City Planning’s Draft Proposal for Applying CEQA Raises Issues

Last fall the San Francisco Planning Department began a process to clarify what sort of classification or designation a property should have in order to qualify as a “cultural resource” subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The department’s invitation to members of the public to comment on a draft proposal drew some concern from the preservation community.

Enacted in 1970, CEQA requires state and local agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts that may result from their actions or projects, and to avoid or mitigate them if feasible. The statute applies to the activity or “project” of any public agency, or to private activity that receives government funds or requires discretionary approval by a public agency (such as a planning commission).

A preliminary finding by a local agency that a project appears to have significant environmental impacts triggers the requirement for more intensive analysis, usually resulting in an environmental impact report (EIR). The purpose of this document is to identify the adverse environmental effects of a project and to identify ways to avoid or significantly reduce those effects, including the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when feasible.

Impact on “cultural resources” is one aspect of the environment the law covers, and identification of what exactly constitutes a cultural resource is critical to all interested parties, including property owners and developers, neighborhood and preservation advocates, and staff of City agencies who review projects.

Heritage has commended planning staff for attempting to clarify the environmental review process and the status of the various architectural surveys that exist. However, we share a concern with individuals in the community that the effort may define “cultural resource” more narrowly than intended by CEQA.

The Planning Department has proposed four categories for classifying properties in the city. Category A includes all properties that are historical resources “by definition.” These include designated landmarks and historic districts. Category B properties are “strongly presumed” to be historic. Category C “could be considered” historic and would require additional research to make a determination of significance. The
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Comments from the President
Hang a Chad on that Finial

With the arrival of spring, we’re fully in the midst of a new political cycle on our San Francisco merry-go-round. In November, we’ll be in the position of choosing another mayor for “Our Fair City” (apologies to Click and Clack from NPR). We’ve enjoyed (endured?) 8 years of the Willie Brown Administration and now our City Charter calls for a change, whether we want it or not.

Based on what I’ve gleaned from chats with my colleagues, most of us who are committed to preservation have generally done our quiet duty and approached the ballot for senior municipal officer with a sense of stoic civic responsibility. There’s not much joy there for the average preservationist and, to most of us, this is more like a duty that we should endure.

Well, folks, IT’S TIME FOR A CHANGE!

This election for mayor provides the preservation community with a rare, but regular, opportunity to demonstrate to the mayoral candidates (26 last count, but I expect that number to fluctuate with the passage of each hour) what’s important to us. There are at least 2000 of us preservationists out there with whom I’m sharing this (assuming that each of these newsletters is read by one person, at least in part). And I’m willing to guess that, for each declared preservationist in San Francisco, there are about 20 in the closet who believe that preserving San Francisco is important, but they’re relying on you and me to do the heavy lifting.

Assuming I’m only half right and there are another 20,000 of them hiding out there, that makes 22,000 preservationists, ranging from the semi-conscious dilettantes through the vast majority of rational believers, to the half-crazed zealots. In fact, it’s a sizable block of voters in our fractious City of 750,000—which, by the way, could only muster 195,000 voters in the last mayoral election. By way of comparison, San Francisco’s Democratic Clubs and special interest political action committees generally have fewer than 200 members each.

We can take the opportunity in 2003 to inform the candidates of our views in numerous ways. When you run into a candidate at a business reception, or you’re at your local neighborhood association or church meeting and the candidates come to meet your group and debate, ask them pointed questions about their position on preserving San Francisco. You may receive some pat answers from them, as many do from candidates at such events, but the important thing is that they’ll have heard that their desired constituency is concerned about the continuing loss of our heritage to the wrecker’s ball or vinyl windows.

If you really want to get active and you’re working with other groups that develop candidates’ questionnaires, insert your preservation concern into the mix. Hold a “Meet the Candidate” reception at your home and invite your fellow preservationists there to discuss the candidate’s preservation platform (and, by the way, if there aren’t enough planks in it, help them craft a few).

The preservationists of San Francisco need to demonstrate that we’re a group with a mission and that our choices for the office of mayor will depend on the candidates’ positions on the subject we all care about—preserving San Francisco. Go out there and save our city at the ballot box.

