

**COMPREHENSIVE CITYWIDE CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCE SURVEY**  
**DRAFT**  
**WORK PLAN**

**OVERVIEW**

The mission of the San Francisco Planning Department Historic Preservation Program is to strengthen the integration of historic preservation into the broader public policy and land-use planning arenas by identifying and evaluating cultural resources in San Francisco. This will be accomplished by institutionalizing a multi-year citywide comprehensive survey and by cyclical updates of existing surveys<sup>1</sup>. It is the goal of the Department that these activities will increase the opportunities for broad-based and diverse public participation in planning and historic preservation activities and that they will promote the retention of neighborhood character through historic preservation, planning and adaptive re-use of the built environment.

The Planning Department has assembled a team of staff members to work on the Comprehensive Citywide Cultural and Historical Resource Survey (Survey Program). This team of professionally qualified individuals has developed a dynamic plan to address an enormously complex task over a period of several years. Considerations have been made for the different survey data needs of current long-range area plans, and for existing neighborhoods without ongoing planning efforts, which contain undocumented cultural resources.

The Survey Program will first attempt to catch up with several long-range planning areas, providing a baseline of information on historic resources within plan boundaries in the initial stages. The Survey Program consists of several strategies, each tailored to the specific needs of the area plan being documented, and the level of information needed. Goals for area plans include the identification of potential resources, and the effects of the plan on the resources – without necessarily documenting the full extent of a neighborhood that lies beyond the plan boundaries.

Non area plan surveys will need to suit the needs of the neighborhood or identified district, and work toward documentation to the full extent of the context as defined by a natural boundary, a change in architecture, or historical pattern of development, use or buffer zone. The Survey Program also incorporates long-term survey goals by addressing a citywide context statement, data management and community outreach. This Survey Program as designed is subject to revisions as the Department learns from experience in the next year.

According the Department of Building Inspection, San Francisco has about 148,500 buildings. About 133,500 are older than 45 years old, a general age requirement for properties to be considered in a survey. The Planning Department has some survey data gathered since the 1960s on about 18,000 buildings. This leaves a need to document 115,000 buildings over 45 years old under the Survey Program<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> California Register statute (PRC § 5024.1) and regulations (14 CCR § 4850 et seq.) require that at the time a local jurisdiction *nominates* an historic resource survey for listing in the California Register, the survey must be updated if it is more than five years old. NOTE: this does not mean that resources identified in a survey that is more than five years old need not be considered “historical resources” for the purposes of CEQA.

<sup>2</sup> There are an estimated 15,000 buildings erected in San Francisco between 1961 and 2006.

## METHODOLOGY

The Planning Department has been engaged with several stakeholders in the field of historic preservation, not only in San Francisco but also across California, for more than a year. The Planning Department's own Survey Advisors group, the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, the Historic Preservation Fund Committee, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the Getty Conservation Institute, the State Office of Historic Preservation, as well as numerous local neighborhood organizations and working professionals have all participated in the discussions.

The Planning Department is committed to conducting context-based architectural and historical surveys throughout the City. The Survey Program plans to use the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation 523-series forms to document cultural resources (following the California Office of Historic Preservation's *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*<sup>3</sup>), and the methodology of National Register Bulletin # 24: *Technical information on comprehensive planning, survey of cultural resources, and registration in the National Register of Historic Places*. When an individual survey, by means of field forms or other interim data collection tools, generates DPR 523 forms as an end product, the results of any such analysis shall undergo a peer review, before being reported to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, and then transmitted to the State Office of Historic Preservation for incorporation into the California Historic Resource Inventory System (CHRIS) database.

The State's DPR 523-series forms are the means to record a variety of resources from buildings to archeological finds to bridges and roadways. They were designed to be the final product of a survey in a standard format. Individual survey teams are free to design their own methods in order to achieve the goal of documentation on the forms. The Planning department has, to date, relied on a digital photograph taken in the field combined with a paper field form (not the DPR 523 itself) to document the physical characteristics of a property. Following a field survey, the notes are keyed into a database program that can take the information and print it onto the actual DPR 523 forms. Several technology firms have developed other digital means to accomplish the same task.

By means of comparison, the Getty Conservation Institute has worked for over five years on the organization of a similar survey for Los Angeles. The Getty Plan begins with a citywide context statement; identifies significant properties and areas; establishes evaluation standards and inventory; establishes priorities of action; associates incentives and designations; develops a database; increases public awareness and intends to streamline the review process.<sup>4</sup> The San Francisco Survey Program seeks to adapt these elements to our needs in order to meet San Francisco-specific goals.

Historic resource surveys will ordinarily begin with a visit to the area, combined with an investigation into the history of an area in preparation for an initial context statement. The next step is to proceed with a reconnaissance survey that documents the physical qualities of the property. An intensive survey then follows with an assessment for the National, California or local significance. At the final stages, the context statement is revised to summarize the full body of research conducted<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> The 523 forms document the physical attributes of a property also including a photograph on the DPR 523A form; document the history and significance on a DPR 523B form; and document groups of buildings as in districts on DPR 523D forms.

<sup>4</sup> More about the Getty Conservation Institute plan is available online at:  
[http://www.getty.edu/conservation/field\\_projects/lasurvey/](http://www.getty.edu/conservation/field_projects/lasurvey/)

<sup>5</sup> A more detailed approach to context development is found on pages 8 and 14.

The following San Francisco Survey Program proposal is designed to find a middle ground that will seek to understand the importance of neighborhoods or classes of resources first, then document properties or areas of significance. A City staff of professionally qualified architectural historians will visit a proposed survey area, take digital photographs of each building or property, and work to provide an initial assessment of properties. Results of an initial assessment will undergo an internal peer review, and lead to refinements of a scope of work for further physical documentation on descriptive DPR 523A and evaluative DPR 523B forms for individually significant properties. Significant groups of buildings generally considered being “districts” would each be documented on a combination of descriptive DPR 523A forms for each building or property coupled with a district 523D form, with pertinent information on each district building or element noted on the district 523D form.

