick Baths at 165 10th Street, later operated as the People’s Laundry by a Japanese American family for 50 years.

The remainder of the list reflects overriding historic and architectural considerations. These include two houses dating from the 1860s, listed in Here Today: the Captain Adams House on Potrero Hill, whose owner has indicated an interest in landmark designation, and the Price House at 1268 Lombard Street.

Completing the work program are the Chronicle Building at 5th and Mission Streets, Children’s Hospital, and the City-owned Juvenile Court and Detention Building, a highrise of exceptional character by Louis Christian Mullgardt (150 Otis Street). Although there is no potential historic district on the list, the board will seek preparation of a context statement for cottages. This item reflects the concerns of many neighborhoods in which older, small vernacular houses are being demolished to make way for more intensive new development. Among the most noteworthy is an interesting enclave of five cottages at 1338 Filbert Street, whose owner is considering development opportunities.

Supervisors Turn Down Jewish Community Center Nomination

It came as no surprise when the Planning Commission voted to reject the recommendation of the Landmarks Board to designate the Jewish Community Center as a city landmark. The 5-0 decision (two commissioners were absent) followed a long period of public testimony on both sides, at the October 5th meeting, but without comment or discussion among the commissioners themselves.

The Art Deco Society filed an appeal of the commission’s decision to the Board of Supervisors, which heard the matter on November 20. After a lengthy session, the supervisors voted to uphold the Planning Commission’s disapproval of the designation.

Only Supervisor Bierman dissented, stating that it was wrong to denigrate the building in order to win approval of its demolition. She said the JCC is a lovely building that needs upgrading, “but to make the argument it has no soul or no history does not wash.” There are alternatives to demolition.

Public testimony from those supporting demolition of the JCC produced nothing new. We heard the same points made from the start. Most of the opposition focused on the fact that the building is outdated and inadequate for the JCC’s programs. There is no doubt this is true, but a thoughtful, creative rehabilitation project combined with new construction would remedy each of the deficiencies. Yet it has become evident, unfortunately, that there was no will on the part of the project sponsor to preserve the building.

There was never any satisfactory refutation of the Landmarks Board’s finding that the building is significant and merits designation as a landmark. The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors voted as though the considered judgment of the one panel best qualified to evaluate the architectural and historical value of the building were of no consequence.

Gratitude is due to the Art Deco Society of California, whose board voted to seek the appeal before the Board of Supervisors, and to the many members of the public who supported the effort. We welcome their active participation in the preservation arena.
Chinatown YWCA Begins Conversion to Chinese American Historical Museum

On October 4, 2000, the Chinese Historical Society of America (CHSA) held a Renovation Kickoff Celebration for the new Chinese American National Museum, at the City Landmark Chinatown YWCA at 965 Clay Street. Located on the corner of Clay and Joice Streets in San Francisco, the building was designed in 1930 and completed in 1932 by architect Julia Morgan. Centrally located between historic Nob Hill and Chinatown, the building adjoins the YWCA Residence Hall (940 Powell Street), which Morgan had designed earlier.

The Chinatown YWCA is a complex, multi-tiered structure punctuated by three Chinese towers with wooden spires. The 9,500 square-foot building varies in height from one to three stories on the steep slope of Clay Street, with the large barrel-vaulted gymnasium at the lower side of the hill.

The building consists of brick bearing walls with exposed wooden beams supporting the roof. In the gymnasium, a lamella vaulted roof consisting of wooden members forming diamond-shaped patterns spans the column-free space. The horizontal thrust is taken by the use of tie rods at the top of the brick wall, which receives the lamella construction.

In designing the Chinatown YWCA, Morgan integrated Chinese motifs with the framework of Western architecture. Details include crenellation with ceramic roof tiles imported from China, decorative wall panels, a cast-stone arch with leaded glazing, and a circular cast-stone window with steel sash. At the interior, the Chinatown YWCA and the Residence Club share a traditional Chinese courtyard, flanked by a glass-walled corridor in the YWCA.

The Chinatown YWCA holds special significance among second generation Chinese American women. During the 1930s and 1940s, the institution provided the means and opportunity for them to meet, to acquire professional and leadership skills, and to learn the importance of voting and the democratic process. At the YWCA, many of these women interacted with people outside of the Chinese community for the first time.

Founded in 1963, the Chinese Historical Society of America is the oldest and largest not-for-profit organization dedicated to fostering an understanding of the Chinese experience in the United States through research, documentation, interpretation and education. CHSA has the largest collection of Chinese American artifacts in the country. After thirty-six years of planning, the society is on the verge of realizing its dream of opening a Chinese American National Museum and Learning Center in the heart of San Francisco Chinatown.

