Citizens’ Group Brings Suit to Halt Emporium Project

A citizens’ group calling itself San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan has filed suit seeking to set aside all approvals for the Emporium development. The litigation, initiated in San Francisco Superior Court, November 22, names the City and County of San Francisco, its Planning Commission, Redevelopment Agency and Board of Supervisors as respondents. Also cited as real parties in interest are Forest City Development California, Inc.; Emporium Development, LLC; Bloomingdale’s, Inc.; and Federated Department Stores, Inc.

The suit alleges that the City and County violated the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), state redevelopment law and local ordinances in approving the Emporium project. The project would demolish up to twelve architecturally and historically significant structures, including the Emporium, a Category I building under the Downtown Plan, which would undergo substantial demolition. According to Article 11 of the Planning Code, Category I buildings are of “the highest architectural and environmental importance—buildings whose demolition would constitute an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of downtown.”

The petitioners assert that the environmental impact report presented at least three reasonable alternatives that could achieve the project’s objectives without the loss of historical resources and without violating state and local laws. Under CEQA, they argue, a public agency must adopt measures that might mitigate a project’s adverse environmental impact, if feasible. The record presented no substantial evidence of the alternatives’ economic infeasibility, using current economic models. Therefore, the City’s approval of this project as proposed, when there are feasible alternatives that reduce significant environmental impacts, the suit contends, is a violation of CEQA.

The suit further alleges that amendment of the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan to incorporate the Emporium site was “arbitrary and capricious and invalid,” because the site does not meet the definition of “blight” under the California Health & Safety Code. One required finding of blight is that revitalization of the area cannot be reasonably expected by private enterprise or government action or both, without redevelopment. The success of the adjacent San Francisco Center and other neighboring businesses makes the assertion of blight questionable. In fact, the record offers no substantial evidence of the existence of blight in support of the inclusion of the Emporium site within the redevelopment area.

The petitioners also cite alleged violations of the Planning Code and inconsistency with the City’s General Plan. The project fails to comply with the Downtown Plan and Article 11 of the Planning Code in its treatment of historical resources and in exceeding height and bulk limitations. Furthermore, the suit contends, it violates planning code regulations regarding transfer of development rights (TDR). The transfer or sale of development rights to another site is intended to provide an incentive to preservation on the transferring site. The developer transferred a portion of the Emporium’s development rights to the Macy’s Union Square project, and yet the proposed plan calls for virtual demolition of the Emporium.

Finally, the suit charges that the City approved the closure of Jessie Street to accommodate the proposed
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Comments from the Executive Director

There never seems to be an idle moment at Heritage. There is always a horde of preservation issues wanting for attention. Here is a sampling of ongoing preservation issues in which Heritage continues to be an active participant.

The New Mission Theater
Heritage is working with a group of neighborhood constituents to seek a preservation alternative with the construction of the Mission Campus for City College. Heritage assisted “Save New Mission” with a grant proposal to hire an architectural preservation professional to evaluate the historic resource. In February, Heritage submitted a nomination to the California Office of Historic Preservation for inclusion of the theater in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Northeast Waterfront
In conjunction with interested preservation professionals and local advocates, Heritage continues to work with the Port of San Francisco to nominate a waterfront historic district that would include piers, sheds and bulkhead buildings from Pier 45 to China Basin. We continue to be actively involved in the review of development proposals along the waterfront and encourage the use of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the federal investment tax credits for certified rehabilitations.

Dogpatch & the Central Waterfront
A survey of the architectural resources in the central waterfront residential neighborhood known as Dogpatch has been an ongoing project with assistance from Christopher Ver Planck, former Heritage architectural historian, and the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association. In light of increased development pressures in the area, the Dogpatch residents raised funds to complete the survey on an accelerated schedule.

In addition, Heritage supports the efforts of the Planning Department to expand the Dogpatch survey with its area reconnaissance survey under a grant from the California Office of Historic Preservation. Further, Heritage is an active participant in the development of goals and objectives for Pier 70 development by the Port of San Francisco, which has just issued a Request for Proposals. The development area appears eligible for listing as a district on the National Register of Historic Places.

