San Francisco Planning Department
Annual Report Fiscal Year July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017

MAYOR
Edwin M. Lee

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
London Breed, President of the Board of Supervisors, District 5
Sandra Lee Fewer, District 1 (Eric Mar through January 2017)
Mark Farrell, District 2
Aaron Peskin, District 3
Katy Tang, District 4
Jane Kim, District 6
Norman Yee, District 7
Jeff Sheehy, District 8 (Scott Wiener through January 2017)
Hillary Ronen, District 9 (David Campos through January 2017)
Malia Cohen, District 10
Ahsha Safai, District 11 (John Avalos through January 2017)

PLANNING COMMISSION
Rich Hillis, President
Dennis Richards, Vice President
Rodney Fong
Cindy Wu
Michael Antonini
Christine D. Johnson
Kathrin Moore, FAICP

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Andrew Wolfram, President
Aaron Jon Hyland, Vice President
Karl Hasz
Ellen Johnck
Richard S. E. Johns
Diane Matsuda
Jonathan Pearlman

ANNUAL REPORT PREPARED BY
John Rahaim
Director of Planning
Gina Simi
Communications Manager
Candace Soohoo
Deputy Communications Manager
Martin Thibodeau
Web Specialist

This Annual Report fulfills the requirement of San Francisco City Charter Section 4.103 for both the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR ........................................................................... 5
MESSAGE FROM THE
PLANNING COMMISSION PRESIDENT ................................................................. 6
MESSAGE FROM THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION PRESIDENT ........................................ 7

PLANS & PROJECTS

TRANSPORTATION .......................................................................................... 8
PUBLIC SPACE ................................................................................................. 14
PRESERVATION .................................................................................................. 20
DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW ........................................... 28
RESILIENCY AND SUSTAINABILITY ................................................................. 36
COMMUNITY PLANNING .................................................................................. 42
LEGISLATION AND POLICY ............................................................................. 48
SNAPSHOT OF KEY MILESTONES ................................................................. 56
STAFF LIST ........................................................................................................ 58
THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, SHAPES THE FUTURE OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE REGION BY:

• generating an extraordinary vision for the General Plan and neighborhood plans;
• preserving our unique heritage;
• fostering exemplary design through planning controls;
• encouraging a broad range of housing and a diverse job base;
• improving our surroundings through environmental analysis;
• and enforcing the Planning Code.

OUR MISSION

MAKING SAN FRANCISCO THE WORLD’S MOST LIVABLE URBAN PLACE – ENVIRONMENTALLY, ECONOMICALLY, SOCIALLY AND CULTURALLY.
I am happy to present the San Francisco Planning Department’s Annual Report. The report highlights the Department’s core services, finances and major achievements for the 2016-2017 fiscal year. I’m proud of all we’ve accomplished this past year, and am pleased to share the highlights with you.

While the workload may be at times daunting, we share a common goal: making San Francisco the world’s most livable urban place, and creating a long-term vision for the City that will guide and shape its future. We take that goal and our responsibilities to heart, particularly in a time of rapid change. We as a city, and the Bay Area as a region, have experienced the largest percentages of job growth in the US during the past eight years. This growth has created a demand for housing unseen in decades, and a resultant crisis of affordability. In light of these challenges, I firmly believe that San Francisco as a city, and the Department as an agency, have done more to address these issues than any other city in the US. We must continue to build housing for all income levels; slowing down the construction of new housing is not the solution. New residents, mostly of higher incomes, will find a place to live in San Francisco simply because they have the means to do so. At the same time, we must strengthen our efforts to stabilize our existing neighborhoods, in particular those most vulnerable to the impacts of job and population growth, and use every tool at our disposal to make them healthier and more equitable.

However, as we all know, there is more to Planning than housing. The world’s most dynamic and livable cities recognize the interrelationships of a broad range of activities and urban functions. In that light, our work now involves environmental protection, economic and environmental resiliency, equity and community development, and transportation planning, while continuing our ongoing endeavors to preserve our heritage, create great public spaces, and pursue the best public and private development projects possible.

I’d like to thank the commitment and hard work of staff who strive every day to improve the quality of life in San Francisco as a diverse, sustainable and flourishing city of neighborhoods. We also thank the Mayor and his staff, the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission for their guidance and collaboration toward the best future possible for San Francisco. Together, we will address the challenges we face with optimism, commitment, and hard work, to ensure that San Francisco remains one of the world’s great cities.
MESSAGE FROM
PLANNING COMMISSION
PRESIDENT RICH HILLIS

As President of the Planning Commission, it is my honor to present the San Francisco Planning Department’s Annual Report for 2016-2017.

The breadth of the Planning Department’s accomplishments over the past year, outlined in this report, is exceptional: playing an integral role in developing policy to incentivize more affordable housing along neighborhood commercial and transit corridors, providing a framework to keep families with children in San Francisco, developing the most progressive program in the country requiring developers to provide on-site amenities that support sustainable modes of transportation, and even completing the first comprehensive census of San Francisco’s Street Trees - just to name a few. These efforts and many others exemplify the talent and dedication of Department staff, who continue to impress me and my fellow Commissioners every day. I am proud of all Planning has accomplished, despite record workloads and an enduring affordability housing crisis.

The Planning Commission is committed to guiding growth and development in San Francisco, a city that prides itself on the unique character of its neighborhoods, in a way that best serves those who live here today as well as in the future. We must continue working closely with the community to look for ways to build more affordable housing in San Francisco and the region, create more efficient public transit to address a growing population, develop solutions to the rising homeless crisis, curb the ongoing causes of displacement and gentrification, work to keep families from leaving the City, and address the realities of climate change. We continue to be a leader in developing solutions to the problems that affect not just our own city, but cities across the country; the challenges we face as San Franciscans will only be met through innovation, talent, and hard work. There is always more work to be done, but I’m confident we’ll get there together.
MESSAGE FROM HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION PRESIDENT ANDREW WOLFRAM

Much of the City’s physical built environment is associated with some of the most prominent social and cultural events related to immigrant communities and the civil rights movement – which is why it’s more important than ever to protect these existing businesses and landmarks. The Historic Preservation Commission and Planning’s Preservation Team witnessed another historic fiscal year and as the President of the Commission, I am so proud of what we’ve accomplished.

Since 2016, the Historic Preservation Commission has made great strides in its role for the Legacy Business Program. The Commission provides a recommendation to the Small Business Commission as to whether a small business has contributed to a neighborhood's history and/or the identity of a particular neighborhood or community. Led by Planning's Preservation team, the City designated and recognized 93 community-serving businesses within the 2016-2017 fiscal year. In total, the City’s Historic Preservation Commission has recognized 123 legacy businesses since the start of the program.

San Francisco Planning’s Preservation Team has made significant progress in its permit review work on historical resources and the City's Landmark Designation Work Program. The Preservation Team approved 118 permit applications for work at historical sites – a record number for a single fiscal year. In addition, three Mills Act Historical Property contracts were approved and two properties received local landmark designation statuses, and lastly, the Commission added 40 properties to its Landmark Designation Work Program, many of which were identified as part of San Francisco Planning’s San Francisco Sites of Civil Rights Project.

Protecting our cultural heritage helps sustain the traditions, businesses, arts, and practices that construct the City’s social and economic fabric for generations to come. The Preservation Commission is also committed to safeguarding the historical, social, and economic value of its communities in a way that strengthens residents’ and visitors’ understanding and appreciation of these significant places and practices. This fiscal year marks the launch of Planning’s Cultural Heritage Program with its first citywide cultural heritage project: the LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Strategy. Planning’s Preservation Staff has been working very closely with a citizen working group on this project; and I look forward to the recommendations and priorities that will be outlined and identified that we can locally recognize in the future.

It is now more important than ever to ensure that the physical and cultural diversity of all our communities are protected and preserved. To that end, I look forward to another great fiscal year as we continue to protect San Francisco’s architecturally, historically and culturally significant buildings and sites.
TRANSPORTATION
KEEPING PEOPLE MOVING AS OUR CITY GROWS
CONNECTSF

What does the future of transportation look like to you?

ConnectSF will be the City’s guiding framework to update the following transportation plans and projects:

- Subway Vision: establishing a framework for expanding the subway network in San Francisco.
- San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) 2050: the City’s 30-year plan to identify goals, needs, and investment priorities for our transportation system.
- Transit Modal Concept Study: to identify, develop, assess and prioritize transit projects to meet the 2050 goals for the transit network.
- Freeway and Street Traffic Management Strategy: to identify a preferred long-range strategy that combines physical and operational concepts for the network of freeways and associated major arterials within San Francisco.
- Transportation Element Update: an update to the Transportation Element of the San Francisco General Plan and guide all transportation-related planning decisions in San Francisco.

