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A message from our
Planning Director and Commissioners

We are pleased to share San Francisco Planning’s Annual Report for Fiscal Year 18/19 with you. Planning plays a critical role every day in achieving the City’s goals for housing, urban design, transportation, public space, zoning, preservation, and the quality and sustainability of the built environment.

As we look to 2020, we can’t help but reflect upon the extraordinary changes San Francisco has seen this past decade. Whether it was the Great Recession, the unexpectedly sharp rebound in our economy fueled by the tech sector leading to astronomical housing cost increases, economic displacement, and upheavals in many neighborhoods, it all took place in seemingly record time. And of course, these changes occurred while the City elected our first Asian-American Mayor, mourned his early passing, then elected our first African-American woman as Mayor.

While we still have work to do, San Francisco as a city, and the Planning Department as an agency, have done more to address the housing crisis than any city or planning agency in the United States. But the even greater challenge is maintaining our long-valued status as a place for everyone. San Francisco can justifiably boast a long tradition of welcoming everyone, regardless of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, personal beliefs, aspirations, quirky behavior, or unique appearance. The threatened loss of San Francisco’s soul has both cultural and economic consequences. We can grow without losing our values, but only if we act now.

This past year, like several before it, has presented any number of challenges and successes, met by an extraordinary staff. We will always have great appreciation for their resolve, talent, and dedication. Our work wouldn’t be possible without the support of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and our partner City agencies. Their guidance and collaboration lead us toward the best future possible for San Francisco. Together, we will continue to develop ways to protect the natural and built environment, preserve and enhance our quality of life, promote equity and equality, and deal effectively with growth and development to ensure that San Francisco remains one of the world’s great cities.

John Rahaim
Director
San Francisco Planning Department

Myrna Melgar
President
Planning Commission

Aaron Jon Hyland
President
Preservation Commission
Effective January 1, 2018, California Senate Bill 35 (SB 35) is intended to **grow the housing supply in California cities** by requiring them to **streamline the approval of certain housing projects** by providing a ministerial approval process. Applicable statewide, this is a voluntary program that a project sponsor may elect to pursue, provided that certain eligibility criteria are met.

SB 35 provides ministerial review for projects that provide a certain amount of affordable housing dependent on a jurisdiction’s progress toward the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

The bill contains two programs: one for jurisdictions that are under-producing in the above moderate-income category (120% Area Median Income and above); and the second for those under-producing in the low-income housing (under 80% Area Median Income).

SB 35 works to speed up housing production for these projects by removing the requirement for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis and removing the requirement for Conditional Use Authorization or other similar discretionary entitlements granted by the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission.

Since the program’s inception in 2014, 2023 units have been proposed, 1160 units have been approved, and 261 units have been completed (236 of those rent controlled).
Affordable Housing Developments Approved FY 2018/19

1. 681 Florida Street
   130 Units / 100% Affordable

2. 457-475 Minna Street
   270 Units / 53% Affordable

3. 2340 San Jose Avenue
   129 Units / 100% Affordable

4. 1064-1068 Mission Street
   253 Units / 100% Affordable

5. 833 Bryant Street
   146 Units / 100% Affordable

6. 3001 24th Street
   45 Units / 100% Affordable

7. 4840 Mission Street
   137 Units / 100% Affordable

8. 2109 22nd Street
   4 Affordable Units
**Highlight: Racial and Social Equity Initiative**

The Planning Department and other City agencies are defining racial equity, as a state when race can no longer be used to predict life outcomes, and outcomes for all groups are improved. Social equity is fairness and justice in the management of public institutions, forming of policy, and delivery of public services that consider historical and current inequities.

Launched in 2016, the Racial and Social Equity Initiative is an essential component of San Francisco Planning’s work and is supported by the City’s Human Rights Commission and Mayor Breed’s policy priorities. It aims to **pro-actively advance equity in the Department’s internal and external processes** such as community planning, policy development, resource allocation, and process improvements. It sets the long-term strategy for City investments, under Mayor Breed’s leadership to achieve a diverse, equitable and inclusive city and to generate greater accountability and equitable outcomes in the provision of city services and use of City funds.

The Initiative will become our primary tool to help advance racial and social equity in our work in a comprehensive way, including internal and external processes, including hiring, public information, project review, outreach, policies and programs, staff capacity-building, and process improvements.