Bruce Bonacker, AIA
President
Landmarks Board Sets Sights on New Designations

Before the close of 2002, the Landmarks Board made its selection of prospects for designation in the current year. Whittling down the list from some 30 candidates, the board arrived at a working list of 9.

The individual sites under consideration as possible landmarks include several whose significance is more historical or cultural than architectural. Examples of what may be called “high architecture” are 1337 Sutter Street, the Conservatory of Music, and the Music Concourse in Golden Gate Park, which includes the band shell, numerous sculptures, three fountains and three pedestrian tunnels.

Architect Albert Henry Jacobs designed the Sutter Street building as a religious school for Temple Emanu-El (1910). In later years it was a Lutheran and then a Mormon church. It is now home to the San Francisco Girls Chorus.

Community activists proposed the Concourse nomination because plans for an underground garage threaten the integrity of the tunnels. Plans for the Conservatory to move from its present home at 1201 Ortega Street in the next few years have raised concern for the future of the building, which Louis Christian Mullgardt designed for the San Francisco Infant Shelter (1927).

In proposing the Samuel Gompers Trade School, 106 Bartlett Street, advocates for modernism described it as “an important modern building” in the city. Architects Masten & Hurd designed the school, which was completed by 1939. Dedicated to providing the city’s working class with manual training and education, the building now houses classes offered by City College, which recently announced that it proposes to incorporate the building into a new Mission District campus.

Selecting the building at 2362 Market Street for its final list, the Landmarks Board noted that from 1987 to 2001, it was national headquarters for the AIDS Memorial Quilt, conceived by Cleve Jones, who became a prominent leader in the gay community. The building was also, briefly, the location of Harvey Milk’s Castro Camera, in 1978. The modest one-story structure with Mission Revival details, began its life as a motion picture theater, c. 1912-1917, and recently became a restaurant.

Two prospective landmarks have direct links with the city’s labor history. The International Longshoreman’s Association was headquartered at 115 Steuart Street at the time of the 1934 Waterfront and General Strike and was on the frontlines in the battle with police that left two strikers dead. The Labor Temple, aka Redstone Building, in the Mission, at 2940 16th Street, witnessed the deliberations and vote that called the San Francisco General Strike, in 1934, in support of the longshoremen.

The single-family house at 1419 39th Avenue, the first Henry Doelger-built home (1927), launched the prolific developer’s career, during which he constructed about 24,000 homes in the Sunset District and Peninsula suburbs.

Philo T. Farnsworth successfully transmitted the first television image in his laboratory at 202 Green Street, in 1927. An attempt to designate the building a landmark in 1980 failed, but the 75th anniversary of the event last year and widespread recognition of Farnsworth as the inventor of television revived interest in the idea.

Short of landmark designation, the board will also consider adopting context statements—a way to recognize several sites sharing a common significance—for gay bars and for the burial sites in Yerba Buena Cemetery, the city’s first municipal burial ground that once stood in the area bounded by Market, McAllister and Larkin Streets. A possible “historic sign” designation is also on the board’s work list for the large Shasta Cola sign painted in 1960 on the south-facing wall of the David Hewes Building, at 6th and Market, and brought to light when last year’s winter storms tore panels from the building.

Cobblestone Lives!

On our recent field survey of demolition permit applications, we happened upon a cobblestone street that appears to be in fine condition. There has been controversy in the last few years over the removal of historic paving materials, like the brick surface on Chinatown’s Commercial Street. Maybe the Landmarks Board should consider adding this to its list. A context statement may help to preserve any others that remain.
Proposition for Plaque Program to Mark Designated Sites

San Francisco has more than 200 individually designated City Landmarks and ten historic districts. In addition, there are scores of individual National Register properties, National Register districts and resources listed on the California Register.

While some of these designations overlap, there are in the range of 1500-2000 structures and sites in the city officially recognized for their historic and architectural value. Yet these mostly remain invisible to visitors to the city and even to locals walking the streets of their home town. A group of long-time preservation activists would like to change that. They have proposed a formal historic plaque program for San Francisco and are seeking Heritage’s participation.