The first phase of ConnectSF was to create a 50-year transportation vision for the future of the City that answered the focal question: What is the future of San Francisco as a place to live in the next 25 and 50 years?

Beginning in December 2016, the ConnectSF team led a series of outreach and engagement events, including a citywide survey, open houses and pop-ups, and a scenario planning process, which compelled stakeholders to consider about how different futures could unfold in San Francisco and the Bay Area, and develop actions to help guide us towards a preferred future.

Staff assembled a Futures Task Force to engage in scenario planning work to develop four possible future scenarios for the City and its transportation system. Futures Task Force members, individuals representing the many perspectives of San Francisco, were invited to three co-learning events to immerse themselves and their thinking in the future of change, and a scenario building and strategic implications workshop to develop future scenarios, later identifying a preferred future direction. In between the two workshops, staff consulted the public in many ways to evaluate the scenarios and their respective trade-offs. Based on the scenario planning work and community engagement and feedback, ConnectSF staff emerged with a long-range vision that described a San Francisco as a diverse, regionally minded city where government and citizens consider community-wide and regional effects for making policy choices.

The next phase of ConnectSF consists of technical studies that will develop projects and policies related to transit, streets, freeways, funding and priorities for the overall transportation system, and an update of the Transportation Element that is found in the City’s General Plan.

ConnectSF is a collaborative effort facilitated by the San Francisco Planning Department, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), the San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), and the Office of the Mayor of San Francisco.

connectsf.org
RAIL ALIGNMENT AND BENEFITS (RAB) STUDY *

San Francisco has committed to significant transit and infrastructure investments in the South of Market, Mission Bay, and Showplace Square/Lower Potrero Hill neighborhoods. The Downtown Rail Extension (DTX), the electrification of Caltrain and High-Speed Rail service are planned around existing infrastructure that includes street-level commuter rail tracks, a half-mile long railyard and an elevated freeway. However, this infrastructure was built in a time when the area was primarily an industrial neighborhood. This presents a number of challenges that potentially divides these densifying neighborhoods, reduces connectivity and exacerbate congestion for public transit, cars, pedestrians and cyclists.

Further, these facilities inhibit the opportunity for transit-oriented jobs and housing in this central city location, an important consideration in an age where climate change, lack of affordable housing, congestion and loss of open space due to regional sprawl are growing concerns.

Rather than simply considering how to build each project independently in the existing circumstances, the City wants to coordinate these projects into a unified vision for the area.

The RAB will evaluate whether these challenges can be addressed through a comprehensive, regional approach to building a future that integrates land use with local and regional transportation and builds a high-quality urban environment.

*Formerly the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard Feasibility Study

BALBOA PARK TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

The Balboa Area Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Framework recommends measures to better manage the current and future transportation needs of commuters, families, seniors, employees, visitors, and students of all ages, means, and schedules in the neighborhood.

Funded by the District 7 Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) at the request of Supervisor Norman Yee's office, this Framework was proposed as a response to community feedback gathered by the Balboa Park Station and Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committees (CAC), as well as public workshops in the neighborhood. Read more about the NTIP process here.

The Balboa Area TDM Framework provides specific recommendations to encourage sustainable travel choices, make efficient use of limited transportation infrastructure, and maximize access for Balboa Area residents, employees, visitors, and students.

A number of improvements in the Balboa Park Plan Area are steadily enhancing transit access, SFMTA operations, BART access and pedestrian safety around Balboa Park station. In addition, planned streetscape improvements will make Ocean Avenue more pedestrian friendly and visually appealing. Yet, as the neighborhood and City College continues to grow, access to the area will continue to face the limits of roadway, transit, and financial resources. TDM measures can help more efficiently use these limited resources by encouraging sustainable transportation choices.

The Balboa Area TDM Framework will be the first effort to understand and coordinate measures to support sustainable travel choices and roadway space on behalf of all users and needs in the neighborhood. The draft of the framework is expected to be completed by December 2017.
BAYSHORE MULTI-MODAL FACILITY STUDY

Extensive growth in the bi-county, Bayshore area is placing significant pressure on regional and local transportation systems. To meet both current neighborhood needs as well as the expected increase in travel and commuting demand, several transportation improvements have been identified for the bi-county area; including Muni Forward service enhancements, US-101/Candlestick Point interchange, Caltrain Modernization and Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit.

A multi-modal facility, a service or resource that links various transportation services & infrastructure within a single location or area, is one significant way to better connect these improvements and serve future transportation demand in the bi-county area. A facility will also support regional priorities of coordinating land use and transportation planning, as well as reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The Bayshore Multi-Modal Facility Location Study is analyzing alternative locations, conceptual designs, and implementation plans for such a facility in the Bayshore area based on consultant analysis, public agency input and community feedback. The report was completed in August 2017.

TDM COMPLETES TRANSPORTATION SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM

The Transportation Demand Management Program, or TDM, represents the “Shift” component of the Transportation Sustainability Program, or TSP, a three-part citywide policy initiative to help transportation keep pace with growth in the City. TDM is the most progressive program in the country, requiring developers to provide on-site amenities that support sustainable modes of transportation. The third and final component of the initiative, TDM requires developments to provide on-site amenities that support sustainable modes of transportation and reduce single-occupancy driving trips associated with new development.

Staff developed a menu of 66 sustainable TDM measures, each with a different point value based on its relative ability to reduce the number of trips by people driving. Every new development project will be assigned a specific point target calculated by the type of land use and the number of parking spaces the project proposes. Developers will use the TDM menu to choose specific measures that will get their project to its target point requirement. A user-friendly online tool will help developers calculate their project’s required points and identify ways to meet the points requirement though different TDM measures.

Once TDM measures are selected, they will comprise the TDM Plan for the development project, and the TDM Plan will be a condition of project approval. After a project is constructed, it will be inspected for compliance before the first Certificate of Occupancy is issued, with follow-up inspections to occur periodically throughout the life of the project.

The Transportation Sustainability Fee (Invest) was adopted in November 2015, replacing the Transportation Impact Development Fee to provide additional revenue from new development to help fund improvements to transit capacity and reliability as well as bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

In March 2016, the Planning Commission Modernized Environmental Review (Align) by replacing level of service analysis, or LOS, with transportation analysis that looks at vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Instead of counting car throughputs at already congested intersections, the City is evaluating the more meaningful metric of how much new driving a project generates.

TDM was signed into law February 2017.
PUBLIC SPACES
CELEBRATING
SAN FRANCISCO
THROUGH OUR
COMMON SPACES
FEATURED PROJECT

CENTRAL WATERFRONT – DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN

The Central Waterfront - Dogpatch neighborhood has undergone rapid change for decades: once a cattle ranch on the coast, then a thriving industrial job center, then a sparsely populated neighborhood after the industrial decline of the 1960s. Today, the Central Waterfront is a mixed-use neighborhood at the epicenter of creative industries such as design, fabrication, and specialty food production. In recent years, the neighborhood has seen an influx of residential development, enriching and diversifying the area's culture and charm.

In anticipation of this growth, the Planning Department initiated the Central Waterfront - Dogpatch Public Realm Plan in order to prioritize and coordinate public investment in the neighborhood, including pedestrian amenities and bicycle infrastructure, open space, and park projects.

A multi-faceted public engagement plan was executed, including public workshops, focus groups, stakeholder meetings, and surveys with school representatives, residents’ associations, developers, and other stakeholder groups. Esprit Park was prioritized through the Public Realm Plan for conceptual design and a capital renovation project, and the Recreation and Parks department has accepted the conceptual plan and is leading the next phase of the park renovation based on the Public Realm Plan's community engagement.

A public realm plan is also a vehicle for realizing near-term prototyping of improvements to streets and public spaces. The Planning Department, in partnership with the California College of the Arts (CCA), was able to assist with efforts at Tunnel Top Park. Architecture students and faculty worked closely with the Tunnel Top Steering Committee to develop and implement an interim site plan for innovative seating, fencing, and night time lighting, installed during the summer of 2016. Future collaboration with CCA will focus on other project sites – such as Woods Yard Park and areas beneath overpasses – identified in the Public Realm Plan.

Key fundraising goals for capital projects were also achieved in fiscal year 2017, even before the Public Realm Plan was officially released. The Planning Department drove the allocation of over $5M in impact fees to several complete streets and park projects in the neighborhood. The Planning Department also staffed the Dogpatch Community Task Force convened by the University of California San Francisco. Using cost estimates and conceptual scopes of work from the Public Realm Plan, UCSF committed $11.5M dollars to streetscape and park projects identified in the Public Realm Plan, all which are set for construction within the next few years.