San Francisco is presently acquiring and installing the State-sponsored California Historic Resources Inventory Database (CHRID), for the collection, maintenance and dissemination of survey results<sup>6</sup>. It is likely the review will recommend adoption of the CHRID system with modifications to provide for the specific needs of San Francisco. A more in-depth discussion of the database is on page 9.

## **PROPOSED SURVEY PROGRAM WORK PLAN: AREA PLANS**

**Area Plan Surveys** that were part of Supervisor McGoldrick's Better Neighborhoods legislation consist of the Market and Octavia, Central Waterfront, East SoMa<sup>7</sup>, Lower Potrero Hill/Showplace Square and Mission areas. The following Area Plan surveys will involve different mixes of Department staff time and paid consultants to accomplish the tasks. In each case, the Department will require a photograph of every property, and will seek documentation of every property over 45 years of age. Alongside survey work called for in FY 2006-2007, preservation staff will develop policies and code provisions specifying the various classifications of cultural and historic resources and the development controls that will apply to them. This will ensure that when the surveys are completed and classifications are assigned to the various resources, the development controls that apply will have already been determined, obviating the need to amend the Plans and implementing documents. This plan addresses these areas first.

The Market and Octavia Area Plan survey was awarded to Page & Turnbull (P&T). The survey is intended to generate the products requested within the scope, as well as to inform decision makers and stakeholders regarding potential historic resources within the boundaries of the Area Plan. The Planning Department intends to accommodate the results of this survey into the plan's policies, and to amend the plan if necessary per the findings of the completed survey. The consultant deliverables are to include:

1. Develop site-specific software to be used on tablet personal computers (PCs). Forms are intended to be compatible with the California Historic Resource Information Database (CHRID, the State's new database program). This software will allow surveyors to collect data in the field and create the DPR 523A forms. The rented PCs will be used by the consultant teams to record physical descriptions of buildings in the field on the touch-screen panels that will be directly downloaded into the database at Page & Turnbull's office.
2. Data collection process and field survey. Teams of surveyors will complete the survey divided geographically by neighborhood – limited by the boundaries of the Area Plan. This initial survey will focus on South of Market (SOMA), Market Street, Mission, Eureka

---

<sup>6</sup> This review is in the form of an IT RFP to be sponsored by the Historic Preservation Fund Committee and MOEWD.

<sup>7</sup> For the purpose of survey, the East SoMa area is combined with, and includes the area of study by the Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force.

Valley/Castro, Duboce Triangle, Lower Haight, Hayes Valley, Western Addition and Civic Center. The survey will focus on properties built before 1961 within the survey area. In accordance with this plan, all properties will be photographed, and all properties over 45 years old will be documented.

3. Consultant and the City will confer to determine which properties and/or districts will qualify for additional research and completion of DPR 523B and/or 523D forms. P&T historians will rate each property as non-contributing, contextual, and significant. From the survey ratings, only properties designated as "significant" will include a brief evaluation of eligibility for Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. Between 200 and 250 DPR 523B (about 10% of the total) and as many as 10 DPR 523D forms will be completed to State standards. (See page 14.)
4. Consultant will produce "How to Research" workshop materials, and conduct workshops in a volunteer program. The product of the research will be included in the context statements and DPR 523B and 523D forms.
5. A Context Statement will be written to include a history of the relevant neighborhoods (Hayes Valley, Mission, SOMA, Civic Center, Market Street, Duboce Triangle, Lower Haight, Eureka Valley/Castro and the Western Addition); an outline of the architectural types & styles; periods of development; important individuals; evolution of street patterns; evolution of social, ethnic and LGBT populations; and major events, including the area's labor and industrial history, especially as it relates to SOMA and the Mission. The context statement will also include recommendations for additional research and evaluation. This may lead to new phases of survey work within the area, or areas adjacent to the Area Plan boundaries with additional 523B forms to be generated in subsequent years.
6. Support and other deliverables will include: Press Releases and Community Meetings; Website or Pages for the SF Market/Octavia Preservation; Graphic Identity and Collateral Material; Video Documentation.

The Department expects to receive survey results by May 2007. The costs are not to exceed \$270,000.00 with funding from the City's FY 2005-2006 budget. The Department has allotted .25 Full Time Equivalent staff (FTE) in the 12-month period beginning in June 2006 to manage the contract and review survey findings.

The Central Waterfront Area Plan boundary is from Mariposa Street south to Islais Creek and from the I-280 east to the Bay. The Planning Department and the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association surveyed the plan area in 2000 and 2001. The two surveys together generated DPR 523A and DPR 523B forms for all properties built before 1956 within the Central Waterfront Plan Area. A significant residential enclave has since been listed as a local historic district in Article 10 of the Planning Code. The Port of San Francisco has independently opted to seek consultant services to focus on Pier 70 Port-owned properties for more intensive historical analysis<sup>8</sup>. The Department's 2001 survey has one outstanding need – completion of a historic district record - which will take approximately six months to complete. The department intends to hire a consultant to conduct the bulk of the remaining survey work. The Department proposes allotment of .10 FTE to prepare the contract documents, based on the tasks listed below beginning in the first quarter of FY 2006-2007, and .10 FTE to manage the contract and review findings in the second and third quarters.