The Initiative consists of the following components:

- **Phase 1**, completed in early 2019, focused on internal functions such as hiring, capacity building, resource allocation, and contracting.

- **Phase 2** focuses on Planning’s external functions such as community planning, legislation, public information and historic preservation among others.
Central SoMa is a 230-acre area that sits adjacent to downtown, has excellent transit access, and contains numerous undeveloped or underdeveloped sites, such as surface parking lots and single-story commercial buildings. As such, the neighborhood is well positioned to accommodate much-needed employment and housing. As it grows and evolves over the next 25 years, Central SoMa can become a complete, sustainable, and vital neighborhood without losing what makes it special and unique today.

While increasing the capacity for jobs and housing in San Francisco, we must also ensure that new growth provides public benefits to improve the lives of residents and workers. The City has been planning for such growth over the last 20 years, through major Area Plans such as Mission Bay, Hunters Point, Rincon Hill, Eastern Neighborhoods, Market & Octavia, and the Transit Center District.

However, there is still substantial demand for development of space for jobs and housing in transit-rich, walkable, amenity-laden neighborhoods. Adopted in 2008, the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan included new land use controls and proposed community improvements for the eastern part of the South of Market neighborhood, as well as the Central Waterfront, Mission, and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhoods. During this process, the City determined that the development potential of the surrounding area, coupled with the improved transit provided by the Central Subway, required a separate planning process that took the City's growth needs and environmental goals into account.

In 2011, San Francisco Planning began the process to develop the Central SoMa Plan; one that should play a major role in accommodating the City’s share...
Highlight: Central SoMa Plan

The Central SoMa Plan is based on meeting eight specific goals:

1. Increase the Capacity for Jobs and Housing
2. Maintain the Diversity of Residents
3. Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center
4. Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit
5. Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities
6. Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood
7. Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood’s Cultural Heritage
8. Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City
Highlight: Central SoMa Plan

of anticipated regional growth in jobs and housing while creating a social, economic, and environmentally sustainable neighborhood fully realized by 2040 that meets the needs of the present — without compromising the opportunities of future generations.

As San Francisco’s housing crisis continued to escalate, changes to the Plan now accommodates up to **8,800 housing units** (from an original plan for 7,000). The Plan also includes the first-ever Housing Sustainability District, utilizing a state law (AB 73) that allows residential projects that meet certain affordability and labor standards to take advantage of a 120-day streamlined review and approval process.

The Central SoMa Plan will result in **$2 billion in public benefits** for the neighborhood while generating $1 billion in revenue for the City’s General Fund.

The Central SOMA Plan:

» Accommodates development capacity for up to 8,800 housing units and **32,000 jobs**;

» Maintains the diversity of residents by requiring that over 33 percent of new housing units are affordable;

» Facilitates an economically diversified jobs center by requiring large sites to be jobs-oriented, by requiring Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) in many projects, and by incentivizing vibrant retail, hotels, and entertainment uses;

» Provides over $600 million towards safe and convenient transportation, improving conditions for people walking, bicycling, and taking transit;

» Funds $185 million towards construction and improvement of parks and recreation centers in the area, plus privately created publicly-accessible open space;

» Provides up to $64 million to invest in school facilities to support the expanding population;

» Creates an environmentally sustainable neighborhood by requiring green roofs, walls and non-greenhouse gas energy sources, while funding projects to improve air quality and help manage stormwater;

» Preserves and celebrate the neighborhood’s cultural heritage with over $100 million dedicated to social programs and the rehabilitation and maintenance of historic buildings; and

» Includes design controls that reflects the neighborhood’s mid-rise character, while facilitating innovative architecture.

On August 11, 2016, the Planning Department published the revised draft Central SoMa Plan and Implementation Strategy, and a 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.

Four appeals regarding the adequacy of the EIR were filed. Appellants raised an array of concerns ranging from socioeconomic effects of the plan related to gentrification, adequacy of public services and transit to serve the Plan area; seismic stability within the Plan Area; growth in vehicle miles traveled; increased traffic hazards and air pollution; and the desire for the report to study additional Plan alternatives. The Planning Department presented thorough analysis and testimony demonstrating that the EIR remained adequate, accurate, and complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). On September 25, 2018 the Board of Supervisors unanimously rejected all four appeals and upheld the Planning Commission’s certification of the Central SoMa Plan EIR.