Geneva Office Building Stabilization and Restoration
The Municipal Railway’s outstanding, historic Geneva Office Building is the focus of neighborhood attention. Heritage staff meets regularly with City Planning, MUNI, San Francisco Beautiful, and interested citizens to assure secured funding is utilized for the stabilization and adaptive use. Recent efforts have been in assisting city planning staff develop a scope for professional services to initiate the planning and design process.

Of course, these are not all the sites of concern, but they do represent and call attention to the fact that protection of historic resources clearly is a joint venture of interested individuals and neighborhood organizations, with support from Heritage.

Charles Edwin Chase, AIA
Executive Director
DPW Planning Retrofit of Fourth Street Bridge

San Francisco’s Fourth Street Bridge is among many Bay Area bridges that will undergo seismic retrofit. Designed by Joseph Strauss—whose later fame rested on the iconic and far more glamorous Golden Gate Bridge—the single-leaf bascule bridge, constructed in 1917, spans Mission Creek in China Basin.

Although not a designated landmark, like its younger companion, the drawbridge at 3rd Street, also by Strauss (1933), the Fourth Street Bridge was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in Caltrans’ 1985 survey of historic spans. Planning by the City’s Department of Public Works (DPW) for the bridge’s rehabilitation has presented a classic conflict between historic preservation and seismic requirements. It appears, however, as if that conflict will have a satisfactory resolution.

The bridge’s counterweight, the massive overhead concrete block that allows the span to rise and fall on a single pivot below, is in danger of collapsing in a major earthquake. At a weight of around 1.4 million pounds, it constitutes about 76 percent of the bridge’s total weight. Two slender steel columns support it laterally.

After exploring several alternatives, DPW has arrived at a solution that will relocate the counterweight below the roadway. The bridge would continue to operate on the same principle, as it was designed to, but the counterweight, relocated to a safer position, would move within a pit constructed under the pivot point. A new counterweight fabricated of much lighter material, such as glass fibre reinforced concrete (GFRC), will replace the overhead counterweight, simulating its original function and preserving the historic appearance of the bridge.

Architectural Resources Group, which reviewed the preferred scheme, has recommended that, following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the replacement counterweight “should closely reflect the original design, yet be slightly differentiated from it so as not to create a false sense of historicism.” In doing so, the project will both ensure greater public safety and preserve the bridge’s eligibility for the National Register.

Update on the Effort to Save The New Mission Theater

An organized community effort to convince City College of San Francisco not to demolish the New Mission Theater continues, as the State Office of Historic Preservation reviews Heritage’s nomination of the historic movie house for listing on the National Register. Save New Mission is a grassroots coalition of concerned residents, artists and merchants of the Mission and the city at large that includes CCSF alumni, current students and faculty. It has gained support from various groups, including the Latino Democratic Club and the Mission Anti-Displacement Coalition.

Much of the effort has gone into countering misinformation in the community. The Landmarks Board did not reject the landmark nomination of the theater, as college officials have claimed. In fact, on March 3, 1999, the board voted to reject Planning Department staff’s recommendation to turn down the nomination, and tabled it on condition that City College consider alternative plans that would include at least partial preservation.

Two years later, no such plan has appeared. However, City College has now hired a preservation architect, Page & Turnbull, to explore the options. Save New Mission has also engaged a preservation architect, Carey & Co., Inc., to devise a conceptual design that would incorporate the theater into new construction and fulfill the college’s program for the site.

Much more insidious misinformation has been the charge that preservationists are trying to prevent the Mission’s Hispanic population from having their own campus in the neighborhood. This issue is a red herring that draws attention away from the possibilities of a preservation solution. From the start, everyone in the struggle to save the New Mission Theater has applauded the proposal to site a City College branch campus in the district. Citing City College’s agreement to save the Colombo Building as part of a China-town campus, Save New Mission asks, “Why can’t it happen in the Mission?”

At press time, a committee of the Board of Supervisors was scheduled to hear the issue of the New Mission Theater on April 12. Meanwhile, discussions are under way between the two sides and their architects, in the hope of achieving some mutually agreeable solution to the conflict.

