The Haas-Lilienthal House facelift is rapidly making a difference in the grand old lady's demeanor, thanks to the generous response we've had so far to the Heritage Board's fundraising campaign. The foundation work, completed in 1981, assured us that the House would remain standing on firm ground. Rotting wood was replaced and structural work was done to make the House once again sound. The roof, once again sound. The roof was also replaced and is operating at full capacity.

The tin deck and north slopes of the roof, reshingled before winter and all the leaks were caulked, which turned out to be a timely operation given this year's rains.

Once these urgent repairs were completed, the workers arrived to replace all the galvanized pipes with copper. The challenge for the workers was not only to do theirjob but to take all precautions so that no irreplaceable tiles in the special tour bathroom were broken.

Thanks to PG&E, the House is now "energy proof." After a detailed conservation study was done, the work approved (and paid for) by PG&E was begun. The insulation of the attic, the furnace, the water heater and the ducts, along with a new thermostat, ensured a warmer winter with less wasted energy.

The interior furnishings are gradually being reupholstered or replaced so that the House will continue to be an elegant display of the mood of an earlier San Francisco. The dining room drapes were replaced with a beautiful Fortuny fabric that brightens up the room while maintaining its Victorian ambiance. The couch and two chairs in the middle parlor have been reupholstered in the warm shades of rusts, navies and oranges.

(Continued on page 7)

Heritage Surveys Cities on Successful Preservation Techniques

"Perhaps the primary lesson to be learned from other cities is that every city has its own context for preservation and that no city has been substantially more successful than another due to the use of a particular measure. Success has depended in the main on perceptions regarding the importance of preservation and the resulting political will to pass and administer strong regulations."

-- From the draft of Heritage's study of urban conservation in other cities, John M. Sanger, Inc., Consultants

Every city is different, and San Francisco likes to believe it is the most different of them all. But American metropolises do not exist in isolation, and many are grappling with similar issues to the ones that challenge us here. Right now, San Francisco is particularly concerned with needs, sometimes apparently in conflict, to ensure continued economic viability and to maintain the traditional ambiance and character that have always made this a special, desirable place to live. The City government is reviewing its existing regulatory controls and considering new guidelines for downtown development. Heritage wants to be certain that preservation considerations are incorporated into those guidelines that the force of the demand for new development, plus an uncritical focus only on the economic future, don't lead to the irretrievable sacrifice of the less tangible riches we have from our past.

Heritage felt that a look at how other (Continued on page 10)
Mayor Meets with Heritage to Proclaim Preservation Week

The week of May 11-15, 1982 was proclaimed as Historic Preservation Week in San Francisco by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. Mayor Feinstein met with Executive Director Grant Dehart and other Heritage officials: Bill Sugaya, Director of the Western Regional Office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; and Patrick McGrew, President of the city's Landmarks Board, on May 7 in her office to present Heritage with the official proclamation and discuss the state of preservation in San Francisco. Heritage reported on the status of two major projects: an extension of Splendid Survivors, our highly regarded survey of downtown historic architecture, and a study of preservation techniques being used successfully in other cities.

Mayor Dianne Feinstein, seated, presents the Preservation Week proclamation. Heritage President Jacqueline Young, second from left. Others present at the meeting in the Mayor's office were, from left: Heritage Executive Director Grant Dehart; Barbara Scanlon, Haas-Lilienthal House Manager; Michael Corbett, Heritage's Assistant Director for Conservation; Bill Sugaya, Director of the Western Regional Office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; Patrick McGrew, President of the Landmarks Board; and Heritage Board member John Sanger.

Mayor Dianne Feinstein, seated, presents the Preservation Week proclamation. Heritage President Jacqueline Young, second from left. Others present at the meeting in the Mayor's office were, from left: Heritage Executive Director Grant Dehart; Barbara Scanlon, Haas-Lilienthal House Manager; Michael Corbett, Heritage's Assistant Director for Conservation; Bill Sugaya, Director of the Western Regional Office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; Patrick McGrew, President of the Landmarks Board; and Heritage Board member John Sanger.

Grant Dehart shows Mayor Dianne Feinstein a map of downtown San Francisco that displays all the historic buildings that have been torn down since the publication of Splendid Survivors or that are now threatened with demolition. John Sanger and Jacqueline Young look on.
Development Proposal Would Move Facade

In recent years we have seen a steady erosion of the architectural heritage of downtown San Francisco. What makes the loss even sadder is that much of the buildings that could have been saved -- to the profit of both the developer and the city as a whole.

Right now the preserve-or-demolish controversy swirls around the Maskey Building, an excellent example of the post-fire reconstruction of the Retail District. Its site is part of a parcel assembled by San Francisco Federal Savings and Loan Association, which plans to erect a highrise there with speculative retail spaces in the interior.