The Central SoMa Plan was unanimously approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in December 2018.
An **Executive Directive** is a direct order issued from the Mayor to one or more City Departments. It does not create or change the law but requires Department heads to take immediate and specific action to achieve a designated goal.

For more information on Mayoral Executive Directives visit: [sfplanning.org/project/mayoral-executive-directives](http://sfplanning.org/project/mayoral-executive-directives)

---

**Mayor London Breed's Executive Directive: Accelerating Creation of New Housing**

On August 31, 2018, Mayor London N. Breed issued an Executive Directive to accelerate the approval of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) to clear the backlog of pending applications. ADUs are also known as secondary units, in-law units, or cottages, and are secondary units added to existing residential buildings. The Directive instructs City departments to set clear, objective code standards for ADU applications to provide the guidance necessary for applicants to navigate otherwise competing code sections, and as a result, allow these units to be approved more quickly.

The first ordinance to allow the construction of new ADUs was limited to the Castro neighborhood and was approved in 2014. In 2016, San Francisco's ADU Program became available citywide in zoning districts wherever housing was allowed. ADUs are typically built in underutilized storage or parking spaces, and are often cheaper and faster to build than traditional units. ADUs are predicted to produce more housing units in the next 20 years than any of the 20 neighborhood plans in San Francisco. When an ADU is built within a rent-controlled building, that new ADU is also subject to rent control.

In February 2019, Mayor Breed announced that in the six months since issuing the Executive Directive, the City cleared its application backlog of 919 units. As a result of this action, the City permitted more in-law units than it did in the previous three years combined. As of June 2019, approximately 450 of the backlogged in-law units have been permitted, over 90 percent of which are subject to rent-control, and the rest of the applications have been reviewed by the relevant departments and are awaiting responses from the applicants.

From July 2018 – June 2019, 282 ADU permits were approved, adding approximately 500 units to San Francisco’s housing stock. Since the program’s inception in 2014, 2023 units have been submitted, 1160 units have been approved, and 261 units have been completed (236 of those rent controlled).

---

1. Based on 1.8 units per permit average
2. As of December 2019
Executive Directive:
Keeping up the Pace of Housing Production

Issued September 27, 2017 by Mayor Edwin Lee, Executive Directive 17-02 set established target approval timeframes for housing projects and directed the Planning Department to develop a Process Improvements Plan to meet or exceed these timeframes. The Directive also called for regular quarterly reporting to the Mayor’s Office on the Department’s implementation of these process improvements and our progress in speeding approvals.

The Department issued a Process Improvements Plan on December 1, 2017, which included dozens of improvements in every aspect of the Department’s operations.

As June 1, 2019, the bulk of the improvement measures included in the Plan have either been implemented or are well under development and are to be implemented in 2020.

The most impactful measures include:

» Consolidating environmental and project review under a single Project Application.

» Advanced Planning Commission scheduling for housing projects.

» Consistent public notification requirements, and online notice.

» Historic Resource Assessment for potential project sites.

» Standard Conditions of Approval for selected CEQA topics.

» Online applications and electronic document review.

As part of the consolidated Project Application and review process, Planning implemented a series of review milestones that increase the predictability of the application process, consolidate Department comments into a single document managed by the project planner, and greatly improve the transparency of the review process. In addition, the Department streamlined the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) process to provide clearer direction to applicants about the level of review that will be required and reduced the target timeframe for PPAs to 60 days, down from 90 days. Taken together, these changes provide a more clear, expeditious and predictable review path from preliminary design to final approval.

In the first year of implementation, the Department had exceeded or nearly met the performance target for each of these project review milestones. Two-thirds of projects are receiving PPA feedback within 60 days, and 90 percent are either accepted or issued a Notice of Incomplete Application letter (NIA) within 30 days after an application is submitted. Over half of all projects are receiving a consolidated Plan Check letter (PCL) within 90 days.