CHSA’s project includes three phases of work. Currently, at a cost of $1.4 million, Phase I will complete seismic upgrades, ADA, code requirements and exhibition spaces. Phases II and III are estimated to cost $1.3 million and $4 million, respectively, over the course of the next five years. These long-term goals provide for optimal restoration and preservation of the 965 Clay Street building and new construction on an adjoining lot at 233 Joice Street to create a state-of-the-art learning center.

In a public/private partnership with the City and County of San Francisco and the California State Legislature, CHSA, foundations, corporate sponsors and many private contributors are working towards a complete Chinese American National Museum. Contribu—continued on page 8, column
When the elaborately ornamented architecture of the Victorian era fell out of favor early in the 20th century, many homeowners removed offending gingerbread—offending as often because of maintenance issues as aesthetic ones. Frequently this “modernization” included the application of a smooth skin to the exterior, such as stucco or asbestos siding.

This predilection was confined largely to residential architecture; most of the commercial Victorian architecture downtown succumbed to the 1906 earthquake and fire. The urge to modernize office buildings appeared around mid-century, when the Beaux-Arts idiom that predominated in the rebuilt downtown began to appear outdated, and building owners sought a “permanent” solution to exterior maintenance problems. Some impetus came from the appearance of the Crown Zellerbach Company’s glass curtainwall skyscraper at One Bush Street, and a small crop of other new buildings in 1959-1960, that introduced Modernism to the financial district.

Most often, the solution for owners who wanted a modern office building was to demolish the existing structure and build anew. There are noteworthy exceptions to this rule, with the result that certain buildings that appear to be modern are in fact merely masquerading. Like the modernized Victorian homes, these have lost their ornamental detail, belt courses and projecting cornices, and a sleek new skin conceals any other exterior evidence of the building’s real provenance.

Completed in 1908, the 15-story David Hewes Building still dominates its neighborhood at the southeast corner of 6th and Market Street, but the face it presents to the street today is the result of a remodel in the late 1950s. The “miserable and removable veneer” of sheet metal panels (in the words of Splendid Survivors) conceals a structure whose original Reid Brothers design was “a three part vertical composition with a rusticated mezzanine over a glass base, a smooth shaft, and an elaborate capital with a giant order over a transitional story.”

Removal of the wide cornice offered the opportunity for the construction of an additional floor. A three-story 1922 addition on 6th Street, also by the Reid Brothers, received the same remodel as the tower. Viewing the east face of the Hewes Building tower from Stevenson Street, which was spared the porcelain cladding, gives a sense of what was and what might be, if the owners were to undertake a restoration of this historic building.

At 690 Market Street, in another example of architectural cross-dressing, a veneer of porcelain enameled metal panels conceals what Splendid Survivors calls “one of the great architectural treasures of San Francisco.” In 1888, M.H. De Young, publisher of the Chronicle, commissioned the firm of Burnham & Root to design a headquarters for his newspaper. The celebrated Chicago firm produced a Romanesque Revival structure, with a massive clock tower on the roof. It was the first steel-
frame building in the West and San Francisco’s first skyscraper.

In 1905, Willis Polk, working for Burnham, designed a 16-story addition fronting on Kearny Street and an additional two floors for the older building. This construction was underway when the 1906 earthquake struck. According to the United States Geological Survey, the buildings withstood the earthquake reasonably well. Failure of the west wall in the older building was the result of fire damage.

Polk took on the reconstruction. The tower, said to have housed the world’s largest clock and removed during construction, was not rebuilt nor was the slightly projecting bay on the original west wall. The lower two floors of both buildings were faced in sandstone with terra cotta above. A photo showing the building in the course of its 1962-63 remodel indicates the removal of cornices, belt courses and the projecting bay at the juncture of the two unequal and slightly offset wings that face Geary and Market Street. The architect for the alteration was Hagman & Meyer, of Menlo Park.

Splendid Survivors concludes its entry on the Chronicle Building with this wistful observation: “The restoration of this building, one of the most important buildings in the city, would be a great civic gesture, comparable in its own way to its original construction, which was intended and accepted as an object of beauty and a source of pride.”

In the January 1926 issue of Motor Land magazine, the California State Automobile Association announced the opening of “the country’s finest automobile club service headquarters,” at 150 Van Ness Avenue. Prominent San Francisco architect George Kelham provided an architectural motif in which the “freedom and romance of sunny Spain combine with the more staid and refined detail of the Italian Renaissance.”