At the Historic Preservation Fund Committee (Committee) meeting of May 13<sup>th</sup>2006, the Committee agreed to provide up to \$25,000 of funding for this project with the intent to complete the survey process in the Central Waterfront Better Neighborhoods Plan Area. The contract was awarded to Page and Turnbull, and results are expected in March or April of 2007.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.sfport.com/site/uploadedfiles/port/RFP%20Announcement.pdf>

The following are work tasks assumed necessary to complete a historic district record for the Central Waterfront:

1. Analyze the existing Central Waterfront Survey data consisting of context statements for the Central Waterfront and Dogpatch Neighborhood, as well as survey forms.
2. Develop a district record (DPR 523D with continuation sheets) that encompasses the industrial landscape of the Central Waterfront from 1886-1945 which should include:
  - a. Physical description of the eligible district; boundary description with map and justification.
  - b. A context statement describing the historical development of the area, with reference to the historical development of SoMa in general and San Francisco as a whole. Important patterns, events, persons, architectural types and styles, or cultural values should be identified and discussed.
  - c. An evaluation of the area's eligibility as a district locally, under the California Register, and/or under the National Register. Evaluation should include discussion of the period of significance and integrity.
  - d. Reevaluate properties from both survey efforts that were originally assigned "4-series" National Register Status Codes, (presently rated 7N or 7N1 in the CHRIS database) on continuation sheets (DPR 523L) using the current California Historic Resources Status Codes.

The Historic Preservation Fund Committee and the Planning Department have a combined budget for contracted surveys in **FY 2006-7** for \$500,000.00. This will be divided between three survey areas: Northeast Mission/Showplace Square, Mission Area, and SoMa.

Northeast Mission / Showplace Square Survey of the northeast portion of the Mission Area Plan, dominated by an industrial building context, will be conducted together with survey of similarly industrial Showplace Square within the Showplace Square/Lower Potrero Hill Plan – an area of approximately 445 (four hundred and forty-five) buildings constructed over 45 years ago. The boundary of this area is roughly from Shotwell Street east to 7<sup>th</sup> Street and Interstate 280, and from 13<sup>th</sup> Street and Bryant Street south to 20<sup>th</sup> Street (see map, Appendix E). These areas mostly contain thematically connected industrial and warehouse buildings, which are proposed for rezoning under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan as one of the following: Production, Distribution, Repair (PDR), Urban Mixed Use, Design and Showroom District, and Arts and Technology District. Survey and evaluation is needed to determine whether the area contains one or more eligible historic district(s) and/or individually significant historic resources. Important patterns, events, persons, architectural types and styles must be identified and researched with an emphasis toward evaluating related properties in the area. Determinations for eligibility for both districts and individual resources should be based on National Register, California Register, and local significance criteria.

An initial draft historic context statement is currently being prepared for the Showplace Square portion of the survey area, and it will be completed prior to initiation of this survey. It is expected that this document will inform a new context statement, to be completed under this scope, which would also include the adjacent Northeast Mission area. The expectation is that Showplace Square and the Northeast Mission comprise a single contextual unit with a shared development history and containing primarily similar office, commercial, and industrial building stock. The consultant may also refer to the existing Inner Mission North context (<http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/preservation/InnerMiss.pdf>). for related information. In addition, it is expected that the context statement prepared in advance of the SoMa survey will also be a valuable reference.

A combination of reconnaissance and intensive level survey is needed in the industrial northeast section of the Mission and Showplace Square Plan areas in order to guide City policies. Although these areas are in separate Area Plans, they appear to share a similar industrial building context, therefore for the purposes of streamlining this survey the Department seeks a single contract to carry out the inventory and evaluation. Non-industrial buildings within the survey area must also be evaluated, informed by the appropriate historic context based on the location of those properties and association (or lack of association) with the surrounding industrial theme. DPR 523A forms are needed for each building over 45 years old, of which there are approximately 445 in the subject area. Approximately 57 of these have some kind of historic rating or have been previously evaluated, and therefore a number of DPR 523A and 523B forms for these properties may already exist. Although pre-existing DPR forms should be verified, for the purposes of this RFP they do not need to be recreated unless changes to resources necessitate an update or re-evaluation. In addition to this existing information, the Planning Department will provide the selected consultant with electronic files indicating the Assessor's Parcel Number (APN), address, Assessor's office date of construction, digital photograph of all properties over 45 years old, and historic ratings (if any) for each parcel within the study area.

The following are work tasks necessary to complete a survey and evaluation of historic resources in the Northeast Mission/Showplace Square area.

1. Prepare State of California DPR 523A (Primary Record) forms for each property within the survey area built before 1962 where no previous DPR form has been prepared.
2. Prepare DPR 523B (Building Structure Object Record) and DPR 523D (District Record) forms. Include an evaluation of eligibility to Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, the California Register of Historical Resources, and the National Register of Historic Places based on the context statement (not limited to architecture; associations with important events and persons should also be considered). Respondents are expected to scope the number of these forms that they will provide.
3. Verify existing DPR 523A, 523B, and 523D forms for accuracy and update if necessary.
4. Prepare a context statement covering both Showplace Square and the Northeast Mission incorporating new information learned through individual property research. A *Suggested Outline for a Fully Developed Context Statement* is located within this RFP following the third scope of work.
5. Complete a documentation spreadsheet, expanding on baseline information provided by the Planning Department (noted below by an asterisk \*), for each building and/or parcel within the area, which must include: Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)\*; Assessor address\*; Other address; Assessor's office date of construction\*; Alternate date of construction and source; Property type (from standard list provided by the Department); Previously assigned California Historical Resource Status Code (CHRSC), if any\*; Local historic categorization or previous survey\*; Proposed status code (CHRSC) through this survey evaluation.
6. Provide recommendations for additional research and evaluation.