As of July 2019, all projects that filed a Project Application under the consolidated review process, comprising over 2,300 units, have been approved within the target time frames established by the Executive Directive.
## Executive Directive: Accelerating Creation of New Housing

### Summary and Status of Planning Department Process Improvements Plan, July 2019

NOTES: (1) BF 180423: Mayor’s Process Improvements Ordinance (Mayor Breed), approved July 2018
(2) BF 180456: HOME-SF and 100% Affordable Housing Bonus Program (Tang, Safai), approved August 2018
(3) BF 171193: Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program (Peskiri, Kim), approved February 2018
(4) BF 180298: Accessory Dwelling Units (Tang, Kim, Brown), approved August 2018
(5) BF 181156: Accessory Dwelling Units in New Construction (Safai), introduced November 2018

### A Application and Intake Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1</strong> Streamline Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA)</td>
<td>Effective April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.2</strong> Consolidate environmental and project review via Project Application</td>
<td>Effective June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.3</strong> Revise plan submittal and intake requirements</td>
<td>Effective June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.4</strong> Uniform public notification procedures</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;- Consistent mailing and poster requirements; Online Notice (Effective Jan. 2019 (BF 180423))&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;- Apply uniform requirements to 311/312 building permit notices (TBD (not in BF 180423))&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;- Notification materials redesign and streamlining (Initiated Summer 2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B Routine Projects and Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1</strong> Enhance capacity for Over-the-Counter (OTC) approvals at PIC counter</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;- Expand or add dedicated PIC shifts for: Preservation, Design, ADUs (Effective April 2018, ongoing) &lt;br&gt;- Streamline CEQA Categorical Exemption process for OTC approvals (Effective January 2018) &lt;br&gt;- Improve public information materials (Ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.2</strong> Expand permits that can be approved same-day at PIC counter</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;- Minor alterations to Historic structures (Effective Aug. 2018 (BF 180423))&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;- Limited Rear Yard Additions, and related minor alterations (TBD (not in BF 180423))&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.3</strong> Accessory Dwelling Units and Unit Legalization approvals</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;- Assign ADU core staff at key agencies (DBI, SFFD, Public Works, Planning, SFPUC) (Effective October 2018) &lt;br&gt;- Offer combined interagency Pre-Application meetings (Effective September 2018) &lt;br&gt;- Expedited plan review, preliminary approval OTC by appointment (Effective August 2018) &lt;br&gt;- Provide interagency plan review and combined Plan Check Letter (Effective October 2018) &lt;br&gt;- Provide parallel processing with DBI and Planning for ADU permits (Effective August 2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C Environmental Planning, Historic Preservation, and Design Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.1</strong> Standard Conditions of Approval for selected CEQA topics</td>
<td>Fall 2019 / Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.2</strong> Streamline review process for selected CEQA topics:</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;- Two-tier transportation review: streamlined review for most projects (Effective August 2018) &lt;br&gt;- Streamline wind and shadow review (Effective February 2019) &lt;br&gt;- Replace narrative “certificate” documents with checklists for Exemptions. (Effective January 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.3</strong> Streamline use of technical studies and environmental consultants</td>
<td>Effective July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.4</strong> Expand and streamline environmental review exemptions</td>
<td>Effective July 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic Preservation Review

C.2.1 Revise Preservation review procedures:
- Historic Resource Assessment (HRA) for pre-project determination
  Effective Jan. 2019 (pilot)
- Revise Preservation Bulletin No. 16
  TBD

C.2.2 Complete a citywide historic preservation survey
  Ongoing

C.2.3 Reassess Historic Preservation staffing at PIC counter:
- Enhanced service hours by Preservation specialists
  Effective April 2018
- Revise PIC review procedures for non-Preservation specialists
  Summer 2019

Design Review

C.3.1 Identify Design Guidelines to be codified or standardized
  Initiate Spring 2020

C.3.2 Enhance staffing of Design Advisory teams, add Design staff at PIC
  Effective June 2018

C.3.3 Adopt Urban Design Guidelines (UDGs) and develop UDGs matrix
  Effective May 2018

C.3.4 Streamline Residential Design Guidelines (RDGs) with RDGs matrix
  Effective June 2018

C.3.5 Update Residential Design Guidelines (RDGs), develop an RDGs matrix
  Effective Aug. 2018