Among the goals the program aims to achieve is increasing the awareness of San Francisco’s history and its cultural resources among residents, and enhancing the travel experience for visitors. The hope is also to promote pride of ownership and, through that, good stewardship of historic buildings.

Starting a number of years ago, the City of San Francisco offered owners of newly designated landmarks a paper “plaque” which the recipients could then replicate in metal or other more permanent material for display on their building. The most recent example of this is the City Lights Bookstore in North Beach. Generally speaking, however, its use has been rare.

Official plaques are available for National Register properties, and some owners proud of their landmark property have taken it upon themselves to affix some kind of identifier to their buildings. In any case, there is no formal program for marking designated structures and sites in the city, and what is available does not follow consistent criteria.

The proposal, still in preliminary stages, is to begin with City-designated resources. The first phase would be to install simple identifiers on existing street signs at intersections within historic districts. Beyond that, recognition plaques for individual landmarks and for contributory structures in historic districts would identify the site and perhaps include date of construction and architect. A final phase in the program would produce interpretive plaques that would provide more detailed historical information on a district or on a particularly important building.

There are many details to work out, including identifying funding sources and raising money to support the program, as well as the design of markers and setting up an application, administration and review process. Heritage supports the concept of the plaque program and will work with the group that has initiated this effort to define our role.

Heritage Comments on Environmental Impacts

Two major development projects have recently been in environmental review. Heritage has taken the opportunity to comment on their potential effects upon historical resources.

Our remarks on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the underground garage at the Golden Gate Park Concourse noted the historic importance of the pedestrian tunnels as part of the park’s larger landscape design and original circulation system. As they are contributory to the historic character of the Concourse, their retention and rehabilitation according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards should be the first consideration.

However, In the event the tunnels’ structural condition requires their replacement, Heritage believes the project should seek to minimize the effects of addressing structural, life-safety and other code requirements upon their extant spatial and architectural characteristics. The approach should be to replicate to the greatest extent possible the current design features of each tunnel, avoiding significant modifications to their height, width and architectural detail.

Finally, we urged retention of pedestrian access through the southwest tunnel to the Concourse via the garage, rather than its abandonment.

The draft environmental document for the Transbay Terminal/Caltrain Downtown Extension drew from Heritage the comment that it does not provide for a preservation alternative. The two alternatives that the document does offer include the total replacement of the terminal and its ramp system. Both elements are listed as contributing to the Bay Bridge National Register determination of eligibility.

Federal requirements for any federally funded project, as the new terminal would be, stipulate that special efforts be made to protect historic sites. Heritage contends that it is possible to design a prudent and feasible alternative to demolition of the historic terminal and ramps that minimizes harm to the historic resources.

Regarding the extension of Caltrain to the terminal, the draft’s preferred project alternative would be to bring in the tracks underground by a “cut and cover” construction method. This substantially reduces the impact on historical resources, compared with the tunneling alternative. Yet, Heritage contests the conclusion that the loss of even three structures at Howard and Second Streets is unavoidable. We noted that significant subway construction in cities like New York and Washington, D.C., has occurred without removal of a single existing building.
Reading the Changing Face of a Richmond District Streetscape

Our periodic field surveys of current demolition permit applications often pay off in the opportunity to pick up on a larger story. The most recent review took us to the 200 block of 26th Avenue, where we found the demolition candidate to be an older single-family dwelling typical of the small residential buildings we are losing across the city.

While viewing the streetscape, it struck us that the west (odd-numbered) side of the avenue told an interesting tale of change over time. Back at the office, the Sanborn Maps provided some basic information. The 1899 edition showed that, at that time, there was only a single lot developed on the entire block, and that was at what is now 263 26th Avenue.

In less than 15 years, as the 1913 Sanborn Map (V, 492, shown above) reveals, the only vacant sites on that side of the street were at the California Street corner and at 267-269. Most of the buildings were detached and, with only three exceptions, showed setbacks of varying depths. As for types of structures, a one-story store sat at the Lake Street corner; there were two 2-flat buildings and one duplex (side-by-side); and the balance (11 structures) were one- and two-story dwellings.