The Planning Department seeks to have work on this project completed by Summer 2008. At a minimum, progress will be monitored with phased submittals at 4, 8, and 12 months after the contract has been signed. These submittals will include initial context statement, DPR 523A, 523B and 523D forms. At least four in-person meetings with Planning Department staff are expected; one at kick-off and one each at approximately 25% (4 mos.), 50% (8 mos.), and 75% (12 mos.) complete. Consultant attendance at two community meetings and one public hearing may be required.

The Mission Area Plan<sup>9</sup> ("Mission Plan") is bounded by Guerrero Street to the west, Potrero Avenue to the east, Division Street to the north, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south. Including streets and sidewalks, this district covers over 841 acres; however, for the purposes of this survey, the northeast industrial portion of the plan area is not included and will be surveyed under separate contract (Northeast Mission/Showplace Square), leaving approximately 3,693 (three thousand six hundred and ninety-three) properties over 45 years old in the survey area (see Appendix F). Portions of the remaining Mission Plan area have been documented through the Planning Department's Inner Mission North historic resources survey, which has been ongoing since 2001. The Department will continue its survey activities within the Inner Mission North and will coordinate these efforts with that of the Eastern Neighborhoods Mission Survey.

The Department will produce a historic context statement in-house for the entire Mission Plan area by expanding the existing Inner Mission North context statement. The consultant should recommend revisions to the context statement to the Department if additional substantive information comes to light during the process of surveying the area, but new research for the context statement will not be required. This document will be completed prior to the start of the contract in March or April 2007. Proposers are encouraged to refer to the existing Inner Mission North context statement available online at: <http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/preservation/InnerMiss.pdf>

A combination of reconnaissance and intensive level survey is needed in the Mission Plan area in order to guide City policies. DPR 523A forms are needed for each building over 45 years old, of which there are approximately 3,693 in the subject area. Approximately 300 of these have some kind of historic rating or have been previously evaluated, and therefore a number of DPR 523A and 523B forms for these properties may already exist. Although such pre-existing DPR forms should be verified, for the purposes of this RFP they do not need to be recreated unless changes to resources necessitate an update or re-evaluation. In addition to this existing information, the Planning Department will provide the selected consultant with electronic files indicating the Assessor's Parcel Number (APN), address, Assessor's office date of construction, and historic ratings (if any) for each parcel within the study area.

The context statement will inform an evaluation of potential resources or historic district boundaries in the area. Respondents should estimate the number of DPR 523B and 523D forms they will provide.

The following are work tasks necessary to complete a survey and evaluation of historic resources in the Mission Plan area.

---

<sup>9</sup> This survey does not include the northeast industrial area of the Mission, which contains similar building stock to that found in Showplace Square and has therefore been included as part of a separate scope/contract.

1. Prepare State of California DPR 523A (Primary Record) forms for each property within the survey area built before 1962 that has not been previously surveyed.
2. Prepare DPR 523B (Building Structure Object Record) and DPR 523D (District Record) forms. Include an evaluation of eligibility to Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, the California Register of Historical Resources, and the National Register of Historic Places based on the context statement (not limited to architecture; associations with important events and persons should also be considered) Respondents are expected to scope the number of these forms that they will provide.
3. Verify existing DPR 523A, 523B, and 523D forms for accuracy and update if necessary.
4. Complete a documentation spreadsheet, expanding on baseline information provided by the Planning Department (noted below by an asterisk \*), for each building and/or parcel within the area, which must include: Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)\*; Assessor address\*; Other address; Assessor's office date of construction\*; Alternate date of construction and source; Property type (from standard list provided by Department); Previously assigned California Historical Resource Status Code (CHRSC), if any\*; Local historic categorization or previous survey\*; Proposed status code (CHRSC) through this survey evaluation.
5. Recommend any context statement revisions to the Planning Department, incorporating new information learned through individual property research.
6. Provide recommendations for additional research and evaluation.

The Planning Department seeks to have work on this project completed by Summer 2008. At a minimum, progress will be monitored with phased submittals at 4, 8, and 12 months after the contract has been signed. These submittals will include initial DPR 523A, 523B and 523D forms. At least four in-person meetings with Planning Department Staff are expected; one at kick-off and one each at approximately 25% (4 mos.), 50% (8 mos.), and 75% (12 mos.) complete. Consultant attendance at two community meetings and one public hearing may be required.

The South of Market survey area is roughly Market Street to Townsend Street, between 1st and 13th Streets, and contains approximately 1,650 (sixteen hundred and fifty) properties constructed over 45 years ago (see Appendix G, Map 2). The Department proposes a single survey for South of Market, which will include the separate planning areas of East and West SoMa. The area of East SoMa is generally made up of the same building stock and context as Western SoMa, presently under study by the Western SoMa Citizen's Planning Task Force – and it is the same as many elements of the adjacent Mid-Market Redevelopment area. The results of the single survey will benefit all planning efforts.

While much survey work has been done South of Market, none has yet to look at the area comprehensively (See Appendix G, Map 3). A historic context statement is currently being prepared for SoMa, and it will be completed prior to initiation of this survey. This context statement has identified two potential historic districts, a South Van Ness Deco/Moderne District and a West SoMa Light Industrial & Residential District (see Appendix G, Map 4). The consultant should revise this context statement if additional substantive information comes to



light during the process of surveying the area, but new research for the context statement will not be required.

A combination of reconnaissance and intensive level survey is needed in the SoMa area in order to guide City policies. DPR 523A forms are needed for each building over 45 years old, of which there are approximately 1,650 in the subject area. Approximately 238 of these have some kind of historic rating or have been previously evaluated, and therefore a number of DPR 523A and 523B forms for these properties may already exist. Although such pre-existing DPR forms should be verified, for the purposes of this RFP they do not need to be recreated unless changes to resources necessitate an update or re-evaluation. In addition to this existing information, the Planning Department will provide the selected consultant with electronic files indicating the Assessor's Parcel Number (APN), address, Assessor's office date of construction, and historic ratings (if any) for each parcel within the study area.