Planning Code and Commission Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>Advanced Planning Commission scheduling for housing projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2</td>
<td>Streamline staffing and timeframe for Discretionary Review (DR) cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3</td>
<td>Reduce requirements for Conditional Use and other entitlement hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminate Commission hearings for 100% Affordable Housing Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace CU hearing for HOME-SF with a design review hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify additional approvals to be consolidated or eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| D.4.1 | Update the Planning Code for consistent definitions and procedures | Ongoing |
| D.4.2 | Ongoing Planning Code reorganization |
|      | Article 8 (Chinatown Districts) | Pending BF 190594 |
|      | Article 8 (Mixed Use Districts) | Initiate Fall 2019 |

| D.5  | Planning Code revisions to streamline housing review |
|      | Reduce the need for Variances for large downtown projects | Effective Aug. 2018 (BF 180423)⁴ |
|      | Expand administrative approval for 100% Affordable projects | Effective Aug. 2018 (BF 180423)⁵ |
|      | Expand approval options for ADUs in buildable area | Effective Sept. 2018 (BF 180268)⁴ |
|      | Provide administrative approval of “no waiver” ADUs | Effective June 2019 (BF 181156)⁵ |

Administration and Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1.1</td>
<td>Online submittal and payment for all development application types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.2</td>
<td>Electronic Document Review (EDR) for Planning review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.3</td>
<td>Electronic Document Management System (EDMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.4</td>
<td>Develop a web-based Impact Fee Calculator for staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.5</td>
<td>In-House processing of public notification mailing lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.6</td>
<td>Property Information Map (PIM) enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.7</td>
<td>Develop business zoning check online tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Activity Map

- **8,497** Planning Cases Filed FY 2018/19
- **2,726** Planning Cases Approved FY 2018/19

San Francisco Bay
Planning Cases & Building Permits FY 2018/19

8,497 Planning Cases Filed
8,172 Building Permit Applications Filed

CASE & PERMIT VOLUME TRENDS
FY 2013/14 - FY 2018/19

- Building Permit: Alterations
- Building Permit: New Construction

BUILDING PERMITS
Permits reviewed over the counter: 72%
Permit intake / staff review: 28%
5,854
2,318

PLANNING CASES
FY 2018/19
Final Budget

Planning Case Type
- CEQA Categorical Exemptions: 414
- Conditional Use Authorization: 204
- Condominium Referral: 162
- Discretionary Review: 113
- Enforcement: 713
- CEQA: Other Environmental Review: 615
- Misc Permit: 2,206
- Preliminary Project Assessment: 59
- Project Review Meeting: 321
- Section 311: Neighborhood Notification: 624
- Short Term Rental: 1,243
- Variance: 140
- All other cases: 1,683

FISCAL YEAR 2018 - 2019 ANNUAL REPORT
## Case & Permit Volume Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application/Fee Type</th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Bonus (AHB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-50%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium Referral</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>26%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Appropriateness</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-24%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Authorization</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Planning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0%--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-33%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Exceptions (309.1, 309.2, 309.3, 309.4)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Review - Mandatory</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-60%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Review - Public Initiated</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>-11%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exemptions (EEC and ECA)</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>33%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>-10%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Neighborhood Exception (329)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-75%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Time and Materials (ETM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>8%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Section (106)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-46%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreement Design Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Advertising Sign Annual Inventory Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Application w/o Hearing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Assessment 5 or less units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Assessment 6 or more units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Application-Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Requests</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-37%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station Conversion Determinations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Use Permits</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Hotel Conversions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Letters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Referral</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-30%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Agreement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Master Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-50%↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Business Registry (LBR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69%↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case & Permit Volume Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application/Fee Type</th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Line Adjustment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Map Amendment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Permit</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>8% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Act</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Allocation (321)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Code Text Amendment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Project Assessment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Review Meeting</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit to Alter (Major, Minor)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Study (295)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0% --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Survey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Rental</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Section (106) / Subdivision Referral</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Statement of Eligibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Certificate of Transfer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0% --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Notice of Use</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) - Letter of Determination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) – Notice of Special Restrictions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) - Verification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>80% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Cannabis Dispensary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 311</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Book Notification</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits (New Construction)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits (Existing Alterations)</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>7,909</td>
<td>7,928</td>
<td>8,297</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,851</td>
<td>15,740</td>
<td>17,806</td>
<td>17,718</td>
<td>17,610</td>
<td>16,669</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Permit Project and Tracking System for Planning Cases and DBI’s Permit Tracking System for Building Permits

Bldg. Permits: DBI Permit Tracking System data by fiscal year may vary slightly due to permit issuance timing.