The Planning Department would like to thank several neighborhood organizations for their participation in the Public Realm Plan, especially the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association, the Dogpatch Northwest Potrero Green Benefit District, the Potrero Boosters, the Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association, and the University of California San Francisco.

The Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan, led by the Planning Department, is an interagency effort comprised of Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Recreation and Parks Department, and the Port. Fletcher Studio, a landscape architecture firm based in Dogpatch, serves as the Plan’s urban design consultant.

THE PUBLIC REALM IS THE SETTING FOR CIVIC LIFE, COMPRISED OF THE NETWORK OF STREETS, PARKS, OPEN SPACES, AND THE BUILDINGS THAT FRAME THEM
**BAYVIEW PLAY STREETS**
Part of San Francisco Planning’s Groundplay program, Play Streets promotes healthy communities by closing public rights-of-way to traffic and making space for kids to be active and play outside. In coordination with Livable City, Play Streets launched in the Bayview as a pilot phase from June to October 2017, where it temporarily took over Jamestown Avenue between Hawes and Griffith streets. Play Streets is a citywide program developed by San Francisco Planning, SFMTA, and the Department of Public Health.

**LOWER HAIGHT PUBLIC REALM PLAN**
In early 2015, the Lower Haight Merchants and Neighbors Association (LoHaMNA) approached the office of the District 5 Supervisor, London Breed, to explore the possibility of creating a public realm plan for the neighborhood. This community led request to the City formed the basis for this Public Realm Plan.

With funding from Supervisor Breed’s office, the Planning Department took the lead on assembling an interagency team to develop the Public Realm Plan, which would include specific improvements to focus areas for the Lower Haight neighborhood. Beginning in 2015, the San Francisco Planning Department began a dialogue with the community about public realm improvements in the neighborhood.

The Planning Department was joined by staff from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco Public Works to form an interagency team to lead the planning effort. A variety of community
events, including workshops, community events, and stakeholder meetings, were held between October 2015 and May 2017 with the goal to develop and refine the specific recommendations in the Plan.

This Public Realm Plan lays out a vision and framework for the Lower Haight neighborhood of San Francisco and its shared public spaces. While numerous projects and plans have been undertaken throughout the neighborhood, none have comprehensively examined how the Lower Haight’s most important public spaces can be designed and function to best serve the needs of the people that live, work and visit the area. The final Plan was published in Summer 2017 and provides a design framework for the neighborhood which it can build on over time.

**CIVIC CENTER PUBLIC REALM PLAN**

The Civic Center Public Realm Plan will create a unified vision for medium and long-term improvements to Civic Center’s plazas, streets, and other public spaces. The plan is an interagency effort managed by the Planning Department in partnership with multiple city agencies including San Francisco Public Works, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, San Francisco Recreation & Parks, San Francisco Real Estate Division, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco Arts Commission, and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. The Public Realm Plan is part of the City’s larger Civic Center initiative to improve the area as both a neighborhood gathering space and a public commons for all San Franciscans.
PRESERVING THE UNIQUE SAN FRANCISCO CULTURE AND IDENTITY
LGBTQ CULTURAL HERITAGE STRATEGY

San Francisco is committed to safeguarding its historical, social, and economic values in a way that strengthens the community’s understanding and appreciation of these significant places and practices. Our cultural heritage helps sustain the traditions, businesses, arts, and practices that construct the City’s social and economic fabric for generations to come.

Tangible cultural heritage includes items you can see and feel: artifacts, photographs, books, buildings, sites, monuments, works of art, or physical districts significant in cultural histories. Intangible cultural heritage includes non-physical characteristics, such as customs and practices, artistic expressions, beliefs, languages, folklore, traditions, and even cuisine. It is constantly evolving in response to community’s religious, political, and social environment, and provides a sense of identity and continuity.

In January 2017, San Francisco Planning, together with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) and the San Francisco Entertainment Commission began developing a Citywide LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Strategy to preserve and promote LGBTQ cultural heritage in San Francisco.

The LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Working Group, comprised of community members, organizations, nightlife and cultural heritage stakeholders, was assembled to contribute to the development of the Strategy on topics such as cultural celebration, placemaking, nighttime entertainment, community services, community preservation, and economic opportunities. Through four sub-committees: Business and Economic Development, Arts and Culture, Heritage and Historic Preservation, and Community Services and Education, the Group works to articulate goals for the management of LGBTQ resources, and outline a process for developing and prioritizing projects that support those goals. The Group also distributed a citywide LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Strategy Survey, asking members of the LGBTQ community to provide feedback on their own experiences in San Francisco. At the time of this report, nearly 1,000 people have participated in the survey.

Ultimately, the LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Strategy will provide a comprehensive implementation plan that describes an approach to safeguarding LGBTQ cultural heritage and lists specific projects, procedures, programs or techniques to achieve the Strategy’s goals. The plan will include timelines and project leads comprised of City agencies and community partners for each project, and a monitoring and reporting plan to track the progress of the strategy over time. The LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Working Group and San Francisco Planning will seek adoption of the LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Strategy and accompanying implementation plan by the Board of Supervisors with recommendations by the Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and Entertainment Commission.

The LGBTQ Cultural Heritage Strategy is expected to be completed in fall 2018.

http://sf-planning.org/LGBTQStrategy
What does it mean to be LGBTQ in San Francisco?

Share with us by taking the survey!

SF-PLANNING.ORG/LGBTQSURVEY
THIRD BAPTIST CHURCH, 1399 MCALLISTER STREET

Significant as the third location of the Third Baptist Church and for its associations with Reverend Frederick Douglas Haynes, Sr. Haynes participated in the longshoreman strike of 1934; the struggle to end race-based hiring restrictions at the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph company; and was part of the Black Ministerial Alliance, a group of black ministers who organized action against housing and job discrimination in black communities. In 1945, he was the first African American to run for Supervisor of San Francisco, in 1945, 1947, and 1951.

On October 23, 2017, the Land Use Committee of the BOS voted unanimously to recommend landmark designation of Third Baptist Church (1399 McAllister Street) to the full BOS. The property was listed on the HPC’s Landmark Designation Work Program (LDWP) and the designation report was staff-produced. On November 14, 2017, the full BOS voted unanimously to designate the property as a local landmark. On November 15, 2017, the Mayor signed the ordinance designating the Third Baptist Church Complex (1399 McAllister Street) as a local landmark.
The Alemany Emergency Hospital and Health Center buildings anchor the corner of Alemany Boulevard and Onondaga Avenue in the heart of the Excelsior District. They were designed by City Architect Charles H. Sawyer, who began his career with the City during the hectic rebuilding of San Francisco after the 1906 earthquake and fire.

Funded by a 1928 public bond measure and built in 1933, the buildings extended the City’s emergency hospital system to cover a growing and underserved part of town which today remains predominately populated with modest, single-family homes. These buildings were the final piece of the citywide emergency hospital system and serve as remnants of a noble, and once controversial, effort to provide free and efficient emergency health care to the district.

The Health Center contains two frescoes which were funded by the State Emergency Relief Administration and designed by the prominent artist, Bernard Zakheim, who won the first federal Public Works of Art Project (PWAP) grant to create the Coit Tower frescos. PWAP was a predecessor of the WPA programs: Works Progress Administration/Work Projects Administration. Zakheim painted the Library fresco at Coit Tower, and later in 1934, he painted the two frescos at the Alemany Health Center building: Community Spirit and Growth. The Alemany frescos, which depict the neighborhood and a healthcare theme, are important examples of Zakheim’s work and contribute to the overall aesthetic significance of the buildings.

In June 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted to approve the Alemany Emergency Hospital and Health Center as San Francisco’s 272nd landmark.
ROUSSEAU LANDMARK DISTRICT

During the 2012-2013 Sunset District Historic and Cultural Resource Survey, the Rousseaus’ Boulevard Tract, known for its whimsical and detailed architecture, was identified as a potential historic district for its exceptional and intact architectural character. The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) adopted the Sunset survey findings on September 18, 2013.

In summer 2016, San Francisco Planning staff drafted a Landmark Designation Ordinance in order to designate the Tract as an Article 10 landmark district. The draft incorporated residents’ feedback of their favorite building features to help determine what types of alterations would or would not require additional review by San Francisco Planning.

Preservation Planning staff continues to work with the community on an ordinance that reflects the distinct character of the district and aligns with the preservation goals of the community.

V. C. MORRIS GIFT SHOP, 140 MAIDEN LANE

Renowned American architect Frank Lloyd Wright’s personal aesthetic and design theories on architectural form influenced the development of Modern architecture in the United States and in Europe. His work helped spawn a new design aesthetic that addressed the natural environment, contained minimal superfluous ornamentation, and emphasized function, flexibility, and an honest expression of a building’s structural frame. Although Wright produced several designs for other buildings in San Francisco, the V. C. Morris Gift Shop at 140 Maiden Lane is the only one that was realized. Built in 1949, it was designated as Landmark No. 72 in 1975. However, only the exterior features of the building were designated.