Save New Mission has also been raising money to pay the cost of preparing a preservation scheme. On February 25, an open house fundraiser at 1348 South Van Ness—the fine, historic Frank M. Stone residence (1886), by architect Seth Babson (Landmark #74)—drew an appreciative crowd. This event produced about $2000, which will go toward matching a $2500 grant from the National Trust.

If you would like to make a donation, contact Save New Mission at 415-820-1472, or <savenewmission@aol.com>.
Some Landmarks Suffering Neglect

The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board is commendable in its continuing program of designating new landmarks. The designations, begun in 1968, now number over 200. Yet among those, there are causes for concern that landmarks are receiving insufficient attention to ensure their protection from neglect.

Heritage News has cited some of these victims of neglect in the past (see issues of September/October 1998 and March/April 2000). These include the Oak Street firehouse, owned by the fire department and operated as a fitness center for its firefighters. Although more than two years ago the department indicated it had plans to correct the conditions, the neglect continues, without needed repairs or even routine maintenance being given the exterior of this historic 19th century structure.

Another example is the former Market Street—later Municipal—Railway power substation at Fillmore and Turk. This historic building, in the jurisdiction of the Art Commission, awaits a new use. Meanwhile, although the adjoining open space is undergoing some improvement, the structure itself remains vacant and little cared for.

The fire department is responsible for the condition of yet another landmark station, that on Pacific Avenue, between Polk and Van Ness. It is inactive, apparently unused and certainly not maintained. Unabated graffiti invite more and could lead to worse vandalism against the building.

These all happen to be City-owned landmarks, and their treatment indicates that the City of San Francisco has an uneven record with respect to its architectural heritage. Glamorous, high-profile landmarks, like City Hall and the Opera House, often get exemplary attention (not, however, the old Main Library); others are sometimes less fortunate. One positive case is the Geneva Office Building, once marked for demolition by Muni, but now, thanks to the efforts of organized neighborhood groups, on the road to rehabilitation. There is slow progress toward achieving stabilization of the structure and planning for its reuse.

Among privately owned landmarks, Green’s Pharmacy, at Divisadero and Fell, is a prime case of neglect. The storefront remains vacant, after plans several years ago to install a fast-food outlet ran into opposition. The entire building appears abandoned, and while the owner did some remedial foundation work, it remains in a sad state.

Finally, the so-called Belli Buildings, on Montgomery Street, in the Jackson Square Historic District, continue to be a major embarrassment to their owner, a sitting member of the Landmarks Board, and to the City that, in spite of repeated attempts by Heritage and others to get action, has failed to obtain her compliance with the law. The buildings remain insufficiently secured against weather and other intrusion in what appears to be a case study in demolition by neglect.

Strategic Preservation Planning

Last fall’s supervisoral election under the new district system resulted in a substantial change in the complexion of San Francisco’s legislative body. Seven new supervisors, firmly rooted in their districts and elected on platforms of neighborhood concerns, took their seats in January. They join four members from the previous, at-large Board of Supervisors, now also elected from their districts.

Some of the new members come to the board with a decidedly pro-preservation bent, having worked for years as neighborhood activists on preservation issues. Others come with a sympathetic disposition and a willingness to give thoughtful consideration to our concerns. Joining with the returning members, this new Board of Supervisors offers the promise of a more balanced approach to development issues in the city than we have experienced in recent years.

Hoping to seize the opportunity that this improved disposition toward neighborhood issues offers, a group of citizens began holding strategy meetings early this year. San Francisco Beautiful, San Francisco Tomorrow and the Victorian Alliance have joined Heritage in joint sponsorship of these sessions.

Participants have included as many as 40 individuals from around the city, representative of varied interests, who share a common concern for preservation. Their purpose is to formulate a plan for promoting higher visibility for preservation and to improve the effectiveness of their collective efforts in the public forum.