Today, a curtainwall of the by now familiar porcelain enameled metal panels covers the original cast stone finish, which is just visible through some of the clear panels of the newer skin. Austere rectilinear framing has replaced the rich plateresque treatment of the Van Ness Avenue entry, and replacement of the red tile hipped roof with a flat roof increased the useable space on the 7th floor.
Porcelain Enamel Suited Modernist Architects

Porcelain enamel, also known as vitreous enamel, is a thin coating of glass fused to metal (most commonly iron, steel or aluminum) at extremely high temperatures. While the technique of bonding glassy material to metal has a long history, in the making of jewelry and other art objects, the application of porcelain enamel to sheet steel first occurred in Austria and Germany in the middle of the 19th century. German immigrants helped to introduce the process to the United States in the last quarter of that century.

The use of porcelain enamel in the manufacture of kitchenware, appliances and bathroom fixtures became widespread by the 1920s. Later in that decade, the White Castle pioneered the use of porcelain enamel sheets in the design of its chain restaurants. Its success prompted the industry to market the material for other building types, including gas stations, that sought to project an image of modernity.

By late in the 1930s, a large number of companies were selling architectural porcelain enamel panels. The material, available in a variety of finishes and textures, attracted architects because of its flatness, color permanence and resistance to weathering and abrasion.

Modernists, with their preference for clean unadorned lines and mass produced, prefabricated materials, were particularly receptive to porcelain enamel. They appreciated its durability and ease of maintenance. In a design of the early 1950s that helped define corporate modernism, Eero Saarinen, devised one of the first true porcelain enamel curtainwall systems for the General Motors Technical Center, in Warren, Michigan.

Author to Address Members’ Meeting

Heritage will host a meeting for its members at the Haas-Lilienthal House, Wednesday, January 24, 6:00 to 8:00 pm. There will be a report on the organization’s activities since the annual meeting in June, and members will have the opportunity to ask questions.

We are pleased to announce that Peter Booth Wiley, author of the recently published National Trust Guide San Francisco, will address the meeting. His illustrated lecture, through which he hopes to engage the audience in a discussion of their experiences with preservation, is titled, “An Outline History of the Architectural Preservation Effort in San Francisco.”

A journalist and historian, Mr. Wiley has served as an associate editor and staff reporter for Pacific News Service, and, with Bob Gottlieb, wrote a syndicated newspaper column covering the western United States and the Pacific Basin. Wiley and Gottlieb co-authored two books, Empires in the Sun: The Rise of the New American West and America’s Saints: The Rise of the Mormon Power. Wiley also took part as a researcher and writer in the production of a prize-winning public television documentary on the Mormon Church.

Other books by Peter Wiley include Yankees in the Land of the Gods: Commodore Perry and the Opening of Japan and A Free Library in This City: An Illustrated History of the San Francisco Public Library.

Not intended for the typical tourist, National Trust Guide San Francisco is geared to the growing segment of travelers interested in architecture and history. The book’s introductory portion consists of seven chapters that cover what Wiley calls “the geographical transformation of the city and its history.”

An account of the city’s architectural history, drawn in very broad strokes, introduces the tour section of the book, which includes thirteen routes, all but one designed for walking or public transit. Only the final tour, of the western portion of the city, is a driving tour.

Arrangement of tours of the city’s districts and neighborhoods, with maps that clearly delineate the routes, is roughly in the order of their historical development, beginning with the “Gold Rush City.” A brief essay—anywhere from a few paragraphs to several pages—prefaces each tour, describing the history and character of the area’s development. Historical and contemporary photographs, most of the latter by the author himself, illuminate the text.

Members will receive formal notice of the meeting in the mail. Call to reserve space, 415-441-3000, or e-mail info@sfheritage.org.

Donate Stocks or Mutual Funds for Added Tax Savings

Contributions to Heritage will cost you less if you transfer appreciated stock or mutual funds rather than writing a check. To get this benefit, you direct your brokerage company to transfer to Heritage shares that you have held at least one year.

Heritage’s account number at Charles Schwab & Co. is SF3403-7450; the account is under our original name: Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage. There should be no charge to you for the transfer. To avoid having your shares land in our account mysteriously, please call to inform us of the gift.

Why transfer shares? Appreciated long-term capital gain property is the ideal charitable contribution because you can deduct the property (shares of stock or mutual funds) on your income tax return at the fair market value, without paying tax on the built-up appreciation. Since Heritage pays no tax on the sale due to our tax exempt status, no one ever pays the tax on the appreciation.