In November 2016, the Historic Preservation Commission initiated a landmark designation amendment to include the double-height, mezzanine-ringed, top-lit circular interior space. The Mayor signed the designation on November 22, 2016.
INGLESIDE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AND THE GREAT CLOUD OF WITNESSES, 1345 OCEAN AVENUE

Constructed in 1923, Ingleside Presbyterian Church and Community Center embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period and method of construction, and represents the work of a master architect. With its tripartite composition, symmetrically composed façade, dentilled cornice, and centrally located, and Ionic columns and pilasters, the Ingleside Presbyterian Church illustrates the distinctive characteristics of the Neoclassical style that was popular in the decades following Chicago’s 1893 World’s Columbian exposition. Architect Joseph A. Leonard was well known in the area for the magnificent Craftsman homes he built in his Richmond Heights (circa 1910) development and subsequent venture, Ingleside Terraces, (1912) where he also resided when he was chosen as the church’s architect. The temple and Ingleside Presbyterian Church stand as one of the few extant examples of Leonard’s ecclesiastical and institutional architecture.

The property also embodies high artistic values. Self-taught folk artist Reverend Roland Gordon created the church’s most significant interior feature, a “collage-mural,” entitled The Great Cloud of Witnesses. Over the past 35 years, his collage-mural consists of newspaper and magazine clippings, posters, framed prints, painted murals, and other objects that depict prominent African Americans throughout history. What began as Reverend Gordon’s simple mission to provide images of role models to the community’s youth has resulted in an awe-inspiring contribution to the body of American and African American Folk Art and serves as an extraordinary, unparalleled visual documentation of national and San-Francisco-specific African American history.

In November 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted to approve the landmark designation making Ingleside Presbyterian Church and Community Center and The Great Cloud of Witnesses San Francisco’s 273rd landmark.
ENVIRONMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
GUIDING SUSTAINABLE CHANGE AND GROWTH
Located within the Hub District, this project will demolish the 29,000 square foot retail and office building at the corner of South Van Ness and Mission, along with a 57,000 square foot warehouse building at the corner of 11th Street. The project would construct two buildings above a shared foundation and parking structure.

Key features of each building are as follows:

1. **CITY OFFICE BUILDING.** The office building at 49 South Van Ness includes an approximately 500,000 square foot, 16-story, 264-foot-tower primarily along 11th Street with mid-rise podium elements extending west and south from the tower. This building will consolidate office space for multiple City departments, including the Department of Building Inspection, SF Public Works, and the Planning Department. Features of the office building include:
   - Consolidated, one-stop permit center;
   - Enhanced pedestrian connectivity via a mid-block public space and alley network extending from Mission Street to South Van Ness Avenue;
   - Ground floor exhibition and gallery space;
   - Ground floor conference facilities and community event space; and
   - Publicly-accessible open space at 2nd floor permit center.

2. **RESIDENTIAL BUILDING.** The residential building at 1500 Mission will include an approximately 700,000 square foot, 39-story, 396-foot-tall tower with mid-rise podium elements extending along Mission Street and South Van Ness Avenue. Features of the residential building include
   - 560 Dwelling Units;
   - 112 Below Market Rate Units (approximately 20%, rather than the required 13.5%);
   - Approximately 60,000 square-feet of ground floor retail;
   - Approximately 26,000 square-feet of private and common open space;
   - Approximately 300 bicycle parking spaces;
   - Up to 280 Vehicular Parking Spaces.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

On November 9, 2016, the Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review. On March 9, 2017, the Department published a Responses to Comments document responding to comments made regarding the Draft EIR prepared for the Project, and on March 23, 2017, the Commission certified the Final EIR.
Also located in the “Hub” District, the One Oak Street Project will demolish all existing structures on the project site at 1500-1540 Market Street, including 47 existing valet-operated on-site commercial parking spaces and construct a new 304-unit 40-story residential tower with ground-floor commercial space. In addition, the project will include a subsurface parking garage containing 136 spaces for residents and new public plaza.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:
On November 16, 2016, the Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review. On June 1, 2017, the Department published a Responses to Comments document responding to comments made regarding the Draft EIR prepared for the Project, and on June 15, 2017, the Commission certified the Final EIR.
Located in the Downtown/Civic Center neighborhood, the project will demolish the existing 33,310 square foot building and construct a 13-story 178,308 square foot mixed building. The building will have up to 186 dwelling units comprised of 96 studios/junior one-bedrooms, 21 one-bedrooms, 57 two-bedrooms, and 12 three-bedrooms.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:
On September 21, 2016, The Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review. On January 11, 2017, the Department published a Responses to Comments document, responding to comments made regarding the Draft EIR prepared for the Project, and on January 26, 2017 the Planning Commission certified the Final EIR.
PIER 70 MIXED-USE PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Located east of Illinois Street between 20th and 22nd Street, the Pier 70 Mixed-Use Project would rezone the entire 35-acre project site, establish land use controls through the Pier 70 Special Use District (SUD), and incorporate design standards and guidelines in a Pier 70 Design for Development document.

The proposed project would involve the demolition of seven buildings/structures and the rehabilitation of three buildings. The proposed project would accommodate, depending on the uses proposed, between a maximum of 1,645 to 3,025 residential units, a maximum of 1,102,250 to 2,262,350 gross square feet of commercial-office use, and a maximum of 479,980 to 486,950 gross square feet of retail-restaurant-arts/light industrial use. New buildings would range in height from 50 to 90 feet, consistent with Proposition F (2014). The proposed project would also include transportation and circulation improvements, new and upgraded utilities and infrastructure, geotechnical and shoreline improvements, and nine acres of public open space.

On December 21, 2016, the Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review. On August 9, 2017, the Department published a Responses to Comments document, responding to comments made regarding the Draft EIR prepared for the Project, and on August 24, 2017 the Planning Commission certified the Final EIR.

ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY EIR

The Academy of Art University (AAU) was established in San Francisco in 1929. AAU is a private postsecondary academic institution that occupies buildings throughout the City (predominantly in the northeast quadrant) for its existing art programs. AAU plans on expanding its facilities and programs to accommodate a projected on-site student enrollment of approximately 17,282 students and 3,511 faculty and staff by 2020, resulting in a total increase of approximately 6,100 students and 1,220 faculty and staff. In addition, AAU has a long history of noncompliance with City Planning building rules, resulting in litigation filed by the San Francisco City Attorney in 2016.

The proposed project, which would resolve this litigation, consists of four general components: study area growth, project site growth, legalization of prior unauthorized changes, and shuttle service expansion. Study area growth consists of approximately 110,000 net square feet of additional residential uses (to house approximately 400 students, equivalent to about 220 rooms) and 669,670 square feet of additional institutional space in 12 geographic areas (study areas) where AAU could occupy buildings to accommodate future growth.

Project site growth consists of six additional sites that have been occupied, identified, or otherwise changed by AAU since publication of the September 2010 Notice of Preparation for this EIR. The six project sites would include a total of 411,070 sf of institutional, bus storage, and recreational uses. The Proposed Project also includes extension of AAU’s shuttle service to serve growth in the study areas and at the project sites.

On August 25, 2015, the Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review. Responses to public comment on the Draft EIR were published, and the Final EIR was certified and approved by the San Francisco Planning Commission on June 28, 2016. A development agreement and associated project approvals are scheduled to be acted on by the Planning Commission in late 2018.
CENTRAL SOMA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Central SoMa Plan (formerly, Central Corridor Plan) is a comprehensive plan for the area surrounding much of southern portion of the Central Subway transit line, a 1.7-mile extension of the Third Street light rail line that will link the Caltrain Depot at Fourth and King Streets to Chinatown and provide service within the South of Market (SoMa) area. The Plan Area includes roughly 230 acres that comprise 17 city blocks, as well as the streets and thoroughfares that connect SoMa to its adjacent neighborhoods: Downtown, Mission Bay, Rincon Hill, and the Mission District.

The Plan seeks to encourage and accommodate housing and employment growth by (1) removing land use restrictions to support a greater mix of uses while also emphasizing office uses in portions of the Plan Area; (2) amending height and bulk districts to allow for taller buildings; (3) modifying the system of streets and circulation within and adjacent to the Plan Area to meet the needs and goals of a dense, transit-oriented, mixed-use district; and (4) creating new, and improving existing, open spaces.

Department published a Responses to Comments document, responding to comments made regarding the DEIR prepared for the Project, and on May 10, 2018, the Planning Commission certified the Final EIR.

NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS MANAGEMENT PLAN EIR

Fragments of unique plant and animal habitats within San Francisco and Pacifica, known as Significant Natural Resource Areas (Natural Areas), have been preserved within the parks that are managed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD). In the late 1990s, the SFRPD initiated a Natural Areas Program to protect and manage these Natural Areas. Over the course of several years, the SFRPD developed the Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP), with the final draft plan published in February 2006. The SNRAMP contains detailed information on the biology, geology, and trails within 32 Natural Areas, 31 in San Francisco and one (Sharp Park) in Pacifica. The SNRAMP is intended to guide natural resource protection, habitat restoration, trail and access improvements, other capital projects, and maintenance activities over the next 20 years.

The Draft EIR analyzes the 20 year management plan at a programmatic level, with project-level review of routine maintenance actions and habitat restoration at Sharp Park. The Draft EIR identified the following unavoidable significant environmental effects of the proposed project: Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Recreation, Biological Resources, and Air Quality. Significant Hydrology and Water Quality, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials effects identified in the Draft EIR were found to be less than significant with Mitigation.

San Francisco Planning published the Draft EIR in August 2011. Responses to public comment on the Draft EIR were published on November 16, 2016, and the Final EIR was certified and approved at a Joint Hearing with the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission on December 15, 2016.
RESILIENCY AND SUSTAINABILITY
GUIDING A LANDSCAPE THAT PERFORMS NOW AND IN THE FUTURE
LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT

San Francisco’s Ocean Beach is part of a highly-dynamic coastal environment. Portions of Ocean Beach – particularly the area between Sloat and Skyline boulevards – have experienced substantial erosion over the past few decades, while the northern portion of the beach has remained stable or expanded. Shoreline erosion has already damaged the Great Highway and beach parking lots and threatens to damage critical wastewater system infrastructure. Sea level rise and the increased frequency and severity of coastal storms anticipated due to global climate change will likely exacerbate these effects in the decades to come.

In response to these challenges, San Francisco Planning began to develop a plan in 2015 that seeks to balance the preservation and enhancement of public access, recreation and natural habitats with the need to maintain critical public infrastructure. If it is adopted, the City’s plan for Ocean Beach must first be approved by the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and the California Coastal Commission as an amendment to San Francisco’s Local Coastal Program (LCP).

The Local Coastal Program (LCP) is a policy and regulatory document required by the California Coastal Act that establishes policies on land use, development, natural resource protection, coastal access, and public recreation for San Francisco’s Coastal Zone. San Francisco Planning is amending the City’s 30-year old LCP to address sea level rise and coastal hazards using the best available science.

The LCP amendment strives toward long-term resiliency by balancing environmental resources, maintaining coastal access, addressing community needs, and protecting our investment in public infrastructure, such as roads and wastewater treatment facilities.

The LCP Amendment will define the City’s approach for implementing the sea level rise and coastal erosion recommendations in the Ocean Beach Master Plan (OBMP), an interagency effort to develop a sustainable long-term strategy for Ocean Beach. The Plan represents the cooperation and involvement of SPUR, San Francisco Planning, federal, state, and local agencies, and community stakeholders in addressing seven focus areas: ecology, utility infrastructure, coastal dynamics, image and character, program and activities, access and connectivity, and management and stewardship.

The Ocean Beach Master Plan recommendations focus on six “Key Moves”:

1. Reroute the Great Highway behind the San Francisco Zoo via Sloat and Skyline Boulevards*
2. Introduce a multipurpose coastal protection/restoration/access system*
3. Reduce the width of the Great Highway to provide amenities and facilitate managed retreat
4. Restore the dunes along the middle reach
5. Create a better connection between Golden Gate Park and Ocean Beach
6. Introduce bicycle and pedestrian improvements north of Balboa Street

The project involved extensive community outreach and involvement, including several public meetings and a Community Advisory Group.

Adoption of the Local Coastal Program Amendment is anticipated in 2018.

http://sf-planning.org/local-coastal-program-amendment
TAKING ACTION TO PROTECT OCEAN BEACH
EVERYTREESF

The City of San Francisco conducted its first citywide street tree census. EveryTreeSF is a collaborative effort among San Francisco Planning, San Francisco Public Works, Friends of the Urban Forest, and tree inventory specialists ArborPro. The need for a census was identified in the Urban Forest Plan (Phase 1: Street Trees), a citywide strategy to improve the sustainability of the City’s urban forest.

Beginning in January 2016, a team of certified arborists began mapping and recording every street tree in the City. Upon completion in January 2017, the census identified the exact location, species and current condition of every tree, in addition to identifying potential vacant sites for future plantings.

The final results have revealed 124,795 street trees, over 20,000 more than previous estimates including 500 different species. Approximately 40,000 potential planting locations were recognized, providing tremendous opportunity to grow the City’s urban forest. Data shows that the current number of street trees sequesters over 19 million pounds of carbon dioxide and filters more than 100 million gallons of stormwater every year.

The census results come at a time of great opportunity with the passage of Proposition E in November 2016. Taking effect on July 1, 2017, Prop. E transfers street tree maintenance responsibility from private property owners to Public Works, and establishes a $19 million annual set-aside in the General Fund to pay for tree care and to repair sidewalks damaged by tree roots.

San Francisco Public Works’ Bureau of Urban Forestry will be using the census data to help implement Prop. E, improve tree and sidewalk maintenance, inform future planting programs and promote public stewardship of the City’s urban forest. All the data from the City’s recent Street Tree Census is now available to the public on an online searchable website, UrbanForestMap.org. Visitors can zoom in to find information on street trees anywhere in the City, in addition to calculate the environmental benefits street trees provide. Each tree has its own page presenting its “bio,” and the public is welcome to upload a photo to help tell their tree’s story.

RESILIENT BY DESIGN

Climate change and earthquake vulnerability means that businesses, homes, and public infrastructure are at significant risk. The Bay Areas’ decades-old systems were not built to withstand the effects of sea level rise, extreme storms, urban flooding, and seismic events; leaving us vulnerable to catastrophic physical and economic damage across the region. We need a comprehensive and innovative strategy that meets our needs today and creates tangible solutions for tomorrow. Rather than wait for a natural disaster, the San Francisco Bay Area is proactively reimagining a better future by creating a blueprint for resilience that harnesses Bay Area innovation and serves as a model for communities around the world.

The Bay Area Resilient by Design Challenge (RBD) presents an exceptional opportunity to develop a unified vision for a more sustainable and resilient future. San Francisco Planning helped launch RBD in May 2017 with an open call to engineers, architects, designers, artists, dreamers, community members and students to come together and create teams of experts willing to tackle the challenge of building resilience to climate change.

In September 2017, 10 teams were chosen from 51 contenders to work with with engineers, climate change experts, designers, architects and community members to develop community-based adaptation strategies for 10 distinct locations along the edge of the bay.

In May of 2018, Design Teams will reveal 10 innovative solutions to launch a new resilient approach for the Bay Area.
ENSURING ALL OF SAN FRANCISCO'S 124,795 STREET TREES ARE ACCOUNTED FOR
CENTRAL SOMA

In 2011, the Planning Department began the process to develop the Central SoMa Plan; a sustainable neighborhood fully realized by 2040 that meets the needs of the present without compromising the opportunities of future generations. This neighborhood, rich with history, is well positioned to accommodate needed employment, housing, and visitor facilities in the core of the City and Bay Area region. As it grows and evolves over the next 25 years, Central SoMa has the opportunity to become a complete, sustainable, and vital neighborhood without losing what makes it special and unique today.

The Plan’s philosophy for achieving neighborhood sustainability is to maintain what is already successful about the neighborhood - and improving what is not. Doing so requires implementing the following three strategies: Accommodate growth; Provide public benefits; Respect and enhance neighborhood character.

The Central SoMa Plan Area is bounded by 2nd Street in the east, 6th Street in the west, Townsend Street to the south, and an irregular border to the north generally south of Folsom Street east of 4th Street and Howard Street, Clementina Street between 4th and 5th Streets, and Natoma Street between 5th and 6th Streets. It is within the larger Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area and is comprised entirely of areas currently part of the East SoMa Plan Area and Western SoMa Plan Area. The Central SoMa Plan Area boundaries were created to include areas within easy walking distance (i.e., two blocks) of the Central Subway’s 4th Street alignment.

The Plan envisions an integrated community vision for the southern portion of the Central Subway rail corridor, located generally in the vicinity of 4th Street between Townsend and Market Streets. The Central SOMA Plan proposes a comprehensive strategy addressing land use, building size and heights, transportation, sidewalks and open space, and preservation of historic buildings.

Implementing the Plan’s strategy will require addressing all the facets of a sustainable neighborhood. Doing so can be accomplished by meeting all of the Plan’s eight Goals: Increase the Capacity for Jobs and Housing; Maintain the Diversity of Residents; Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center; Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit; Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities; Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood; Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood’s Cultural Heritage; and Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City. Each of these eight Goals receives its own chapter in the Central SoMa Plan.