Discussions have produced a working list of objectives in the areas of preservation advocacy and education, and legislative action. In the latter category, the group is considering appropriate measures to enhance historic preservation through strengthening existing regulations and improved enforcement, increased survey activity and incorporating recognition of historic resources in neighborhood-based planning.
City Completes Restoration of Polk Masterwork at Sunol

The Sunol Water Temple was recently singled out for a preservation award. However, six years ago, when the perilous condition of the historic structure first came to our attention, Heritage found that its owner, San Francisco’s Public Utilities Commission (PUC), showed little interest in its preservation. The Loma Prieta earthquake had caused significant damage, compounding the consequences of years of neglect, and removal of the roof to storage exposed the structure to further deterioration.

Following a change of administration, a new PUC, under the presidency of E. Dennis Normandy, made an enthusiastic pledge to restore the 1910 Willis Polk masterwork, which is a Historic American Engineering Landmark. Work commenced in September 1997. Last September, a public ceremony marked completion of the temple’s three-year rehabilitation.

Designed after the Temple of Vesta at Tivoli, outside Rome, the 60-foot high structure enjoys a fine setting in a 200-acre public park and walnut orchard, where it marks the confluence of three water sources that flow into the Sunol Valley of southern Alameda County. The temple had undergone repairs over the years, but few alterations.

Analysis of the concrete building’s condition revealed that it required extensive repair and structural stabilization. The work crew filled cracks in the columns with epoxy and inserted steel cores to strengthen eight of the twelve columns. In repairing and consolidating the concrete in the balance of the structure, they used epoxy injections and grout consolidation.

The project team found that the structure’s wood rafters were severely decayed, to the point of compromising their capacity to support the weight of the conical roof, which rested on a concrete ring girder. It was this weakened condition that had prompted removal of the entire roof structure early on.

The restoration’s objective, following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, was to repair the damaged elements and strengthen the beams while retaining as much original fabric as possible.

Employing a procedure developed in England for restoring medieval heavy timber buildings and probably never before used in California, the project’s wood conservator embedded a U-shaped steel channel in each of the beams with epoxy. The original wood beams appear to continue their structural function, while in fact the steel now provides the support.

An art conservator completely restored the polychrome painted decorative features on the rafters, as well as the large figures that appear on the ceiling between the rafters. Research has not yet turned up the artist nor the program for the art work, although it is evident that some of the designs were painted over at some point and others were left unfinished.

On the ground, the team constructed an exact replica of the ring beam that supports the roof, in order to reassemble the elements of the roof carefully so it could then be hoisted exactly into place on the real ring beam of the structure. New clay roof tiles replaced the original materials, damaged beyond repair, and finally, the terra cotta finial, after undergoing an off-site restoration, crowned the temple.

On February 24, the Sunol Water Temple project received an award in the category of craftsmanship and preservation technology from the California Preservation Foundation. Sharing the honor were the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Lena Ch’en, SFPUCC project director; Carey & Co., Inc., preservation consultants; SOHA Engineers; LTM Construction Company; Anne Rosenthal, art conservator; U.C. Forest Products, Service to Industry Program, wood specialists; Oakland Museum Conservation Laboratory; Molly Lambert, architectural conservator; Allied Wood
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Hard Times and Changing Fashion Transformed a Historic Skyscraper

Observing, “The old forms had served their purpose,” The Architect and Engineer (August 1938) reported that the Claus Spreckels (aka The Call) Building, “has recently shed its old garments for a more modern dress.” Not merely a change of fashion, A&E reported, but a combination of economic necessity and deteriorating sandstone drove the radical transformation of the famed 1898 Reid Brothers’ Renaissance-Baroque monument at Third and Market into a sleek Moderne tower.

The building, billed as the city’s first “real” skyscraper, was an icon of 19th century San Francisco. The erection of its steel frame drew curious onlookers, as it rose higher and higher. It offered dining in the Spreckels Rotisserie, on the 15th floor, with unobstructed views on all sides. Although gutted by the fire, it withstood the 1906 earthquake and was quickly restored. Thirty years later, however, it could not withstand the winds of change.

Essentially, the alteration of the Spreckels Building, designed by architect Albert Roller, entailed replacing the familiar dome and lantern above the 16th floor, and the turrets at the four corners of the parapet, with a set-back light-weight concrete addition of six stories of new—leasable—office space. Removal of the cornice, belt courses and all other ornament from the shaft, in combination with cutting back the spandrels, would give the building a decided vertical thrust.