GEN: includes GASP program, Records Requests, Temporary Use Permits (for FY10-11 and prior), and other applications.

MIS: includes referrals from other agencies, such as the Police and Fire Departments, Alcoholic Beverage Control, among others.

*PRJ: are project profiles and not counted towards planning volume cases.

*PRL: are over-the-counter profiles and not counted towards planning volume cases.
## Financial Report

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services (Fees)</td>
<td>$25,311,352</td>
<td>$32,116,156</td>
<td>$35,504,019</td>
<td>$44,012,250</td>
<td>$43,828,367</td>
<td>$43,519,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$1,147,978</td>
<td>$3,415,696</td>
<td>$2,695,905</td>
<td>$4,539,531</td>
<td>$6,968,618</td>
<td>$4,516,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Recovery</td>
<td>$749,740</td>
<td>$447,135</td>
<td>$583,713</td>
<td>$740,453</td>
<td>$1,120,332</td>
<td>$1,470,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$2,772,727</td>
<td>$2,372,625</td>
<td>$2,475,487</td>
<td>$1,991,842</td>
<td>$2,584,044</td>
<td>$3,848,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,981,797</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,351,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,259,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,284,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,501,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,355,987</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fee Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Building Permit Alterations</td>
<td>$11,276,692</td>
<td>$16,169,046</td>
<td>$16,263,844</td>
<td>$18,455,090</td>
<td>$22,598,344</td>
<td>$20,896,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Building Permit New Construction</td>
<td>$2,409,459</td>
<td>$2,706,801</td>
<td>$2,794,709</td>
<td>$3,936,266</td>
<td>$5,464,284</td>
<td>$3,067,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Environmental Review Fees</td>
<td>$5,764,357</td>
<td>$7,063,662</td>
<td>$7,075,319</td>
<td>$9,829,289</td>
<td>$7,394,694</td>
<td>$7,666,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Other Short Range Planning Fees</td>
<td>$2,370,783</td>
<td>$2,701,763</td>
<td>$3,949,707</td>
<td>$5,476,761</td>
<td>$3,123,049</td>
<td>$4,826,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Conditional Use Fees</td>
<td>$2,544,717</td>
<td>$2,459,580</td>
<td>$2,859,789</td>
<td>$5,112,250</td>
<td>$2,876,820</td>
<td>$4,519,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Variance Fees</td>
<td>$383,241</td>
<td>$502,324</td>
<td>$691,759</td>
<td>$557,546</td>
<td>$697,187</td>
<td>$751,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Certificate of Appropriateness Fees</td>
<td>$196,279</td>
<td>$142,623</td>
<td>$106,746</td>
<td>$103,809</td>
<td>$261,265</td>
<td>$250,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Sign Program &amp; Code Enforcement</td>
<td>$365,824</td>
<td>$370,357</td>
<td>$371,419</td>
<td>$866,497</td>
<td>$1,412,724</td>
<td>$1,540,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fee Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,311,352</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,116,156</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,113,292</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,337,508</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,828,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,519,481</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Fund Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$2.8 M</td>
<td>$2.4 M</td>
<td>$2.5 M</td>
<td>$2.0 M</td>
<td>$2.6 M</td>
<td>$3.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Other Revenues</td>
<td>$27.2 M</td>
<td>$36.0 M</td>
<td>$38.8 M</td>
<td>$49.3 M</td>
<td>$51.9 M</td>
<td>$49.5 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Fund Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: In FY03-04 through FY05-06, appropriations from the Building Inspection Fund were used in lieu of General Fund Support ($2.3 Million, $5.3 Million and $1.7 Million, respectively)*

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$22,647,636</td>
<td>$25,156,865</td>
<td>$26,848,917</td>
<td>$32,344,832</td>
<td>$33,989,545</td>
<td>$35,895,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$313,400</td>
<td>$26,187</td>
<td>$509,668</td>
<td>$554,786</td>
<td>$774,176</td>
<td>$980,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Services, Materials &amp; Supplies, Capital &amp; Projects</td>
<td>$2,796,255</td>
<td>$8,491,050</td>
<td>$8,482,001</td>
<td>$11,735,231</td>
<td>$13,672,238</td>
<td>$10,042,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services of Other Departments</td>
<td>$4,224,506</td>
<td>$4,677,510</td>
<td>$5,418,538</td>
<td>$6,649,227</td>
<td>$6,065,402</td>
<td>$6,436,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,981,797</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,351,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,259,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,284,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,501,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,355,987</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Report FY 2018/19