The context statement should inform an evaluation of potential resources or historic district boundaries in the area. Respondents should be clear about the number of DPR 523B and 523D forms they will provide.

The following are work tasks necessary to complete a survey and evaluation of historic resources in the SoMa area.

1. Provide a digital photograph of each property over 45 years old within the survey boundaries.
2. Prepare State of California DPR 523A (Primary Record) forms for each property within the survey area built before 1962 that has not been previously surveyed.
3. Prepare DPR 523B (Building Structure Object Record) and DPR 523D (District Record) forms. Include an evaluation of eligibility to Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, the California Register of Historical Resources, and the National Register of Historic Places based on the context statement (not limited to architecture; associations with important events and persons should also be considered). Respondents are expected to scope the number of these forms that they will provide.
4. Verify existing DPR 523A, 523B, and 523D forms for accuracy and update if necessary.
5. Recommend any revisions to the context statement provided by the Department (developed in advance of this project), incorporating new information learned through individual property research.
6. Complete a documentation spreadsheet, expanding on baseline information provided by the Planning Department (noted below by an asterisk \*), for each building and/or parcel within the area, which must include: Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)\*; Assessor address\*; Other address; Assessor's office date of construction\*; Alternate date of construction and source; Property type (from standard list provided by Department); Previously assigned California Historical Resource Status Code (CHRSC), if any\*; Local historic categorization or previous survey\*; Proposed status code (CHRSC) through this survey evaluation.
7. Provide recommendations for additional research and evaluation.

The Planning Department seeks to have work on this project completed by Summer 2008. At a minimum, progress will be monitored with phased submittals at 4, 8, and 12 months after the contract has been signed. These submittals will include initial DPR 523A, 523B and 523D forms. At least four in-person meetings with Planning Department staff are expected; one at kick-off and one each at approximately 25% (4 mos.), 50% (8 mos.), and 75% (12 mos.) complete. Consultant attendance at two community meetings and one public hearing may be required.

The Planning Department's FY 2007-2008 budget calls for **\$862,085** for the Survey Program:

	Planning Department	Historic Preservation Fund Committee
Staff, 5 FTE including .75 new historian Planner III position	\$ 550,408	
Contract funding for Citywide Survey		\$ 220,580
Japantown Survey		50,000
Software		9,034
Materials and supplies		7,500
CHRID hosting software	11,677	12,886
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 562,085</b>	<b>\$ 300,000</b>

See Page 14 for Staff details.

Development of preservation policies for Area Plans in conjunction with both the Citywide Policy Unit of the Planning Department, and the Redevelopment Agency is expected to continue during FY 2006-2007; the Department therefore proposes an allotment of .3 FTE during FY 2006-2007, with .25 FTE allocated for future FYs, to meet the needs for policy development associated with Area Plans. During FY 2005-2006, survey staff participated in the scoping of surveys for other Area Plans in Glen Park and Visitation Valley as part of the programmatic EIR process. Other areas that will be staffed as needed include: Balboa Park, Bayview/Hunter's Point, India Basin, Rincon Hill, Transbay Terminal, Mid-Market and future Citywide or Redevelopment Agency plan areas.

Staff members are also prepared to collaborate on a survey of an upcoming Japantown, (formerly Geary Boulevard) Area Plan, the boundaries of which are not yet finalized. The Department proposes to allot .1 FTE toward initial survey of this plan area in FY 2006-2007, going up to .5 FTE the following year. It is also likely that a consultant would be hired to work on intensive level survey for this plan area in FY 2007-2008, and the Department estimates the cost of this at \$50,000.

### **PROPOSED SURVEY PROGRAM WORK PLAN: LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY**

The Planning Department's Survey Program outline for a Comprehensive Survey outside of designated area plans is expected to have limited staff time and costs for FY 2006-2007, and may be revised in terms of cost and timeline as the Department learns from contracted area plan surveys. More staff time can be afforded from FY 2007-2008 forward.

A **Citywide Context Statement** is going to be developed in large part by Planning Department staff (new hire, Planner III) beginning in October 2007. Consultants may also be called upon to develop some elements of the Citywide Context as well. For the purpose of the Citywide Survey, the Department proposes the formation of a committee of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (Landmarks Board) to embark upon the task. The committee will work with the Department Staff to flesh out the outline that was developed by the Department in 2005.

Initial draft context statements are proposed within the Area Plan surveys specifically outlined above<sup>10</sup> are intended to be preliminary, based on neighborhood-scale research. Context statements at the first stage will be general, and will necessarily be informed by individual property research with revisions to reflect new, more intensive research in later phases of survey. Following the State Office of Historic Preservation's *Suggested Outline for a Fully Developed Context Statement* (attached), the Department will incorporate the outline in each of its consultant RFP/RFQ processes.

To date there is no "Context Statement" for the City and County of San Francisco. Such a document, as produced by other localities, serves as the basis for all historic surveys that are done. For example, it would provide the history of the City in general so that consultants and others could save time by referencing it or quoting portions of it as boilerplate. In addition, it would identify eras in the development of San Francisco, such as "The Victorian Era," "Post-1906 Reconstruction," or "The Post-War Period." Therefore a researcher could match the date of a building to a period of development and place it firmly within the context of city history. Thematic context statements could include "Public Schools and Universities" or "Hospitals and Public Health Institutions;" these do not need to be elaborate, but would establish a framework by which property types could be understood contextually. Geographic context statements would offer short statements about the historical growth and development of distinct neighborhoods. Again, this would simplify the work of researchers who could put building type, date, and location into a clear context, accepted by the City as accurate. The importance and usefulness of such a document cannot be overstated.