Planning for these changes to the Spreckels Building required a full understanding of the original structural system. Arriving at that knowledge took some doing. In fact, H. J. Brunnier, structural engineer for the Central Tower’s remodel, thought the story of reconstructing the original plans for the Spreckels Building had the makings of a novel, for someone with “a good imaginative mind.” (The Architect and Engineer, August 1938)

After a fruitless attempt to track down contractors who worked on the original project, the search turned to engineering literature. References in the U.S. Geological Survey’s report on the 1906 earthquake and fire led to articles in the Engineering Record of April 1898 that identified Charles Louis Strobel, of Chicago, as the engineer for the Spreckels Building and provided a “fairly comprehensive” description of the structural design and construction, including the foundation. There were some detail drawings and photographs, as well.

Strobel was still listed with the American Society of Civil Engineers, but enquiring of his office revealed that he had died but a few months earlier and, furthermore, a short time before that, a fire in his office had destroyed all his records.

Neither Stanford’s nor the University of California’s school of engineering had record of any plans for the Spreckels Building, but the problem intrigued the dean of engineering at Berkeley. On investigating further, he discovered some blueprints and sections of the steel framing in an old storeroom on campus. After putting all the pieces together, only the column schedule was missing, which engineers were able to determine by exposing a number of columns on different floors to establish a ratio that allowed, by interpolation, determining the column sections for each tier of the building.

The USGS findings of the ’06 disaster were that the design of the building’s steelwork showed remarkable care and skill: “It is probably, on the whole, the best designed piece of such work in the United States.” In Brunnier’s account of the remodel, he notes that there is a heavy structural steel frame throughout the original building, with a system of diagonal bracing that provides good resistance to lateral forces.

He described the foundation as “a very substantial construction” consisting of a two-foot thick concrete mat set on firm compact sand 25 feet below street level and covering an area 96’ by 100’. The base of the building was 69’ by 74’. Set upon this base are a layer of 58 heavy steel beams side-by-side and, at right angles to the first, a second layer of 63 beams. Solid concrete fills the spaces in between.
Beginning in 1937, under the economic constraints of the lingering depression, the demolition and new construction took place while the rest of the Spreckels Building remained fully occupied and operational. Temporary roofs and tarpaulins held off the effects of winter storms, and installation of three new elevators, one at a time, ensured continued service throughout the construction period.

Removal of all masonry above the 14th floor lightened the building's structural load considerably. After deconstruction of the dome's steel frame, girders to support new columns for the additional floors were framed into the existing columns at the 15th floor. X-bracing rigidly connected the old and the new exterior columns, tying into the lateral bracing system of the historic structure. Thin concrete walls and floors of lightweight aggregate enclosed the new spaces.

The 1938 remodel affected the interior of the building, as well. Floor-by-floor, the corridors and restrooms underwent modernization, and the entire plumbing system was replaced. Alteration and modernization of the lobby, with bronze, marble and classy vitriolite brick walls, created more retail space to increase the building's revenue potential still further. Of the Moderne lobby finishes only the bronze elevator doors remain. The green and black marble exterior facing at groundlevel has also given way to new materials in a more recent remodel.

By today's preservation standards, the Spreckels Building underwent an unsympathetic alteration, in 1938. Yet by now, over 60 years later, the building has stood for more than half its life in this modernized form, which has attained a significance of its own.

Architect
Albert F. Roller

The architect who transformed the Spreckels Building into the Central Tower was Albert F. Roller, San Francisco native and graduate of Lowell High School. Mostly self-taught, Roller did not attend college but worked as a draftsman while attending night school and, later, in Honolulu, on plans for marine facilities at Pearl Harbor.

His work in San Francisco included the Sommer and Kaufmann shoe store (with Kem Weber) and Moore's men's clothing store (with Bliss and Fairweather). These two buildings, side-by-side on Market Street, were highly regarded expressions of the Moderne style when completed in 1930. Neither is extant.

Roller’s Moderne NBC Building, on the northeast corner of Taylor and O’Farrell, completed in 1942, received accolades from The Architect and Engineer (May 1942), as “the most perfect plant of its kind ever designed.” It accommodated broadcast studios, offices and parking in a windowless, fully air-conditioned building marked with bands of glass block.