$53.4 M Total Revenue Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>FY2018/19 Final Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services (Fees)</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Recovery</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Fee Revenues table on previous page

$53.4 M Total Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY2018/19 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Services, Materials &amp; Supplies, Capital &amp; Projects</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to Other Depts</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPARTMENT REVENUE TREND
FY2013/14 - FY2018/19 Adopted Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>Fee Revenue 82%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$43.5 M Total Fee Revenue Budget

$3.8 M General Fund Support
Environmental Planning: Major Review Documents FY 2018/19

3333 California Street Mixed Use Project
Balboa Reservoir Project
3700 California Street
Better Market Street
10 South Van Ness
Potrero Power Station
30 Otis Street
India Basin Mixed-Use Project
280 7th Street
255 Shipley Street/254 Clara Street
350 Second Street
1075-1089 Folsom Street
2918-2924 Mission Street
1245 Folsom Street
3357-3359 26th Street
3140-3150 16th Street
301 Grove Street
1052-1060 Folsom Street and 190-194 Russ Street
1450 Howard Street
856 Capp Street
265 Shipley Street
1170 Harrison Street
2300 Harrison Street
598 Brannan Street
344 14th Street
55 Belcher Street
333 Valencia Street
828 Brannan Street
655 Fourth Street
953-955 Folsom Street

Draft EIR  Final EIR  Community Plan Exemption
Awards and Recognition FY 2018/19

**SPUR's 2019 Good Government Award**
Recipient: Kate Conner

**2019 APA CA Northern Section Special Recognition Award**
Recipient: Veronica Flores
Category: Emerging Planner

**2019 APA Northern California Chapter, Award of Excellence**
Category: Transportation Planning
Project: Elimination of Minimum Parking Requirements

**2019 APA Silver National Planning Achievement Award**
Category: Best Practice
Project: San Francisco’s Accessory Dwelling Unit Program

**2019 APA Gold National Planning Achievement Award**
Category: Environmental Planning
Project: Sustainable Chinatown

**2018 AIA San Francisco Community Alliance Awards**
Project: Civic Center Commons

**2018 MOCI and Data SF's 2018 Data and Innovation Award**
Category: A Picture’s Worth a Thousand Words
Project: Sustainable Chinatown

**2018 AIA San Francisco Community Alliance Awards**
Project: Civic Center Commons
Planning Staff FY 2018/19

Administration
Nadia Bishop
John Boldrick
Karen Carasi
Glenn Cabreros
Michelle Chang
Theodore Chen
Alton Chinn
Susan Chu
Michael Diaz
Thomas DiSanto
Michael Eng
Lulu Hwang
Biling Jiang
Yvonne Ko
Belle La
Judy Lam
Deborah Landis
Selina Liu
Anika Lyons
Micheal Sanders
John Speer
Isabelle Vulis
Barry Wong
Elaine Wong
Melissa Wong
Mike Wynne
Tony Yeung
Genta Yoshikawa
Karen Zhu

Citywide Planning
Robin Abad-Ocubillo
Svetla Ambati
Amnon Ben-Pazi
Anne Brask
Benjamin Caldwell
Paul Chasan
Celina Chan
Lisa Chen
Kay Cheng
Miriam Chion
Maria de Alva
Scott Edmondson
Susan Exline
Lisa Fisher
Claudia Flores
Julie Flynn
John Francis
Susan Gygi
Kimia Haddadan
Seung Yen Hong
Neil Hrushowy
Adrienne Hyder
Paolo Ikezoe
Doug Johnson
Lily Langlois
Jessica Look
Andrea Nelson
Sheila Nickolopoulos
Teresa Ojeda
James Pappas
Pedro Peterson
Nicholas Perry
Patrick Race
AnMarie Rodgers
Ken Qi
Ilaria Salvadori
Deborah Sanders
Jeremy Shaw
Mathew Snyder
Jonathan Swae
Joshua Switzky
Rachael Tanner
Tam Tran
Reanna Tong
Andre Torrey
Vlad Vallejo
Adam Varat
Michael Webster
Maggie Wenger
Steve Wertheim
Aaron Yen