What if you prefer owning those shares but want to make an advantageous donation? Just donate the old shares and replace them with newly purchased shares. Although this could mean you incur a commission, you are otherwise better off: you have rid yourself of shares with a big long-term gain, and you have the same number of new shares with a basis equal to the price at today’s purchase date.

Help Heritage Meet Challenge Grant

A generous donor, who has asked to be anonymous, has presented Heritage with a challenge grant. If we can raise $30,000 in new contributions by January 15, 2001, the donor will give us $10,000. We are asking for your help.

To date we have raised $12,000 toward that goal. While our members and friends continue to be generous in their support, the increasing cost of doing business in San Francisco has placed a great strain on this year’s budget. Meeting this challenge would be a great boost for Heritage.

Please give whatever you can. All contributions are tax deductible, to the full extent allowed by law. Although the deadline for meeting the challenge grant is January 15, remember that if you are looking for tax benefits for this year, you must make your donation before December 31, 2000. You may send a check, or call 415-441-3000 to use your credit card.
**Bay Area Tours**

**ALLIED ARTS GUILD**  
Menlo Park  
Tours Call 650-322-2405

**CAMRON-STANFORD HOUSE**  
Oakland  
Tours Call 510-836-1976

**CITY GUIDES WALKS**  
San Francisco  
Tours Call 415-557-4266

**COHEN-BRAY HOUSE**  
Oakland  
Tours Call 510-532-0704

**FALKIRK VICTORIAN ESTATE**  
San Rafael  
Tours Call 415-485-3328

**DUNSMUIR HOUSE & GARDENS**  
Oakland (April - September)  
Tours Call 510-615-5555

**LATHROP HOUSE**  
Redwood City  
Tours Call 650-365-5564

**LUTHER BURBANK HOME & GARDENS**  
Santa Rosa  
Tours Call 707-524-5445

**MCCONAGHY HOUSE**  
Hayward  
Tours Call 510-276-3010

**OAKLAND TOURS PROGRAM**  
Call 510-238-3234

**OCTAGON HOUSE**  
San Francisco  
Tours Call 415-441-7512

**PALO ALTO-STANFORD HERITAGE**  
Tours Call 650-299-8878 or 324-3121

**PARDEE HOME MUSEUM**  
Oakland  
Tours Call 510-444-2187

**STRYBING ARBORETUM**  
Golden Gate Park, San Francisco  
Tours Call 415-661-1316, ext. 312

**Continuing Heritage Events**

**HAAS-LILIENTHAL HOUSE TOURS**  
Sundays 11 am to 4:00 pm  
Wednesdays 12 noon to 3:00 pm. $5

**PACIFIC HEIGHTS WALKING TOUR**  
Sundays 12:30 pm. $5

*All regular Heritage tours are free to Heritage members and their guests*

**GROUP TOURS BY ARRANGEMENT**  
Call Natasha Glushkoff, 415-441-3000

**FOR INFORMATION ABOUT CURRENT HERITAGE EVENTS**  
Call 415-441-3004

*Heritage programs supported in part by City of San Francisco Grants for the Arts.*

**January**

Through January 14, Exhibition of the works of Beniamino Bufano. Museo Italo-Americano, Fort Mason. 415-673-2200

Through March 4  
Exhibition: *Selections from the Permanent Collection of Architecture and Design*, SFMOMA  
415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org

Through March 4  
Photo Exhibition: *Hiroshi Sugimoto: The Architecture Series*. SFMOMA  
415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org

**January 1 - July 8**  
Exhibition online & in the galleries: *01.01.01: Art in Technological Times*. SFMOMA. 415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org

**January 9, 7:15 pm**  
Celebration of San Franciscans of Scottish Descent. San Francisco Historical Society. 415-775-1111; www.sfhistory.org

**January 20 - March 17**  
Neighborhood historical/architectural walks Saturdays, 10 am (no tour 2/17)  
SF Historical Society. 415-775-1111; www.sfhistory.org

**January 25, 7:30 pm**  
Lecture on Daly City. San Francisco History Association. 415-750-9986

**February**

February 13, 8:00 pm  
Lecture on the Mission District  
San Francisco Historical Society  
415-775-1111; www.sfhistory.org

February 13, 8:00 pm  
Slide lecture: *The American Wing: 75 Years of Collecting American Furniture*. American Decorative Arts Forum. 415-249-9234