Other Roller-designed buildings are the County Jail in San Bruno, the Masonic Memorial Temple on Nob Hill and the Scottish Rite Temple at 19th and Sloat. He designed the remodeled façade for the California State Automobile Association on Van Ness and the Hayes Street addition.

Roller served on the Art Commission in the late 1950s and worked on the Federal Building, at 450 Golden Gate, with John Carl Warnecke, and Stone, Marraccini & Patterson. He continued to draw plans for CSAA branches until his death, in 1981. He was 90.

Lecture
Heritage's annual meeting (See page 9) will feature guest lecturer William Kostura, whose subject will be "The Career of Peter R. Schmidt, Victorian-Era Residential Architect."

Peter Schmidt is familiar to Heritage members as the architect of the Haas-Lilienthal House. But did you know that in the last half of his 30-year career in San Francisco, alone, he designed over 400 houses? Just about 30 survive, and no two are alike. At times, he worked "ahead of the curve," designing some of the earliest Eastlake and Queen Anne houses in the city. However, he also produced Italianate houses long after the fashion had begun to fade.

William Kostura has been active as a San Francisco historian for twenty years. His publications on the city's history and architecture include two books and many articles. His book on Russian Hill (the first in a projected series on the subject) appeared in 1997. He served on the Landmarks Board (1995-96) and has worked with neighborhood groups on many preservation issues, including the successful effort to save the Shriners’ Hospital as a city landmark. Currently Kostura is an architectural historian for Caltrans.
Who would have guessed that the primary source for this handsomely printed assemblage of vintage San Francisco postcards would be a single collection that resides in Pennsylvania? Glenn Koch began collecting postcards as a boy, but his focus on San Francisco resulted from his first trip to the city, only in 1990. He fell in love at first sight, and that experience reinvigorated what had by then become for him a flagging interest in collecting. Today, Koch has more than 5,000 San Francisco postcards, and his passion has spilled over into gathering all sorts of memorabilia of the city.

Within the time frame of about 1900-1940, and organized around several themes, including “City Life,” “Neighborhoods” and “City Sights,” San Francisco Golden Age Postcards offers reminders of now-vanished San Francisco restaurants and night spots, such as the Sinaloa, the Golden Pheasant, and Bernstein’s Fish Grotto, as well as places of general amusement like Playland, Sutro Baths and Golden Gate Park. Others illustrate the city’s expositions and festivals, and noteworthy events like the visit of the Great White Fleet, in 1908. The Panama-Pacific International Exposition, by far, receives the greatest coverage of any event in this collection.

In addition to San Francisco’s famous sights and tourist attractions, like Chinatown and Fisherman’s Wharf, there are postcards of residences, schools, churches and streetscapes that bring the neighborhoods to life. Of course, hotels often provided their guests with postcards illustrating the building and its accommodations, and not just the city’s world-famous hostels, but the establishments that catered to guests of more modest means before the advent of the inexpensive motel.

Students of fashion and style will find much of interest in the postcards that show people out and about, amusing themselves, enjoying a restaurant meal or strolling the streets. Readers of Heritage News will respond to the historic architecture.

A surprising number of the buildings illustrated in this collection are extant, although many of the businesses that occupied them are not: the Emporium, the White House, Roos Brothers, Podesta Baldocchi on Grant Avenue and others. It is particularly interesting to get a glimpse of original streetlevel storefronts that have generally undergone the greatest change over time.

Several pages of postcards illustrate the 1906 disaster and reveal a certain fascination with the magnitude of the destruction and civic pride in having endured. The collection takes us briefly outside San Francisco to experience the sights and amusements of the, then, still very rural Bay Area counties, and beyond, to Monterey, Santa Cruz and Yosemite.