Commissions Office
Josephine Feliciana
Jonas Ionin
Christine Lamorena
Chanbory Son

Current Planning
Seema Adina
Laura Ajello
Linda Ajello-Hoagland
Christy Alexander
Claudine Asbagh
Julian Banales
Brittany Bendix
Melanie Bishop
Kurt Botn
Marcelle Boudreaux

Keisha Calmese
Shelley Caltagirone
Cathleen Campbell
Mathew Chandler
Michael Christensen
Lorabelle Cook
Moses Corrette
Matt Dito
Kimberly Durandet
Carolyn Fahey
Shannon Ferguson
Veronica Flores
Nick Foster
Tim Frye
Dori Ganetsos
Monica Giacomucci
Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer
Bridget Hicks
Jeffrey Horn
Sylvia Jimenez
Jeff Joslin
Alexandra Kirby
Heidi Kline
Michelle Langlie
Agnes Lau
Pilar LaValley
Victoria Lewis
Xinyu Liang
Ashley Lindsay
Christopher May
Frances McMillen
Theresa Monchez
Elizabeth Munyan
Edgar Oropeza
Gabriela Pantoja
Suzette Parinas
Andrew Perry
Kristina Phung
Georgia Powell
Nora Priego
Max Putra
Erica Russell
Rebecca Salgado
Ella Samonsky
William San
Desiree Smith
Jeffrey Speirs
Richard Sucre
Chris Townes
Nancy Tran
Eiliesh Tuffy
Jonathan Vimr
Doug Vu
Delvin Washington
Elizabeth Watty
David Weissglass
Alex Westhoff
Mary Woods
Sharon Young

Design Review
Allison Albericci
Luiz Barata
Maia Small
Trent Greenan
David Winslow

Director’s Office
Jacob Bintliff
Gary Chen
Kate Conner
Courtney Ferris
Andrea Green
Carly Grob
Audrey Merlone
Elizabeth Purl
John Rahaim
Eugenio Salcedo
Diego Sanchez
Daniel Sider
Gina Simi
Candace SooHoo
Aaron Starr
Martin Thibodeau

Environmental Planning
Rhia Bordon
Vimaliza Byrd
Alana Callagy
Megan Calpin
Stephanie Cisneros
Colin Clarke
Jorgen Cleemann
Rick Cooper
Jenny Delurno
Debra Dwyer
Charles Enchill
Christopher Espiritu
Chelsea Fordham
Sherie George
Lisa Gibson
Justin Greving
Justin Horner
Alesia Hsiao
Melinda Hue
Monica Huggins
Devyani Jain
Timothy Johnston
Chris Kern
Kari Lentz
Don Lewis
Michael Li
Diane Livia
Laura Lynch
Manoj Madhavan
Paul Maltzer
Jennifer McKellar
Sally Morgan
Julie Moore
Joy Navarrete
Josh Pollak
Jeanie Poling
Jessica Range
Rachel Schuett
Tatyana Sheyner
Chris Thomas
Allison Vanderslice
Elizabeth White
Wade Wietgrefe
Lana Wong
Daniel Wu
David Young
Kei Zushi

Zoning & Compliance
EvaMarie Atijera-Taylor
Chaska Berger
David Brosky
Peter Byrne
Michelle Chan
Josephine Chen
Audrey Harris
Ericka Jackson
Dario Jones
Milton Martin
Vincent Page
Jonathan Purvis
Adrian Putra
Rachna
Scott Sanchez
Tina Tam
Corey Teague

Interns
Amiel Leano-Atanacio
Julia Branco
Isa Gaillard
Gretel “G.G.” Gunther
Meital Hoffman
Hye Sun Kim
Honora Montano
Josie Morgan
Helen Pierson
Erin Swicegood
Alec Tobin
Victor Tran
Leopold Wambersie
Kelsey Wilson
Dalia Yedidia

Summer Youthwork Interns
Gus Bennett
Phaedra Cox-Farr
Austin Gisi
Danielle Lei
Maia Saha
Jenny Situ
William Tsui
Fiona Yim

21 Staff Additions
30 Staff Departures