The Sanborn updated to 1961, which we have in the office, illustrates relatively little change over a forty-eight-year period. A two-story-over-basement building housing four flats or apartments has appeared at the previously vacant California Street corner (1920), and a two-story-over-basement two-flat building (1922) fills the vacant lot at 267-269. A new, single-family dwelling (1929) has replaced an older house that sat near the rear of the property at 223.

At the Lake Street corner, the store and the dwelling just to the south of it have been combined by the addition of a second story. Alteration appears to have transformed the one-family residence at 271 into a two-story-with-basement house containing two units. A front addition has brought the building out to the property line.

The sum of the differences between 1913 and 1961 is an increase in density, notably at the two
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corners, where higher density uses have occurred, historically, in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Withal, the streetface did not change significantly, retaining its generally small scale and low profile. Since then, however, more intensive use has invaded mid-block, as well.

The blockbuster came in 1963, with construction of a 12-unit apartment house on a double lot at nearly dead center of the street (239), replacing a small house, a shed and a stable-turned-garage at the back of the lot. The four-story structure overwhelmed its neighbors, and its plain stucco façade, dominated by a large fire escape (to provide the code-required second means of egress) and a nearly solid wall of blank garage doors, was out of character with the streetscape. But it was a sign of what was to come.

In 1968, a four-story, four-unit building replaced a one-story, one-family house at 221, again presenting a dominant fire escape and wide garage door to the street. In 1971, a three-story, four-unit residence took the place of a one-and-one-half-story house at 263 that was probably the first structure on this block. This is the blunt stucco box whose use of details and materials bore little relationship to historic San Francisco residential design. Neighborhood activists came to vilify this type as “Richmond Specials.”

In the last decade or so, new construction completed the transformation of the northern half of the street, between the 1963 blockbuster at 239 and 221 26th Avenue (1968). Four four-story multiple-family residences have replaced the unusual (for San Francisco) materials, the latest construction on 26th Avenue continues the story of increasingly intensified landuse, already evident by mid-century. Demolition of 261 26th Avenue would result in the loss of the last one-story (with garage below) house, and the oldest residence left on the street.

There were nearly forty percent fewer applications filed for demolition permits in San Francisco during 2002, compared with the previous year. This continued the downward trend noted in the second half of 2001. Although the fourth quarter of 2002 showed a 50 percent increase over the first quarter of the same year, the number of permit applications was no higher than that in the fourth quarter of 2001.

side-by-side duplex and two other smaller-scale houses.

Planners and/or developers have learned some lessons, however. Garage doors are less wide and are recessed from the face of the building. There are no exterior fire escapes on the front elevations. The buildings display modest but appropriate architectural features that avoid the false historicism some developers have resorted to elsewhere in order to “fit in” with San Francisco neighborhood character.

While much improved in design and

Older 2-story-over-garage flats typify southern half of 26th Ave.
As a writer and historian, Sally Woodbridge has contributed much to the understanding and appreciation of the architecture of the Bay Area. In the present offering, she illuminates the subject of the development of the campus plan for the University of California at Berkeley and its execution by architect John Galen Howard.

She places her subject in the larger context of the growing influence of the Beaux-Arts model in American architectural education in the late 19th century. The idea of a design competition, which university trustees decided upon in 1895, was itself a legacy of the Beaux-Arts tradition.

That the competition became international in scope was due to the generous financial contribution of Phoebe Apperson Hearst. Woodbridge cites the observation in Harper's Weekly that, “There has never been anything in the history of education or of architecture quite like the competition which the University of California owes to the munificence of Mrs. Hearst.”

Among the eleven finalists the jury selected from the more than 100 entries was the New York City firm of Howard and Cauldwell. John Galen Howard and his partner Samuel M. Cauldwell placed fourth in the final judging, whose winner was Émile Bénard of Paris.

The selection of a foreigner prompted expressions of indignation, especially from the creative circle of Reverend Joseph Worcester, pastor of San Francisco's Swedenborgian Church and a would-be architect with a passionate interest in the subject. Architecture’s local bad boy, Willis Polk (who was not among the entrants), observed that in holding a competition, “The trustees have gone forth to seek mediocrity, and have made elaborate preparations to get it.”