An index of hotels, restaurants and place names at the end makes it easy to look up your favorite old San Francisco building, site or institution to see if it is part of this collection.
Statement of Financial Position as of December 31, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Temporarily restricted</th>
<th>Permanently restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$62,301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Other Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>29,156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities (1)</td>
<td>451,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore Inventory</td>
<td>4,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>26,690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas-Lilienthal House (2)</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Equipment - Net</td>
<td>14,341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$808,854</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$23,582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Payroll</td>
<td>12,589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>13,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Obligation</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,483</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board-designated</td>
<td>71,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated</td>
<td>118,544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>550,494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$740,371</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES
(1) The House Endowment amounts to $350,448. Its income is irrevocably dedicated to the maintenance of the Haas-Lilienthal House.
(2) The Haas-Lilienthal House is carried at its estimated value when donated in 1973.

Treasurer's Certificate
I certify that the accompanying statements were prepared from the books and records of San Francisco Architectural Heritage, without audit.

/s/ Bruce A. Miller, Treasurer, February 16, 2001
Bay Area Tours

**ALLIED ARTS GUILD**
Menlo Park, 650-322-2405

**CAMRON-STANFORD HOUSE**
Oakland, 510-836-1976

**CITY GUIDES WALKS**
San Francisco, 415-557-4266

**COHEN-BRAY HOUSE**
Oakland, 510-532-0704

**CYPRESS LAWN CEMETERY**
Colma, 650-550-8810

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

**FALKIRK VICTORIAN ESTATE**
San Rafael, 415-485-3328

**LATHROP HOUSE**
Redwood City, 650-365-5564

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

**MCCONAGHY HOUSE**
Hayward, 510-276-3010

**MEYERS HOUSE & GARDEN**
Alameda, 510-521-1247

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

**OCTAGON HOUSE**
San Francisco, 415-441-7512

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

**PARDEE HOME MUSEUM**
Oakland, 510-444-2187

**SAN FRANCISCO CITY HALL**
415-554-5780

**STRYBINING ARBORETUM**
Golden Gate Park, San Francisco 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.

April

**APRIL 27, 6:30 PM**
Heritage Soirée 2001

**APRIL 28 - MAY 28**
Decorator Showcase (See page 11)

Through May 27


Through June 10


Through June 24

Exhibition: _Allan Wexler: Custom Built_. SFMOMA. 415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org

Through July 8

Exhibition online & in the galleries: _01.01.01: Art in Technological Times_. SFMOMA. 415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org

May

**MAY 5 - OCTOBER 14**
Exhibition: _Revelatory Landscapes_. SFMOMA 415-357-4000; www.sfmoma.org

May 6, 1:00 - 5:00 PM
Cottage & Garden Tour: Sonoma League for Historic Preservation. (See page 11)

May 6, 1:00 - 5:00 PM
BAHA Live Oak Park House Tour. 510-841-2242 www.berkeleyheritage.com

May 8, 8:00 PM

May 8, 8:00 PM
Slide lecture: _The Ornamental Ironwork of J.W. Fiske_. American Decorative Arts Forum. 415-249-9234

May 14, 6:30 PM

May 17 - 20
California Preservation Conference. San Diego (See page 11).

May 24, 7:30 PM

May 31, 7:00 PM
Lecture: Gray Brechin, _Imperial San Francisco_. Alameda Museum. 510-748-0796; www.alamedamuseum.org

June

June 2, 9:30 - 12 NOON
Heritage Annual Meeting (See page 9)

June 12, 8:00 PM
Lecture: _North Beach: The Faces of a Neighborhood_. S. F. Historical Society. 415-750-9986; www.sfhistory.org

June 12, 8:00 PM
Slide lecture: _How Do We Know? Clues to Historic Interiors_. American Decorative Arts Forum. 415-249-9234

June 28, 7:00 PM

June 28, 7:30 PM
Lecture: Allen Pastron, _Archaeology Right Here in San Francisco_. S. F. History Association. 415-750-9986
Architectural Fragments

Emporium Suit
continued from page 1

development in a manner that is inconsistent with the General Plan and in violation of the Planning Code and Proposition T, which voters passed in 1978, requiring voter approval prior to closing public rights-of-way.

The petitioners have asked the court to set aside all approvals of the Emporium project and have requested an order that would prevent any physical work in furtherance of the project, unless and until the court finds the project is in full compliance with CEQA, the Planning Code, Proposition T, the Government Code and relevant Health & Safety Code sections.