The Department proposes allotment of .75 FTE, beginning in FY 2007-2008, to hire an historian who would prepare the Citywide Context Statement. Following completion of the context (projected at spring of 2009), this historian would continue working on neighborhood-specific context statements and other research related to the Survey Program.

Specific Tasks:

- Data collection from in-house files, synthesis of known context statements
- Formation of context statement advisory panel
- Decide on chapters, layout, etc.
- Draft skeleton context statement/outline
- Complete chapters in-house

Where:

- Overall city context to start
- Neighborhood development chapters to be added
- Thematic studies of property types and historical eras

Staffing:

- In-house staff to begin process, gather data, assemble advisory panel
- Advisory panel to consist of Landmarks Board Members
- In-house staff to prepare context outline, skeleton information, synthesis of known contexts

---

<sup>10</sup> This includes Initial Draft Contexts for Market and Octavia neighborhoods; SoMa; Lower Potrero Hill / Showplace Square and the Mission.

### **Survey Program: Comprehensive Citywide Survey**

Comprehensive Citywide Survey outside of Area Plan boundaries, as stated earlier, is also necessary and supported by the Planning Department. The Department sees the future of non-area plan related survey to be completed in a two-stage process. City staff will provide an initial assessment of neighborhoods, and develop survey areas with informed boundaries and educated scopes of work in the first stage. Using the Citywide Context Statement, consultants will perform in-depth assessments on DPR 523 forms. A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process, where the City gathers a list of pre-screened consultants, will be the most efficient means to get independent surveys funded and underway. City staff will manage the contracts, and review the products. In view of the need to concentrate resources on Area Plan surveys during FY 2006-2007, the Department proposes allotment of 1.25 FTE in FY 2007-2008 (going up to 2.5 FTE the following fiscal years) to initiate these "smart surveys" and estimates spending \$270,580 in FY 2007-2008, and \$275,000 *per annum* thereafter on consultant contracts largely for short-term intensive surveys. The Department proposes allotment of .25 FTE to manage the contracts and review findings.

### Proposed projects for 2007-8

A number of priority areas outlined in the document dated 12/13/05 have not been acted upon and are still considered to be high priority by Department staff, following the methodology laid out in that original document. However, staff propose two modifications to the list; first, to include Chattanooga Street/Golden Fireplug under the broader neighborhood of Noe Valley; and second, to specify that the Sunset survey would be separated into the Parkside and Inner Sunset areas. The revised list follows:

- Balboa Park. This area is currently undergoing a long-range planning effort by the Planning Department, through the creation of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. It is a neighborhood that has been underrepresented in the survey program to date. The development of an area plan may lead to increased development pressures, and therefore it is important that architecturally significant buildings and potential historic districts be identified.
- Bernal Heights. The community group Bernal Heights Preservation (BHP) is supportive of a survey in this neighborhood. The area has been underrepresented by surveys in the past, and therefore it is important that architecturally significant historic resources be identified.
- The Castro. Community groups that support a survey of The Castro include the Friends of 1800, and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Historical Society of Northern California. A survey here will help to directly address and engage the cultural and social history of San Francisco, as well as identify architecturally significant buildings.
- Inner Richmond. San Francisco Architectural Heritage produced a survey of the Inner Richmond neighborhood in 1990 and now supports its update. By updating the previous survey, information about historically significant buildings will be disseminated to the public, and because it is an update the project could be completed in a timely manner.
- Noe Valley (including Chattanooga Street/Golden Fireplug). The community groups Chattanooga Street/Golden Fireplug Historic District Friends, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, and Victorian Alliance of San Francisco support a survey of this area. The age and potential rarity of the buildings, associated with the 1906 earthquake and fire, contribute to the importance of identifying architecturally significant buildings and potential historic districts in the area. In addition, development pressures in Noe Valley make this a priority area for survey.

- Sunset. The neighborhood group SPEAK (Sunset Parkside Education and Action Committee) supports survey work in the Sunset. This large neighborhood has been underrepresented by survey work in the past, and this project would contribute to the identification of architecturally significant buildings in the area. The survey would necessarily be divided or phased into at least two initial areas:
  - Parkside/Oceanside
  - Inner Sunset
 A context statement is being produced for the Parkside/Oceanside portion, and would therefore support completion of a survey of that area in a timely manner.

Department staff recommends prioritizing survey in Noe Valley. Since the initial list was created in December of 2005, it has become apparent to staff that the neighborhood of Noe Valley faces a high degree of development pressures, and planners are seeing many projects being proposed without having an adequate amount of information regarding potential historic districts and resources in the area. A potential project in the area would be to issue a contract for a context statement and preliminary historic district identification.

### **Database, Outreach, Administration**

A Historic Resources Database is required to store, manipulate, and make accessible the Cultural Resource data of past and future surveys and reports done in the City and County of San Francisco. Information that is to be stored in the database will include photographs, maps, and text. Some of the data already exists in different forms, both paper and electronic, and other data will be collected in the future. The final database should be able to make available data in all of the legal survey formats required by different agencies, as well as provide and organize data for research and planning work. It is especially important that the database be compatible with the new California Historical Resource Inventory Database (CHRID) being created by the State Office of Historic Preservation. In addition, the database must be both secure and available to the public on the City Website, and must fit within the existing information technology environment of San Francisco and the Planning Department. At this time, the Historic Preservation Fund Committee is poised to release an RFP for the development of specifications for a database to collect, organize and disseminate survey data in a manner consistent with the State of California CHRID system. The Department proposes allotment of .25 FTE over the next two years to work with Planning Department IT staff, and the City's DTIS staff as needed, on creation and implementation of the database; \$9,034 is expected to be needed for outside consulting services according to a recent quote from CF Webtools; and up to \$24,563<sup>11</sup> /year, based on DTIS quotes to host large databases, will be needed for costs related to server hardware that will store the database.