Lobbying by the dissidents, coupled with Bénard’s own volatile temperament (one observer said he lacked “good American horse sense”), led the university to turn elsewhere for someone to realize the French architect’s plan. Mrs. Hearst’s selection of John Galen Howard to design the mining building as a memorial to her husband had the effect of anointing the “at once reserved and passionate” New Englander. Soon after, the university selected him to fill the dual role of supervising architect and professor of architecture, with the task of forming a program in architecture at the university.

Woodbridge’s description of the innovative design for the Mining Building, which she characterizes as “one of the state’s, and even the country’s most distinguished architectural monuments,” is a model of clarity that she follows in her account of all of Howard’s major projects on the Berkeley campus. Accompanying historic photos, drawings and floor plans contribute to the reader’s comprehension and, coupled with a section of handsome color photographs, leave the reader eager for a campus tour to see the subjects firsthand.

Howard’s charge was to accommodate the idealized Bénard plan to the practical realities of the university’s needs and its resources. The reader gets a good sense of the negotiations, the compromises and always the budget constraints the supervising architect had to contend with. His relations with the university were often strained, and at times he felt overworked and underappreciated.

Woodbridge weaves other threads of Howard’s career throughout the story, including his work in Seattle for the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition and his tenure on San Francisco’s Civic Center Advisory Board. In the latter capacity, design of the Civic Auditorium drew him and his colleagues on the project, John Reid, Jr., and Frederick Meyer, into a rather nasty tangle with the local AIA chapter that the author describes in some detail.

We also learn that Howard was something of a poet. And if his work in that medium proves not so distinguished as his architecture, it does, nevertheless, shine a different light on this interesting figure.

Howard continued as supervising architect for the Berkeley campus until 1924; he retired from directorship of the School of Architecture in 1927.

In evaluating his career, Woodbridge concludes: “John Galen Howard’s life offers us a window on the wide-open world of California and its state university in the period from the end of the nineteenth century to the Great Depression. His buildings, standing as solid evidence of his contribution to that world, remain the crowning jewels of the university campus. The buildings are mute, but when perceived in the light of Howard’s words in his letters and published writings, they reveal the effect of that world on this at once reserved and passionate man.”

—D.A.

Some Preservation Web Sites

California Preservation Foundation  
www.californiapreservation.org

National Trust for Historic Preservation  
www.nationaltrust.org

National Register of Historic Places  
www.cr.nps.gov/nr
Heritage is pleased to announce that Michael Corbett will be the featured speaker at our annual meeting. A highly regarded San Francisco and Northern California architectural historian for 30 years, Michael recently completed the extensive research and writing of the National Register nomination for the Central Waterfront. He will present a slide talk on the history of the waterfront and its structures.

Thanks to the Port and to Wilson Meany Sullivan, the location for the meeting will be the fine new Port Commission hearing room in the rehabilitated Ferry Building, the perfect venue for the subject of Corbett’s lecture. Architect for the hearing room was the firm of Tom Eliot Fisch.

Working as an architectural historian for Charles Hall Page & Associates, Corbett conducted Heritage’s downtown survey and wrote Splendid Survivors, the results of that inventory published in 1979. In the employ of Heritage, from 1981 to 1984, he directed the extended surveys that included South of Market, the Tenderloin/Lower Nob Hill, Chinatown, Civic Center and the Van Ness Corridor. After a stint in graduate school, Michael worked for two years writing landmark nominations for the New York City Landmarks Commission.

Following a period as a self-employed architectural historian back in the Bay Area, Corbett joined Dames & Moore, consulting engineers providing environmental services. When the Port of San Francisco engaged that firm to prepare the National Register documentation for waterfront resources from Pier 45 through China Basin, he directed the task. Dames & Moore is now part of URS Corporation. Since completing that huge project, Michael has returned to contract work as an independent architectural historian.