Sunol Temple
continued from page 5

Products and Oakland Pattern Works, woodworking; and Biocare, pest control.

Save Our Sunol, a group of local residents who have labored for years to preserve the Sunol Valley from negative development, deserves praise for its contribution toward restoring the water temple, by keeping the issue in the public view. Their web site is worth a visit: <www.sunol.org>.

San Francisco’s Birthday

Celebrate San Francisco’s 225th birthday, June 27-30. For information: www.Loscalifornianos.org
www.missiondolores.citysearch
www.at the presidio.org

The 2001 San Francisco Decorator Showcase features the Commandant’s House at Fort Winfield Scott, in the Presidio. The historic Georgian Revival residence, built in 1915, occupies a beautiful site that includes a sweeping front lawn, gardens and two adjacent buildings. The house, which will feature the work of 25 leading interior designers, will be open six days a week from April 28 through May 28. Tickets are available at the door only; general admission is $20/$18 for seniors. Proceeds benefit student financial aid at University High School in San Francisco. For more information and hours, call 415-831-5841, or go online via the News link at <www.sfuhs.org>.

Sunday, May 6, from 1:00 pm until 5:00, the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation will present a cottage and garden tour of at least eight sites in one of Sonoma’s oldest neighborhoods. There will be refreshments at three of the locations, and two will offer a sale of garden treasures, including live plants, sculpture, bird houses and water features. Ticket prices are $25 per person (adult, senior or child). You may order in advance by mailing a check to P.O. Box 766, Sonoma, CA 95476.

The project to remake San Francisco’s historic Union Square began with a groundbreaking on December 28. While a barricade around the square will make it difficult for “sidewalk superintendents” to keep track of the work, expected to take 18 months, the Union Square Association will launch a website that includes a webcam offering a view of the construction from the top of the St. Francis Hotel: <www.unionsquarelive.com>.

The National Park Service recently completed the last of a series of restoration and rehabilitation projects on the 118-year-old John Muir House, in Martinez. The final phase of the three-year undertaking included replacement of the shingle roof and a new paint job. Architectural Resources Group, of San Francisco, performed the paint analysis, penetrating layers of exterior paint to arrive at the colors of the house in the 1890s, when Muir began his 24-year residence there.

San Diego will host the 26th Annual California Preservation Conference, May 17-20, 2001. Classroom sessions and mobile workshops will focus on such topics as the latest trends in survey techniques, architectural photography, cutting edge documentation techniques, and fundraising and organizational strategies for preservation organizations. Architectural tours offered in connection with the conference will feature the work of Irving Gill, Richard Neutra and Rudolph Schindler. For more information call CPF, 510-763-0972, or visit <www.CaliforniaPreservation.org>.

On February 24, the California Preservation Foundation presented its 2001 Historic Preservation Design Awards. Among the recipients were Vincent Marsh, for the City of Sacramento Preservation Element; in the category of craftsmanship and preservation technology: Page & Turnbull, Inc., for the Leland Stanford Mansion roof; Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc., for the Russ Building in San Francisco; and Carey & Co., Inc., for the Sunol Water Temple. In the category of rehabilitation and adaptive reuse: Tanner Leddy Maytum Stacey Architects for the El Cortez Apartments, San Diego; and Architectural Resources Group for the San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo.
JOIN
SAN FRANCISCO
ARCHITECTURAL
HERITAGE!

Please enter my membership in the following category:

☐ $35 Seniors/Students
☐ $50 Individual
☐ $75 Family
☐ $125 Supporting
☐ $250 Contributing
☐ $500 Sustaining

Name
Address
City, State, Zip
Phone
E-Mail Address

Make checks payable to:
San Francisco Architectural Heritage
2007 Franklin Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

or charge by phone:
(415) 441-3000

Contributions are tax deductible.

San Francisco Architectural Heritage proudly announces our redesigned web site

Please visit us at
www.sfheritage.org

The site offers preservation news, volunteer opportunities, events, tour information and more, including an archive of recent issues of Heritage News

Web site created by Gehrschoen Creative
www.gehrschoen.com