#### Specific Tasks:

- Collaboration with in-house preservation staff, Planning Department IT staff (OASIS and DTIS teams), and consultant to create database specifications (HPFC funding)
- Create database with collaboration of consultant and OASIS staff

#### Where:

- The finished database will be publicly accessible online; the data will consist of any and all historic resources in the City and County of San Francisco

#### Staffing:

- In-house preservation staff to provide information, potentially data collection/preparation for inclusion in database, manage contract with consultant and act as coordinator for implementation
- In-house OASIS staff to work with consultants on specifications and implementation

<sup>11</sup> For FY 2007-8, the Department is able to support \$11,677 of the \$24,563 to maximize available contract funding.

- Consultants brought in for short-term, separate contracts to:

#### Public outreach and volunteer training

The City and County of San Francisco is fortunate to have an active preservation community. In addition to those already involved in preservation, many others have an interest in the history of their home or neighborhoods. If they were trained appropriately, these citizens could assist in the preparation of survey forms. This would result in documentation that could be used as a basis for planning decisions, as well as a resource for local historians. Public outreach to neighborhood groups and individuals also helps increase awareness about the value of historic resources. While the Department recognizes the importance of this work, its available staff time is limited in FY 2006-2007

#### Specific Tasks:

- In-house outreach effort consisting of digital photography and basic survey skills training (photo classes already underway)
- Coordination of volunteers for survey of staff-identified areas of study
- Continued assistance to neighborhood and other groups as they independently work on surveys
- Provide information to the public through a Historic Preservation program webpage on the Planning Department's website at [sfgov.org](http://sfgov.org)
- Provide information to the public through presentations at community group meetings.
- Develop a user-friendly survey form for use by volunteers
- Review survey work generated by consultants and neighborhood volunteers
- Organize survey advisory panel and peer reviews.
- Identification of priority resources for official designation

#### Where:

- Training would take place at the Planning Department or in community centers
- Information would be made available online

#### Staffing:

- In-house staff, in collaboration with community members and possible public-private-partnerships

Finally, administration of the proposed work program will be overseen by the Preservation Coordinator with proposed allotment of .25 FTE. In addition, a full-time (1 FTE) administrative assistant position, is proposed to meet a variety of needs, with tasks including: respond to public inquiries, coordinate volunteers and training sessions, enter historic resource information into the database, organize files and the preservation library, and other tasks as needed. Expenses for the Survey Program's materials and supplies are estimated at \$7,500 per fiscal year.

## **ANNUAL BUDGET**

In accordance with the conditions June 14, 2006 resolution of the HPFC, recommending funding for this plan, the Planning Department will: use HPFC monies only for consultants and other non-personnel services related to the Citywide Cultural Resources Survey Work Plan; provide the HPFC with quarterly updates, or more frequently if requested by the HPFC, on its progress in completing the Citywide Cultural Resources Survey Work Plan; and invite one (1) representative each from the HPFC and the Landmarks Preservation Board to participate in the selection process for professional services contractors related to the Citywide Cultural Resources Survey Work Plan.

The costs to produce architectural and historical surveys in Area Plans within a tight schedule are substantial. An ongoing comprehensive survey program, beyond FY 2007-2008, is

significantly lower in consultant costs, while maintaining a stable city staff. The present FY survey program consists of staff costs for 3 FTE and contracts not to exceed \$270,000. For FY 2006-2007 the Department proposes an increase in staff to 4.0 FTE, at a cost of \$426,105. Consultant contract and other costs of for FY 2006-2007 are estimated at \$572,000, with those costs decreasing to approximately \$311,677 in FY 2007-2008 and following. From fiscal year 2008-2009 forward, ending in about 2017, the Survey Staff of 6.25 FTE working with modest consultant contracts can complete a Comprehensive Citywide Survey.

<b>Estimate Yearly Budgets:</b>	<b>Staffing Costs<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Consultant/ Other Costs</b>	<b>Estimated Total</b>
Fiscal Year 2006-2007	\$426,105	\$572,000	<u>\$998,105*</u>
Fiscal Year 2007-2008	\$550,408	\$311,677	<u>\$862,085</u>
Fiscal Year 2008-2009 - forward	\$662,967	\$300,000	<u>\$962,967</u>

FY 2007-8 Staff cost breakdown:

Staff details	FTE	salary	per FTE	with fringe
1426	1	52,053	52,053	\$ 68,189
5278	1	79770	79,770	\$ 104,499
5291	2.75	94,648	260,282	\$ 340,969
5293	0.25	112,215	28,054	\$ 36,750
			Total	\$ <b>550,408</b>

## TIMELINE

Under the proposed Survey Program, during FY 2006-2007 the following surveys will be initiated and/or completed: Market and Octavia, Central Waterfront, SoMa, Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, Mission, Glen Park, and Visitation Valley<sup>13</sup>. This is both aggressive and expensive – yet it is possible. At this stage, it is projected to have the survey results of all the above areas in hand by the end of FY 2007-2008. The foundation of the comprehensive survey will be laid in FY 2006-2007, and the Department can move forward with implementing non-area plan surveys in FY 2007-2008 (see attached graphic).

## STAFFING PLAN

In-house staff members are an essential part of the proposed Citywide Survey Work Program. Additional personnel, beyond current survey staffing levels, are needed to meet Work Program goals. Staff members will be tasked with a two-pronged survey strategy: management of short-term surveys of Area Plans produced by outside contractors (meeting acute needs for survey),

<sup>12</sup> Based on FY 2006-2007 salary rates only; future fiscal year salary rates are unknown.