### Profiles of Board Candidates

The business portion of Heritage’s annual meeting on June 7th will include election of board members. The seven candidates up for reelection are:

**Alice Carey** is president of Carey & Co., Inc., an award-winning architecture, preservation, planning and sustainable design firm, since 1983. She also serves on the board of the College of Environmental Design/UC Berkeley Archives and formerly served on the San Francisco Beautiful board of directors and the California Historic State Capitol advisory board. She is past president of the Landmarks Board and a member of the California Historical Society, California Preservation Foundation, Society of Architectural Historians, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the San Francisco Preservation Consortium.

**Julie Chase** is principal of Chase Communications, a San Francisco public relations firm specializing in media relations, marketing and event planning for real estate, healthcare, financial services, consumer and education organizations. She is a member of the board of trustees of Enterprise for High School Students and a former board member of the National Association of Industrial and Office Parks and Leadership High School.

**Geoffrey Dohrmann** is co-founder, chairman and CEO of Institutional Real Estate, Inc., where he serves as publisher and editor-in-chief of *Institutional Real Estate Securities*, The

**Bland Platt** is principal of Bland Platt Associates, an award-winning San Francisco-based firm that provides services throughout the West in historic preservation, planning, history and materials conservation. He is a member of the President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the First Lady’s Millennium Committee to Save America’s Treasures and serves on the boards of Preservation Action and the National Parks Conservation Association Advisory Council.

**Gee Gee Platt** is sole principal of G. Bland Platt Associates, a historic preservation consulting firm which she established in 1980. She provides historical and architectural research and documentation, applications for National Register and state and local designations, and certification for tax credit applications and compliance with The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. She is active in the National Trust and the California Preservation Foundation.

**Nancy Shanahan** is an attorney who represents non-profit corporations and governmental entities who acquire land and water for open space, wildlife and other conservation purposes. She previously served as regional counsel in the Western Regional Office of the National Trust, responsible for addressing preservation and legal issues in the west. She is currently historian on the board of directors of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers and is president of The Northeast San Francisco Conservancy.

**Rober O. Walther** is principal of the Tusker Corporation, a real estate management firm in San Francisco. He serves on the boards of Charles Schwab Corporation, First Republic Bank, the San Francisco Symphony, Chapman University and the UCSF Foundation.
San Francisco Architectural Heritage
Annual Report to Members

Statement of Activities for the Year Ended December 31, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Temporarily restricted</th>
<th>Permanently restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$41,915</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>80,333</td>
<td>24,983</td>
<td>108,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>59,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs</td>
<td>57,759</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas-Lilienthal House</td>
<td>85,176</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Event - Net</td>
<td>76,241</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and Other Income</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>16,658</td>
<td>20,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets Released</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Restrictions</td>
<td>68,124</td>
<td>(68,124)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>411,817</td>
<td>32,817</td>
<td>3,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EXPENSES       |                        |                        |       |
| Education, Preservation and Advocacy | 191,432          |                        | 191,432 |
| Haas-Lilienthal House | 66,333              |                        | 66,333 |
| Administrative and Membership Services | 144,046         |                        | 144,046 |
| Fundraising | 16,936                 |                        | 16,936 |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | 418,747                |                        | 418,747 |

| Change in Net Assets | (6,930) | 32,817 | 3,510 | 29,397 |
| Net Assets Jan. 1, 2002 (1) | 359,319 | 70,922 | 388,197 | 818,438 |
| Net Assets Dec. 31, 2002 | $352,389 | $103,739 | $391,707 | $847,835 |

Statement of Financial Position as of December 31, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$81,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Other Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>36,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities (2)</td>
<td>513,745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore Inventory</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>24,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas-Lilienthal House (3)</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Equipment - Net</td>
<td>12,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSETS</td>
<td>$894,739</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>LIABILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$16,066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Payroll</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>16,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Obligation</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LIABILITIES</td>
<td>46,904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NET ASSETS                 |            |            |            |            |
| Unrestricted               |            |            |            |            |
| Board-designated           | 78,733     |            |            |            |
| Undesignated              | 273,656    |            |            |            |
| Temporarily Restricted     | 103,739    |            |            |            |
| Permanently Restricted     | 391,707    |            |            |            |
| TOTAL NET ASSETS           | 847,835    |            |            |            |

| TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS | $894,739 |

NOTES

* Prior year amounts have been restated to reflect changes in classification.
* The House Endowment amounts to $415,650. Its income is irrevocably dedicated to the maintenance of the Haas-Lilienthal House.
* 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/ Dennis Richards, Treasurer, March 27, 2003