The Central SoMa Plan is the result of six years of intensive public engagement, involving over a thousand people and an untold number of conversations. The goal of this Plan is to reflect the collective wisdom of the community at this time in a way that sustains it far into the future.

On August 11, 2016, the Planning Department published the revised draft Central SoMa Plan and Implementation Strategy. Before the Central SoMa Plan can be adopted, it requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Central SoMa Draft Environmental Impact Report was released in December 2016.

On March 28, 2018, the Department published a Responses to Comments document, responding to comments made regarding the DEIR prepared for the Project, and on May 10, 2018, the Planning Commission certified the Final EIR.

http://sf-planning.org/central-soma-plan
RICHMOND DISTRICT STRATEGY

Since 1980, the Richmond District has seen slow population and housing growth. In recent years, the District has been experiencing changes similar to many other neighborhoods throughout the City and the region due to the Bay Area’s booming economy. For example, in the past five years, housing costs have increased significantly, the share of higher income households have doubled, and there is a wide disparity in income earned.

The Richmond District Strategy aims to direct this change to benefit the community as the neighborhood evolves and to ensure a sustainable and high quality of life for the Richmond District now and in the future. Initiated by former District 1 Supervisor Eric Mar, in collaboration with San Francisco Planning, this effort provides a comprehensive understanding of the District’s current trends, needs, and opportunities.

In 2014, San Francisco Planning conducted an analysis of existing data on topics such as demographics, zoning and land use, housing, small businesses, development trends, transportation, public space, and community facilities. The results were published in the Existing Conditions Report in September 2015. We followed this analysis by speaking directly with the community who live, work, and visit the Richmond through a Community Needs Assessment Survey. With over 1,400 survey responses, the results were published in the Community Needs Assessment Survey Report.

After several community meeting and neighborhood events, we continued to gather feedback on the survey findings, which helped the community prioritize the goals for the Richmond. The following goals represent the vision for the Richmond from the community members who participated in the program:

• A neighborhood that continues to provide resources and services for families and children to retain and advance its family-friendly character.
• A neighborhood that maintains and increases its racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity.
• A neighborhood with a variety of housing types that meet the needs of all households from single-person to multi-generational families.
• A neighborhood with plentiful rental housing and for sale options especially for low and moderate income households.
• A neighborhood where existing residents can continue to stay and new residents can be accommodated.
• A neighborhood where local businesses can continue to stay and commercial corridors attract thriving businesses.
• A neighborhood with ample, reliable and safe transportation options for a variety of needs.
• A neighborhood with safe streets for pedestrians and cyclists.
• A neighborhood where parks, especially Golden Gate Park, are safely accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.
• A neighborhood where the commercial corridors are vibrant, include a mix of uses that serve the residents daily needs, and where storefronts are active.
BALBOA RESERVOIR

The Balboa Reservoir Project is a multi-agency partnership to study the western portion of the Balboa Reservoir site located off of Ocean and Phelan Avenues and west of CCSF’s multi-use building and parking lot to address some of the City’s most pressing issues: affordable housing, transportation access, and neighborhood sustainability and resiliency.

As one of the first sites identified under the City’s Public Land for Housing Program, the Balboa Site Study, through public participation and input led by San Francisco Planning staff, partner City agencies and a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), will help determine how this proposed development can best serve the need for housing, including up to 50% affordable housing, while providing infrastructure and other amenities specific to the neighborhood’s needs.

Public discussion of the Balboa Reservoir project were carried forward by the City and the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (CAC). The CAC advised City staff on the development “principles and parameters” in the request for qualifications (RFQ) and request for proposals (RFP) documents used to solicit a developer partner.

Three finalists were selected to submit development proposals for the Balboa Reservoir development project. These proposals were submitted in early June of 2017 and were publicly presented and discussed on at two events: Saturday, June 10, 2017 (live presentation) and at a Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee meeting on Thursday, June 15 (video viewing).

The selected developer will be announced in late Summer of 2017. Once a winning developer is selected and announced, CAC meetings and future community design workshops in 2017 and 2018 will continue to provide an opportunity for the community advisors and the public to engage in deeper, detailed discussions about specific aspects of the project.

THE MARKET STREET HUB PROJECT, OR "THE HUB"

In 2016, the Planning Department initiated a community planning effort to look at the neighborhood around Market and Van Ness, an area referred to as SoMa West in the Market & Octavia Area Plan. From April 2016 – March 2017, three public workshops were held to solicit feedback on specific topic areas. Feedback from these workshops informed preliminary recommendations for land use, urban form, public realm and public benefits.

This project will evaluate opportunities to enhance implementation of the policy goals of the Market & Octavia Area Plan around affordable housing, coordinated transportation planning and place making. This effort provides an opportunity to create more housing and more affordable housing in close proximity to transit, to better coordinate improvements to the streets and alleys to make it easier and safer for people to walk and ride bikes and will develop a public benefits package to meet the neighborhood’s needs. A complex EIR will be prepared by San Francisco Planning that will include project-level clearance for three development sites within the plan boundaries. The Hub will result in amendments to the Market & Octavia Area Plan and is expected to be adopted in Fall 2019.
LEGISLATION AND POLICY
ENSURING A CONSISTENT AND MODERN CODE
HOME-SF

San Francisco has several programs designed to create new affordable housing, protect the existing housing supply, and encourage higher levels of affordable housing through development incentives. These programs include the HOME-SF, the Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program, and Small Sites Program.

HOME-SF was developed as part of the City’s Affordable Housing Bonus Program. It is San Francisco’s local density bonus program, designed to incentivize building more affordable and family-friendly housing in neighborhood commercial and transit corridors through zoning modifications.

A density bonus is an increase in the overall number of housing units that a developer may build on a site in exchange for including more affordable housing units in the project. Under HOME-SF, the maximum bonus for a project is an additional two stories and relief from density controls. In return, project sponsors that choose HOME-SF are required to offer 30 percent of units in their housing project at prices or rents affordable to low, middle and moderate-income families. Individuals and families can qualify for these units based on their income, measured in percent of Area Median Income (AMI).

Currently, the affordable units in a HOME-SF project are required to be affordable to the following income categories:

Rental Projects
- 12% of units at 55% AMI
- 9% of units at 80% AMI
- 9% of units at 110% AMI

Ownership Projects
- 12% of units at 80% AMI
- 9% of units at 105% AMI
- 9% of units at 130% AMI

To be eligible for the HOME-SF program, each project must:
- Not demolish any residential units;
- Not demolish or significantly alter a historic resource

In keeping with the character of the neighborhood areas and commercial corridors, HOME-SF residential developments will be required to place a strong emphasis on ground floor retail and meet specific design guidelines that require proposed projects to include elements such as commercial spaces with active ground floor uses, transparent and operable windows, awnings, and informational displays, and attention to design detail, including variation in material use.

San Francisco Planning projects HOME-SF could result in up to 5,000 new affordable units over the next 20 years.

Introduced by Supervisor Katy Tang in March 2017, final legislation for HOME-SF was adopted unanimously by the Board of Supervisors in June 2017.

http://sf-planning.org/home-sf
BETTER ROOFS

On January 1st, 2017, San Francisco became the first US city to require solar or green (living) roofs on most new construction. The San Francisco Better Roofs Ordinance requires between 15 and 30 per cent of roof space on development of a certain scale to incorporate solar, green roofs, or a combination of both. The effort to encourage more living roofs in the Bay Area was the culmination of four years of collaborative effort in concert with SPUR, the San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE), and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).

This legislation sprang from the international green roof conference, CitiesAlive, which San Francisco Planning and SFPUC co-hosted in the fall of 2013. The conference catalyzed supportive representatives from interested agencies and professions to gather and investigate means to advance a green roofs initiative. The result was a series of policy recommendations, issued by SPUR: “Greener and Better Roofs: A Roadmap for San Francisco.”

Following the conference, the SF Planning formed a Living Roof Team, which undertook study tours of existing rooftops throughout the city, conducted interviews of designers, analyzed related policy efforts, and researched environmental attributes that contribute to successful living roofs.

Further collaboration with SFE and SFPUC resulted in the creation of a cost-benefit methodology that tested various likely building uses and scales, and demonstrated the cost efficacy at both the project and the city scale. City scale benefits include:

- $15 - 100 million of tax revenues in the first 5 years from improved property and biophilic value
- 60,000 – 385,000 tonnes carbon emissions avoided or sequestered over 15 years, equaling:
  - the sequestration of 3,600-24,000 acres of forest
  - the energy used by 400-2700 homes
  - 800-5400 cars off the road
- At the current rate of development continue, it’s estimated that San Francisco could experience 1.5 million square feet of living roofs being newly established each year.