\* Note: \*The Planning Department's proposed FY '06-'07 budget allocates \$584,000 for a Citywide Survey Work Program that only includes a limited scope Eastern Neighborhoods Survey. Of this \$584K, \$376,000 is budgeted for staff and \$208,000 for contract work, equipment and materials. This revised funding request to support a comprehensive Citywide Survey Work Program in FY '06-'07 is an additional \$414,105 .

<sup>13</sup> The Balboa Park EIR does cover some elements needed; however, further research may be needed for which funding was not allocated in this plan.

with concurrent and future efforts directed at a steady and systematic survey of the entire city. Other important staff duties include outreach, volunteer training and coordination, and development of a web-based historic resources database for the city. A useful precedent for in-house staff survey at this scale is the 1976 Architectural Survey; in that instance a “windshield” survey of 10,000 buildings was completed over a period of two years, with an average of four staff members each completing an average of 100 buildings per month. Below is a brief description of current staffing and proposed staffing, with duties outlined very briefly.

Past Staffing for fiscal year 2005-2006:

**Planner IV** – Preservation Coordinator (.25 FTE)

Duties: Oversee the initial creation of an expanded Citywide Survey Program; manage Planner III, II and intern; staff to Landmarks Board;

**Planner III** – Mission Survey (1 FTE)

Duties: Continue survey of Inner Mission, revise context statement, bring completed work through adoption process, and complete 400 DPR 523A forms by October 2006 for Phase V in Area 3;

**Planner III** – Citywide Survey (1 FTE)

Duties: Develop survey plans and RFPs, project management for issued RFP, review survey work received from both RFPs and neighborhood groups, community outreach;

**Planning Intern** – (1 FTE)

Duties: Assist both in-house and external survey efforts.

Current staffing fiscal year 2006-2007:

**Planner IV (EXISTING)** – Preservation Coordinator (.25 FTE)

Duties: Oversee the initial creation of an expanded Citywide Survey Program;

**Planner III (EXISTING)** – Mission Survey (1 FTE)

Duties: Continue survey of Inner Mission; bring completed work through adoption process, transition to other areas of Mission or greater Citywide Survey if needed;

**Planner III (EXISTING)** – Citywide Survey (1 FTE)

Duties: Complete initial assessment (“windshield”) surveys, develop survey plans and RFPs/RFQs, and manage contracts for issued RFPs/RFQs, community outreach;

**Planner II (EXISTING)** – Citywide Survey (1 FTE)

Duties: Complete initial assessment (“windshield”) surveys, develop survey plans and RFPs/RFQs, and manage contracts for issued RFPs/RFQs, community outreach;

**Administrative Assistant (NEW)** – Citywide Survey Assistant (1 FTE began in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of the FY)

Duties: Coordinate volunteers, assist with public inquiries and outreach, provide clerical support for contract administration, perform data entry, organize and maintain preservation library and files, other tasks as needed.

Additional Staffing proposed beginning fiscal year 2007-2008:

**Planner III (NEW)** – Historian, City Context Statement (1 FTE)

Duties: Forms advisory panel, synthesizes known information, completes original research and writing of city context statement, future work on supplemental contexts and updates to context statement, produce neighborhood contexts related to survey;

**Planner II (NEW)** – Citywide Survey Outreach Coordinator (1 FTE)



~~Duties: Conducts volunteer training, works with IT staff to create and maintain historic resources database, creates and maintains historic preservation webpage, performs outreach;~~ (Following the Mayor's budget instructions, the Department has removed its request for this position from its budget)

Use of private consultants for short-term survey projects:

- RFPs will be used for surveys of Citywide Area Plans, with work scopes defined by in-house staff and managed by staff.
- An RFQ will be used to generate a list of qualified consultants who will be rotated for work on small-scale neighborhood surveys and historic district evaluations, with work scopes defined by in-house staff and managed by staff.

## **Suggested Outline for a Fully Developed Context Statement**

### **I. Name of Context:**

The theme, time period and geographic limits of the study should be stated.

### **II. Synthesis of Information:**

After data has been collected and analyzed, prepare a written narrative that synthesizes the gathered information. Important patterns, events, persons, architectural types and styles, or cultural values should be identified and discussed with an eye towards evaluating related properties.

### **III. Property Type(s):**

#### **a. Identification**

Identify what property type or types are important in illustrating the historic context. Assign a name to each property type based on the shared characteristics of properties related to the type.

#### **b. Description**

In concise narrative form, describe the physical characteristics and historical associations that unite and define each property type. Discuss the variations occurring within the property type as they relate to changing historical, cultural, or geographical influences.

#### **c. Significance**

State the significance of the property type as it relates to each historic context. How does the property type, in all of its variations, illustrate what is important about the historic context?

#### **d. Registration Requirements**

What attributes, historical associations and level of integrity are necessary to list members of the property type per Article 10 of the Planning Code? This section should provide specific information that can be used for comparing actual historic properties and for making judgments about their relative significance.

### **IV. Goals and Priorities for Identification, Evaluation, Recognition, and Treatment of Historic Properties:**

#### **a. Goals:**

A goal is a statement of preferred preservation activities, which is generally stated in terms of property types. For each goal, a statement should be prepared identifying the activities and strategies most appropriate for accomplishing the goal.

#### **b. Priorities:**

Once goals have been developed, they need to be ranked in importance. Major cost or technical considerations, general social, economic, political and environmental conditions will affect the ranking of goals. Some properties may be more directly threatened by deterioration, land development patterns, legislative requirements or the public's perception of their safety or worth. These factors should all be considered in setting priorities.

Note: The above outline is based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Preservation Planning and on Bulletin 16, Guidelines for Completing National Register of Historic Places Forms. Both of these documents may provide further assistance in preparing a fully developed context statement.