February 22, 7:30 pm  
Lecture on Drake’s Bay. San Francisco History Association. 415-750-9986

**March**

March 10 - May 27  
Exhibition: *Toulouse-Lautrec & the Spirit of Montmartre*  
Legion of Honor. 415-863-3330; www.thinker.org

March 13, 8:00 pm  
Lecture on California women’s political history, 1868-1915. SF Historical Soc. 415-775-1111; www.sfhistory.org

March 13, 8:00 pm  

March 22, 7:30 pm  
Lecture on China Camp. San Francisco History Association. 415-750-9986

March 30 - June 24  
Exhibition: *Allan Wexler: Custom Built*. SFMOMA. 415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org
Old Mint
continued from page 1

Exterior restoration continued over the next three years, with cleaning and repair or replacement of stone facing and replacement of mortar. New cornices and frieze sections cast in fiberglass replaced those elements removed in the mid-1960s for seismic safety, and restored the building’s historic appearance.

The Old Mint would appear on any short list of San Francisco’s most important buildings. Like the first Palace Hotel, which began construction a few blocks away as the mint was nearing completion, the Granite Lady was a monument to the Silver Age. Congress first authorized a mint in San Francisco in 1852, as a subsidiary of the Philadelphia Mint, to handle the increasing volume of ore from the gold fields.

Within ten years, the hoard of silver from the Nevada mines began to strain the facility’s limited capacity, and the government made plans for a new mint in the city, acquiring the site at 5th and Mission in 1867. Construction began two years later according to plans by Alfred B. Mullett, assistant supervising architect of the Treasury Department in Washington, D.C.

The then, “new” mint opened in 1874, independent of Philadelphia, and it soon became the principal mint in the country. In 1877, it minted about $50 million of the total of $83.9 million in gold and silver coins that the nation produced that year.

The Granite Lady survived 1906 with minor earthquake damage, and heroic efforts by mint staff and soldiers, who tapped wells in the building’s courtyard, held off the fire that destroyed nearly every building in the neighborhood. The gold reserves in the mint’s vaults helped stimulate the city’s recovery. The present mint on Duboce Avenue took over coining in 1937, and various government agencies occupied the old mint for the next 30 years.

Fabulous Party

You will not want to miss Soirée 2001; so mark your calendar now: Friday, April 27. Look for details in the next issue of Heritage News.

Architectural Fragments

A two-phase campaign is under way to raise $50.7 million for the preservation and restoration of California’s missions. The California Missions Foundation is currently seeking major donations from individual and corporate sources in the first phase; a second phase will solicit donations from the public. A kick-off gift of $500,000 from the Hearst Foundation has already made it possible to grant funds for several emergency projects, including $25,000 to halt a beetle infestation at San Francisco’s Mission Dolores. Go to the website <www.missionsofcalifornia.org>, to learn how to contribute, or write California Missions Foundation, 5 Third Street, #528, San Francisco, CA 94103.

On November 2, the National Trust for Historic Preservation presented its preservation awards in a ceremony during the Trust’s annual conference in Los Angeles. Awards for preserving, rehabilitating, restoring and interpreting America’s architectural and cultural heritage went to 21 recipients in 13 states. Local honorees include the Kimpton Hotels, of San Francisco: “A hotel operator that practices preservation-minded rehabilitation”; and Stanford University: “Its 10-year seismic strengthening program restored 85 historic buildings.” The Trustee Emeritus Award for Excellence in the Stewardship of Historic Sites went to The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America (owner of San Francisco’s Octagon House), “for leading private preservation efforts nationwide since 1891.”

The 106th Congress has concluded its business without passing the Historic Homeowners Tax Credit. The proposal garnered 39 sponsors in the Senate and 226 in the House, but late negotiations resulted in its being dropped from the omnibus tax package. Nevertheless, encouraged by their progress in winning support, preservation advocates will be reintroducing the measure in the next Congress.
KEEP THOSE GIFTS COMING!

Heritage is planning to stage a fantastic silent auction at next year’s Soirée. The annual fund raiser will take place on April 27, 2001, in a swank, newly rehabilitated premier hotel, to be announced soon. To aid us in this fundraising effort, we are seeking donations of quality items—heirlooms, antiques and whathaveyou—valued at $200 and up. You get to clear out those storage spaces in your home and gain a tax deduction, while Heritage benefits in dollars when Soirée patrons start bidding up those items. To make a donation, contact Barbara Roldan, 415-441-3000; or e-mail <info@sfheritage.org>.
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