Implementation tools have since resulted include a Living Roof manual, webpage, ZA Bulletin, as well as a Living Roof map of San Francisco.

These tools have since been re-deployed to advance similar efforts in other cities, extending the reach of this pioneering work.
Today, San Francisco families are being priced out of the City due to a rapidly growing income inequality and lack of housing. To help meet the needs of all families in San Francisco, the Planning Department is introducing a Family Friendly City initiative to address affordable family friendly housing; Quality childcare, schools, and afterschool programs; Transportation options; Safe and clean streets and neighborhoods; Access to parks, recreation, and open space; and Cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity.

In January 2017, San Francisco Planning, in partnership with Supervisor Normal Yee, produced Housing for Families with Children, a policy paper identifying current conditions and possible solutions to address the many challenges facing today’s families. Based on research of best practices from cities around the world, it outlines family friendly elements that could be incorporated into new housing as well as possible strategies for making existing housing more friendly to families and children. The Planning Department is currently working on the next steps as outlined in the paper, as well as drafting a Design Resource Guide for the design of family friendly new housing.
San Francisco's Affordable Inclusionary Housing Program is a key policy to increase the availability of affordable housing dedicated to low and moderate income San Franciscans by leveraging private development to provide new units with no use of public subsidies. Since 2002, it has produced more than 4,600 affordable units in San Francisco, or about 20 percent of our total affordable housing stock.

In July 2017, significant revisions to Section 415 of the Planning Code were unanimously adopted by the Board of Supervisors, amounting to the most comprehensive overhaul of the Program since its inception.

For the first time, the Inclusionary Program will provide below market rate units for moderate- and middle-income San Franciscans who cannot be served by other existing affordable housing programs that rely on federal subsidies. The new requirements are the highest citywide inclusionary rates in the country, and are set to increase annually until the maximum rates of 24 percent for rental projects and 26 percent for for-sale projects are reached in 2025. These requirements are to be reviewed every three years by the Controller’s Office and a Technical Advisory Committee to ensure the requirements remain financially feasible.

The Affordable Housing Fee amount and methodology are being further studied by the Controller’s Office with the support of a Technical Advisory Committee, and the Controller is expected to complete this study in February 2018 and forward to the Board of Supervisor’s for consideration.
ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADU)

An Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) is a residential unit added to an existing building. Also known as Secondary Units, In-Law Units, or Granny Flats, ADUs are generally developed using underutilized spaces within a lot, such as a garage, storage, or rear yard. Nationwide, cities have been adopting ADU programs into their local laws to allow underutilized areas such as parking, yards, storage, or boiler room space to be converted to new homes. San Francisco, first adopted its ADU program in 2014 for select districts.

In September 2016, the City of San Francisco's Accessory Dwelling Unit program became available for use citywide. This program reduces some Planning Code requirements to make it possible for property owners to add these new units to their buildings. In June 2017, amendments were made to the Planning Code to bring the requirements and procedures for authorizing the construction of Accessory Dwelling Units in single-family homes into conformity with the new mandates of State law. (Ordinance No. 95-17) Further amendments made in August 2017 (Ordinance No. 162-17) have introduced additional flexibility to the program.

THE PLANNING CODE REORGANIZATION PROJECT

Over the years, the Planning Code has grown considerably at times with conflicting or complex provisions. This has created challenges for the public to understand the Code and become involved in the planning process, as well as for Planning staff to provide clear and straightforward information to assist the public in understanding even the most basic land use controls. Perhaps most troubling, however, is that the current structure creates inequities within the many neighborhoods in the City; between those who have the time and access to expertise and those who don’t.

Initiated in 2013, the Code Reorganization Project seeks to restructure the Planning Code so that it’s easier to read, understand, and use. The Code Reorganization Project is a necessary step toward a more organized and comprehensive Planning Code that will benefit future planning efforts in both organization and transparency, and at establishing equal access for all to the Code. The Code Reorganization Project is broken down into three Phases.

PHASE I

Phase I of the Code Reorganization Project consolidated four different sections containing duplicative use definitions into one section of the Code (Section 102), and created Zoning Control Tables in Article 2 for Residential (RH, RM, and RC), Downtown (C-3), and Industrial (PDR, and M) zoning districts similar to the ones already used in Neighborhood Commercial Districts (Article 7). This effectively allows users to obtain building standards and use controls for a particular zoning district in one place.

In addition, the new Zoning Control Tables account for every use in the Code. This allows users to easily find out what uses are allowed in a particular zoning district in one chart, rather than having to rely on interpretations by the Zoning Administrator or complex cross referencing. It will also allow for greater modifications of neighborhood land use controls by removing use groupings that limit how certain uses can be regulated. Phase I of the Code Reorganization Project was approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors and signed as an Ordinance by Mayor Lee in February 2015.
PHASE II
Having successfully completed Phase 1, San Francisco Planning then initiated Phase 2 in March 2015.

Phase 2 focuses on Article 7 of the Code that determines controls for Neighborhood Commercial Districts. The goal for Phase 2 was to delete the definitions in Planning Code Section 790 so that Neighborhood Commercial Districts will use the consolidated definitions created in Phase 1, and update the format of the Zoning Control Tables.

In addition, the Article 7 Ordinance deletes Planning Code Section 316, which specified the Conditional Use Authorization procedures for Neighborhood Commercial Districts. With this deletion, all Conditional Use Authorizations in Neighborhood Commercial Districts now follow the Planning Code Section 306 procedures. As a result of this consolidation, the mailing notice requirements for Conditional Use Authorizations and Variances are now standard for 20 days for all zoning districts.

Phase II/Article 7 of the Code Reorganization Project was approved by the Board of Supervisors and signed as an Ordinance by Mayor Lee in June 2017.

PHASE III
The last step, Phase 3, follows the same protocol for Article 8 of the Planning Code addressing Chinatown and Mixed Use Districts, and was initiated once Article 7 concluded.

One of the most noticeable improvements resulting from this Project is how definitions have been more specifically attributed to distinct uses throughout the Code by the removal of use groupings. This serves two purposes; the first being to maintain all existing controls in every zoning district. For example: In Article 2, Institutional Uses such as Schools, Childcare, and Social Services are regulated and defined separately; however, in Articles 7 and 8 these uses are combined into one definition termed ‘Other Large Institution.’ Conversely, Articles 7 and 8 are very specific when it comes to Retail Sales and Services Uses, whereas Article 2 made few distinctions in this category. Establishing specific and consistent definitions allows all existing controls to be maintained.

The second purpose is to allow individually named Neighborhood Commercial Districts to create more tailored controls. To reference the same example above; Schools, Childcare, and Social Services are currently structured as the same use in Neighborhood Commercial Districts. The proposed changes will allow these uses to be regulated separately if needed. For example, if a neighborhood wants to permit Social Service uses as of right, but still wants to require conditional use for Schools, they can now do that. Prior to that, neighborhoods were left with an all or nothing choice.

Phase 3 is currently in draft form and expected to be adopted in winter 2018.
## SNAPSHOT

### PERFORMANCE IN PLANS AND SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processed Building Permits (Existing and New Construction)</td>
<td>8,441</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Complaints Closed</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Business Registry Applications</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑738%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Permits</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variances</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Referrals</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Project Assessment Requests Received</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Appropriateness</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Act Contract Approvals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Authorizations</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Reviews</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑206%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Designations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INVESTMENT IN THE COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Hours</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Hours</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Summer Interns</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthwork Interns</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL GRANTS

ALLOCATING

$4,500,000

IN FUNDING TO SUPPORT PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

ACHIEVEMENTS AND ACCOLADES

2016 Office of Historic Preservation Governor’s Award: Citywide Historic Context Statement for LGBTQ History in San Francisco
2016 California Preservation Foundation: Civic Center Cultural Landscape Inventory, and for the Citywide Historic Context Statement for LGBTQ History in San Francisco
2016 San Francisco Beautiful: Playland at 43rd Avenue for Best Activation
2016 San Francisco Beautiful: Pavement to Parks for Best Public Program
2017 SF Data Shakers and Innovators: EveryTreeSF for a Picture is Worth a Thousand Words
2017 North California APA Award of Excellence: Transportation Sustainability Program for Best Practices
2017 North California APA Merit Award: Better Roofs Ordinance
2017 Green Roofs for Healthy Cities Civic Award: Better Roofs Ordinance

PUBLISHED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTS

Academy of Art University Project (Final)
1979 Mission Street Mixed-Use Project (Draft)
Transit Effectiveness Project (Final)
Central SoMa Plan (Draft)
Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (Final)
1500 Mission Street (Draft and Final)
One Oak Street Project (Draft and Final)
Biosolids Digester Facilities Project (Draft)

