## SAN FRANCISCO LGBTQ CULTURAL HERITAGE STRATEGY
## WORKING GROUP – MEETING #1 MINUTES

**Meeting Date:** Monday, January 9, 2017
**Meeting Time:** 2:00 – 3:30 p.m.
**Venue:** City Hall

1. Introductions
2. Why are we doing this? (Jocelyn Kane, Tim Frye)
   a. City family has been thinking about how to help sustain LGBTQ culture through efforts such as Western SoMa Plan, the Historic Preservation Commission's (HPC) Cultural Heritage Assets subcommittee, and LGBTQ Historic Context Statement
   b. Supervisor Wiener introduced a resolution (Resolution No. 446-16) to create a citywide LGBTQ cultural heritage strategy, similar to that created for the SoMa Pilipinas Cultural Heritage Strategy. Initiative came as a result of many bars being threatened with eviction so for this reason the focus was on nightlife initially given the potential for bars to function as networking spaces, areas of community, this initiative might help those spaces but want to get input from community
   c. ICOMOS definition of cultural heritage and manifesto, Chapter 6 of LGBTQ HCS describes preservation recommendations but also educational opportunities
   d. Need to come back in 5 months to discuss status
3. How has the City addressed cultural heritage in the past?
   a. LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Strategy will be citywide in scope, as compared to some of the neighborhood/geographically-defined cultural heritage districts
   b. Shelley Caltagirone (Planning Department) provided an overview of recent cultural preservation efforts in Japantown (Japantown Cultural Heritage and Economic Sustainability Strategy) and the South of Market (SoMa Pilipinas)
      i. In both cases, the community articulated needs
      ii. In case of SoMa Pilipinas, broader needs were identified including those related to education, housing, social and human services, business and nonprofit development, traffic, pedestrian safety, etc. Community needs, priorities, and potential strategies were also outlined. Planning is now helping to create a matrix and initiate conversations with various City agencies who will likely be involved with implementation measures.
4. What will the Strategy look like?
   a. Three meetings over 5 months
   b. Board of Supervisors Hearing
   c. Progress Report – will include budget, City agency roles, potential staff persons

d. Some initial desires are to 1. Establish needs of the community  2. Short/long term goals 3. Budget?
5. What will be the City's Role in the LGBTQ Strategy?
   a. Facilitator, Technical Advisor, Partner
   b. Planning Department will help task force synthesize information but content needs to come from the community; we need to make sure all aspects of community are represented in the effort
   c. The process will also include building of a network of relationships
   d. Question to the group: How large of a role would you like the City to have?
6. How do we begin?
   a. Chapter 6 (Recommendations) of the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement
   b. What do we have? Requires an inventory
   c. What is visible (in public view)
   d. What do we want to promote?
   e. What do we want/need?
   f. What efforts are already in progress?
      i. -Eagle Plaza
      ii. -Ringold
      iii. -Compton Cultural District
      iv. -Preserving leather aspects of SOMA
      v. -TF mentioned current landmark designation initiatives related to LGBT history
      vi. Legacy Business Registry could be used to recognize LBTTQ businesses
      vii. SF Travel has promotional/educational resources that could be useful
7. Outreach
   a. Develop a framework for how we do outreach
   b. Glossary of key terms (i.e. district, strategy, etc.) would be helpful
   c. A project manager would be helpful – Can Sup. Shehey and Kim request funding for one?
   d. We need to get more people to the table and make sure the right people are involved
   e. We could consider having a large meeting but it would be good to first define the smaller task force
   f. This group will need to figure out how to work with existing efforts
   g. Planning Dept. is happy to host future community meetings related to the project, but it has been found more effective to piggy-back off of other, existing meetings.

San Francisco Planning