---

Official Announcement
The Annual Meeting of San Francisco Architectural Heritage will take place on Saturday, June 7, 2003, 9:30 am, at The Ferry Building Port Commission Hearing Room
(BART & Muni Metro to Embarcadero Station "F" Line, California Cable Car, #1, 7, 14, 21, 31 bus lines nearby)

Agenda:

9:30 – 10:00 Coffee Reception
10:00 – 10:30 President’s Report
10:30 – 11:00 Question period for members *
11:00 – 11:15 Presentation: Heritage Award
11:15 – 12:00 Speaker: Michael Corbett

*When you RSVP, tell us what issues you would like to have addressed in the question period.

Reservations required.
All are welcome to attend, but only current members of Heritage may vote.

Clip and mail the coupon below to:
Heritage
2007 Franklin Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
or fax it to (415) 441-3015
or call (415) 441-3000
or e-mail us your reservation:
info@sfheritage.org

---

Please reserve ___ places at the Annual Meeting

Names of attendees Member?
________________________ Yes ___ No __
________________________ Yes ___ No __
________________________ Yes ___ No __
________________________ Yes ___ No __
**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**  
Wednesdays 12 noon to 3:00 pm  
Saturdays 12 noon to 3:00 pm  
Sundays 11 am to 4:00 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.*

---

**May**

**THROUGH MAY 3**  
Society of California Pioneers Exhibition: *California: This Land of Golden Promise*. 415-957-1849  
www.californiapioneers.org

**May 5**  
House Tour: The Kearney Track, A Streetcar Suburb. BAHA, 510-841-2242

**May 7, 5:30 PM**  
Friends of City Planning Reception & Dinner (See page 11)

**May 12 - 13**  
Preservation Training Workshop  
College of the Redwoods & Presidio Trust. 707-476-4559; www.presidio.gov/community/events.asp

**May 13, 7:30 PM**  
Lecture: *A Barbary Coast Trail: Pathway to the Past and the Future!*  
S.F. Museum & Historical Society  
415-775-1111; www.sfhistory.org

**May 13, 8:00 PM**  
Lecture: *An Architectural and Social History of Newport’s Golden Age, 1720-1800.*  
American Decorative Arts Forum  
415-249-9234

---

**June**

**June 7, 9:30 AM - 12 NOON**  
Heritage Annual Meeting  
(See pages 8 & 9)

**June 10, 7:30 PM**  
Lecture: *In Search of New Frontiers—Irish Immigrants in San Francisco*  
S.F. Museum & Historical Society  
415-775-1111; www.sfhistory.org

**June 10, 8:00 PM**  
Lecture: *Treasures of the China Trade*  
American Decorative Arts Forum  
415-249-9234

**June 26, 7:00 PM**  
Lecture by Bruce Bradbury, founder Bradbury & Bradbury Art Wallpapers  
Alameda Museum. 510-748-0796

**June 26, 7:30 PM**  
Lecture: *Celebrity Citizens Represented in Golden Gate Park.*  
S.F.H.A.  
415-750-9986
CEQA continued from page 1

final category, D, are “presumed not to be” historical resources.

There is room to debate how the department proposes to assign properties to each of these categories. For instance, should the Heritage surveys and the UMB survey come under category B rather than C, as is the case in the draft proposal? However, the proposed categorization of certain non-surveyed properties may have even wider implications.

The Planning Department’s draft proposal would include under the category “presumed not to be ‘historical resources’” properties not covered in any survey or inventory, built after 1906 and more than 50 years old. The department would not require the sponsor of a project affecting such a property to provide any additional information but would, rather, place the burden on any interested party to provide evidence the property is historic.

Considering the enormous amount of post-quake reconstruction and the development of outlying neighborhoods that occurred in the first half of the 20th century, mostly unsurveyed to date, this exclusion is wide-ranging.