LOCAL AND NATIONAL AWARDS
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COMPLETED PLANS AND REPORTS

2015 Commerce & Industry Inventory Report
2015 Downtown Plan Monitoring Report
2016 Housing Inventory Report
2010-2014 San Francisco Supervisor Districts Socio-Economic Profiles
Public Space Stewardship Guide
Lower Haight Public Realm Plan
Final Draft of the Central SoMa Plan
STAFF LIST

+ Joined the Department FY 2016-17 — Left the Department FY 2016-17

ADMINISTRATION
Nadia Bishop
John Boldrick +
Josephine Chen
Glenn Cabreros
Michelle Chang
Alton Chinn
Susan Chu
Thomas DiSanto
Michael Eng
Lulu Hwang
Yvonne Ko
Belle La
Judy Lam
Deborah Landis
Anika Lyons
Andrea Modena −
Sheila Nickolopoulos
Micheal Sanders
John Speer
Isabelle Vulis
Donnie Wong
Elaine Wong
Melissa Wong +
Mike Wynne
Tony Yeung
Genta Yoshikawa
Karen Zhu

CITYWIDE
Robin Abad-Ocubillo
Amnon Ben-Pazi
Jacob Bintliff
Anne Brask
Benjamin Caldwell
Paul Chasan
Gary Chen
Lisa Chen
Kay Cheng
Paula Chiu −
Maria de Alva
Danielle −
DeRuiter-Williams
Kearstin Dischinger −
Scott Edmondson
Marisa Espinosa −
Susan Exline
Lisa Fisher
Claudia Flores
John Francis
Susan Gygi
Kimia Haddadan
Audrey Harris
Cassie Hoeprich −
Seung Yen Hong
Neil Hrushowy
Adrienne Hyder
Paolo Ikezoe
Doug Johnson +
Lily Langlois
David Leong −
Jessica Look
Menaka Mohan −
Andrea Nelson
Teresa Ojeda
James Pappas
Pedro Peterson
Nicholas Perry
Patrick Race
Ilaria Salvadori
Marlo Sandler −
Jeremy Shaw
Maia Small
Diana Sokolove
Mathew Snyder
Jonathan Swae
Joshua Swizky
Tam Tran +
Rachael Tanner +
Adam Varat
Michael Webster
Maggie Wenger
Steve Wertheim
David Winslow
Aaron Yen +

COMMISSIONS OFFICE
Patricia Gerber
Jonas Ionin
Christine Lamorena
Chanbory Son

CURRENT PLANNING
Seema Adina
Laura Ajello
Linda Ajello-Hoagland +
Christy Alexander
Claudine Asbagh
Brittany Bendix
Marcelle Boudreaux
Keisha Calmes
Shelley Caltagirone
Cathleen Campbell
Colin Clarke
Tina Chang
Michael Christensen +
Lorabelle Cook
Kate Conner
Kimberly Durandet
Wayne Farrens −
Veronica Flores
Nick Foster
Carly Grob
Elizabeth
Gordon-Jonckheer
Jeffrey Horn
Angela Huisman −
Erika Jackson
Sylvia Jimenez
Jeff Joslin
Todd Kennedy −
Alexandra Kirby
Victoria Lewis
David Lindsay
Mark Luellen
Milton Martin
Christopher May
Theresa Monchez
Gabriela Pantoj +
Andrew Perry
Georgia Powell
Nora Priego
Max Putra
Erica Russell
Ella Samonsky
Daniel Siros −
Stephanie Skangos −
Maia Small
Jeffrey Speirs
Richard Sucre
Nancy Tran
Cathy Thai
Chris Townes
Vlad Vallesio
Sarah Vellve
Doug Vu
Delvin Washington
Elizabeth Watty
David Weissglass
David Winslow
Ashley Woods +
Mary Woods
Ming Yeung –
Sharon Young

DIRECTOR’S OFFICE
Audrey Butkus
Courtney Ferris +
Andrea Green
Kimia Haddadan
Elizabeth Purl
John Rahaim
AnMarie Rodgers
Eugenio Salcedo
Diego Sanchez
Daniel Sider
Gina Simi
Candace SooHoo
Aaron Starr
Martin Thibodeau

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
Brett Bollinger –
Virnaliza Byrd
Alana Callagy
Rick Cooper
Randall Dean –
Jenny Delumo
Debra Dwyer
Christopher Espiritu
Chelsea Fordham
Sherie George +
Lisa Gibson
Justin Horner
Alesia Hsiao +
Melinda Hue
Monica Huggins
Michael Jacinto –
Devyani Jain
Timothy Johnston (SFPUC)
Heather Jones –
Sarah Jones –
Chris Kern
Don Lewis
Michael Li
Laura Lynch
Manoj Madhavan
Paul Maltzer
Jennifer McKellar
Julie Moore
Joy Navarrete
Josh Pollak
Jeanie Poling
Jessica Range
Lana Russell-Hurd
Rachel Schuett
Tatyana Sheyner
Steven Smith (SFPUC) –
Chris Thomas
Kansai Uchida –
Allison Vanderslice
Elizabeth White +
Wade Wietgrefe
Daniel Wu +

HISTORIC PRESERVATION
Jorgen Cleemann+
Stephanie Cisneros
Shannon Ferguson
Tim Frye
Justin Greving
Gretchen Hilyard
Michelle Langlie +
Pilar LaValley
Frances McMillen +
Susan Parks –
Ken Qi
Rebecca Salgado +
Desiree Smith +
Tina Tam
Eliessh Tuffy
Allison Vanderslice
Jonathan Vimr +

PLANNING INFORMATION CENTER
Julian Banales
Kurt Botn
Moses Corrette
Jonathan DiSalvo
Heidi Kline
Edgar Oropeza
Ozzie Taeb

ZONING & COMPLIANCE
EvaMarie Atijera-Taylor
Chaska Berger
David Brosky
Matt Dito
Christine Haw –
Dario Jones
Agnes Lau
Jonathan Purvis
Adrian Putra
Rachna
Scott Sanchez
Corey Teague
Cindy Tong –

INTERNS
Ru’a Al-Abweh
Svetha Ambati
Ariadne Brancato
Jayne Chang
Lauren Deaderick
Paul D’Eredita
Paige Dow
Caitlyn Ewers
Brian Goggin
Irene Ho
Kathleen Ma
Terea Macomber
Gabriela Navarro
Kate Pennington
Christopher Purcell
Jill Schmidt
Hannah Simonson
Carla Wietgrefe
Jessica Wunsch

SUMMER YOUTHWORK INTERNS
Wendy Gu
Huimin Huang
Winnie Li
Jessica Liang
Vicky Ma
Spencer O’Brien-Steele
Frank Yu
Emily Zhou
FINANCIALS

TOTAL REVENUE BUDGET (ALL FUNDS)

$51.3M 24% Increase from FY 2015-16

REVENUE FY 2016-17 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>FY 2016-17 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services (Fees)</td>
<td>$44,012,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Special Revenues &amp; Impact Fees</td>
<td>$4,539,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Recovery</td>
<td>$740,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$1,991,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,284,076</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEE REVENUE

$44.3M 86% of Total Revenue Budget

REVENUE FY 2016-17 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>FY 2016-17 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Alterations</td>
<td>$18,455,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit New Construction</td>
<td>$3,936,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review Fees</td>
<td>$9,829,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Short Range Planning Fees</td>
<td>$5,476,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Fees</td>
<td>$5,112,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Fees</td>
<td>$557,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Program &amp; Code Enforcement</td>
<td>$866,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Appropriateness Fees</td>
<td>$103,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fee Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,337,508</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPARTMENT REVENUE 5-YEAR TREND

NOTES:
Salary and fringe expenditures for staff continue to be the most significant portion of the Department's overall expenditure budget representing 59% of all expenditures.
Non-personnel expenditures, which include professional service contracts, advertising, and postage, IT-related professional services and licenses, among other items.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES

$51.3M 59% Salaries & Fringe

EXPENDITURE FY 2016-17 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>FY 2016-17 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Fringe</td>
<td>$32,344,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$554,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Services, Materials &amp; Supplies, Capital &amp; Projects</td>
<td>$11,735,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services of Other Departments</td>
<td>$6,649,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,284,076</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL FUND SUPPORT

$2.0M 4% of Total Revenue Budget


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund Support</th>
<th>$4.8</th>
<th>$2.8</th>
<th>$2.4</th>
<th>$2.5</th>
<th>$2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget</strong></td>
<td>$28.2</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
<td>$38.4</td>
<td>$41.3</td>
<td>$51.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Total Budget | 17% | 9% | 6% | 6% | 4% |