In our view, this presumption is misplaced and inappropriate. If a comprehensive citywide data source existed, then it might be acceptable not to require more information of a developer. However, San Francisco does not have such a source, having completed only a small fraction of the survey work required to meet this need.

Absent a comprehensive survey and its ongoing update, it is unwarranted to make the leap to a presumption of the lack of historic value on any unsurveyed property. Until every district of the city has been surveyed, we think the department should tend toward a broader construction of the concept of historical resource rather than a more narrow one.

We anticipate the opportunity to work with the Planning Department on these and other concerns and to arrive at a workable and orderly procedure for applying CEQA in San Francisco.

ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

The 26th annual San Francisco Decorator Showcase will be on view from April 26 through May 26. This year’s fundraiser benefiting University High School student financial aid will feature the house at 164 Sea Cliff Avenue, designed in the French Renaissance style in 1920 by Albert Farr. General admission is $25/$20 for seniors. Tickets are available at the door only. For open hours call 415-447-5830, or visit www.decoratorsshowcase.org.

On Wednesday, May 7, Friends of City Planning will hold its annual fundraising reception and dinner, at Gold Mountain Restaurant. The nonprofit organization supports the work of the Planning Department by funding grants for such needs as professional development and training of planning staff and the acquisition of innovative software and equipment. The reception begins at 5:30, dinner at 7:00. Help increase the visibility of preservation advocacy by attending. Special Community Sponsor rate for a table of 10 is $500; Special Community tickets are $50 per person. Call 415-355-9988.

The summer session at Dominican University of California, in San Rafael, will offer a comprehensive historic preservation class. The instructor is John Merritt, who has spent 30 years in the field, including stints as director of CPF and assistant director of the National Trust western office. Course is OHP approved for CLG requirements. Call 510-527-7808, or e-mail jmerritt@earthlink.net

In December, by unanimous vote, the board of directors of the Presidio Trust named Craig Middleton as executive director. The selection ended a six-month search that attracted over 250 candidates. Middleton was the Trust’s first employee and served as deputy director for government affairs, programs and administration for four years. Recently, he assumed the role of acting executive director. In his new post, his responsibilities include oversight of historic and natural resource protection.

The first newsletter of a fledgling preservation organization arrived at our offices this winter. Formed in October 2000, the Recent Past Preservation Network, has taken as its mission to provide “an open community platform for the development and revision of practical strategies to document, preserve, and re-use historic places of the recent past.” Based in Arlington, Virginia, the RPPN has a web site, www.recentpast.org.

The schedule of 2003 Seminars in Historic Preservation & Cultural Resource Management is now available. Offered by the National Preservation Institute, this series of programs at sites around the country began in March and runs through November. Programs in San Francisco include those on the use of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, Section 106 Review and photodocumentation of historic resources. For more information, go to www.npi.org, or call 703-765-0100.

The Department of Building Inspection is hosting Brown Bag Lunch Talks, the third Thursday of every month, from noon until 1:30, in Room 2001, 1660 Mission Street. Each session, free to the public and City staff, offers an informal general information talk on a variety of building subjects. You are invited to bring your lunch; coffee and other beverages will be provided. For more information, contact Laurence Kornfield, 415-558-6205.

The California College of Arts and Crafts and the San Francisco Art Institute have announced that they have discontinued talks (noted in the last issue of Heritage News) to explore a possible merger of the two historic institutions. Three months of discussions among trustees, faculty, staff and students determined that joining the two institutions would not be advisable at this time. Both communities expressed hope that the spirit of collegiality that emerged from the talks will continue.
The historic Haas-Lilienthal House, a property of San Francisco Architectural Heritage, is available for private or corporate events. The House can accommodate up to 150 guests. For information call (415) 441-3011.

NEW HERITAGE WALKING TOURS IN THE OFFING

Heritage staff has been working with a group of docents to prepare three new architectural walking tours. Each will feature a neighborhood within reach of the Haas-Lilienthal House, from which the tours will depart. Watch for announcement of the tours and their inaugural dates in the very near future. Notice will appear in Heritage News and on our web site www.sfheritage.org.