The building is notable for its richly ornamented Renaissance/Baroque facade, clad in white glazed terra cotta of particularly fine quality. The public spaces in the interior -- lobby, stairwell, corridors -- are remarkably intact, and so are two of the three ground-floor stores. One, currently occupied by The Tie Rack, is on a fire scale and design. The Maskey Building is important not just on its own merits, although they are considerable, but also for the contribution it makes to its setting. A vital reminder of turn-of-the-century San Francisco, when lower Kearny was one of the most fashionable shopping streets, the building serves as an introduction and anchor to the historic visual corridor extending up that street from Market. It is part of the proposed Retail-Shopping National Register Historic District and contributes visually to two other potential National Register districts along upper Kearny and New Montgomery Streets.

As noted in a recent report on the building by the urban planning firm of Charles Hall Page and Associates, it "is a tangible link with historic patterns in downtown San Francisco's development, sited as it is on a street whose relatively small-scale retail functions extend well back into the 19th century" . . . It has one of the finest and most intact terra cotta facades in an area whose post-fire character is defined by buildings of this scale, articulation and use of materials . . . The vista up Kearny Street from Market is a consistent streetscape unified architecturally and joined historically by a common pattern of growth, though developmental change is imminent."

In July 1981 San Francisco Federal representatives made a presentation to the Preservation Policy Committee of Heritage's Board on that imminent developmental change. The meeting gave Heritage an opportunity to review the plans and begin discussions with the project sponsor aimed at arriving at a design that would consider the architectural and historically significant buildings on the site.

There are two of these -- the Maskey and the former Bullock and Jones Building at the corner of Kearny and Post. Both are rated "B" ("of major importance") in Splendid Survivors. The Bullock and Jones Building, however, has been greatly compromised by remodelings, the removal of its cornice and conversion of its ground floor from retail to banking use. "We think sensitive redevelopment of this corner might improve the overall architectural quality of this part of the site, if the white tonality, scale and detailing of the new building maintain the character established in this area by the Maskey Building and others," says Heritage Executive Director Grant Dehart.

So the primary issue is the Maskey Building, the plan that San Francisco Federal presented to the Preservation Policy Committee calls for it to be demolished, along with the Bullock and Jones Building and three lesser structures on the site. They also showed an alternative proposal that would save a thin facade of the Maskey Building and move its facade to a new building on a new site.

Heritage Loses Appeal on Landmark Status

At a hearing on May 10, acting on an appeal brought by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 to uphold a decision by the Planning Commission not to designate the historic Maskey Building at 48-52 Kearny Street as an official City Landmark. The Planning Commission had turned down the designation on March 10, despite a recommendation in its favor by the Landmarks Board.

Heritage appealed the Planning Commission's decision for two reasons: (1) We believe that the Maskey Building clearly meets the criteria for City Landmark status. Article 10 of the Planning Code. The building's significance is well documented. It is rated "B" ("of major importance") in the city's official list of significant buildings in the downtown area. A recent consultant's study of the building states: "The Maskey Building, by virtue of its architectural excellence and historic associations, is one of the most important buildings in this (Kearny Street) street grid" -- a historic visual corridor that is striking for its consistency of post-fire scale and design.

We feel that the Planning Commission gave undue consideration to a new development proposal for the Maskey Building site. The Commission should base its decision on any suggested landmark only on the historical and architectural merits of the nominated building -- not on pending projects that might affect the building. The appropriateness of a development proposal can be judged in the proper forums: the environmental impact report process, the discretionary review process or, when a City Landmark would be affected, in the Certificate of Appropriateness process.

When the Heritage Board of Directors voted to make the appeal, Executive Director Grant Dehart observed: "Designating the Maskey Building as a landmark will not take the planning Board's discretion away from the Planning Commission any discretion in reviewing and acting on the developer's proposals for the site. It will, however, give the Commission more detailed information and provide more concrete advice, plus a reaffirmation of the significance of the building, which will help them use that discretion more wisely."

"We believe that decisions about landmarks should be based on the criteria of architecture and on planning and on the plans and desires of a particular developer.

Hina people at the hearing spoke in favor of landmark designation for the Maskey Building. Patrick McGrew, President of the Landmarks Board; Bruce Judd, former chairman of the

The fate of Renaissance/Baroque-style Maskey Building on Kearny Street will be decided soon by the Planning Commission.

(Continued on page 12)
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Preservation Loan Program Expands Its Rehab Role

In the spring of 1979, scaffolding went up on a turreted Queen Anne house on Scott Street and an Italianate cottage in Bayview—the first steps to be taken in San Francisco to put Heritage's Preservation Loan Program to work. Over the past three years, the PLP has provided over $160,000 in grants to find funding for the exteriors of 20 vintage homes all over the city -- Victorians and Edwardians, a Tudor rowhouse, a Craftsman bungalow, houses from Hayes Valley Street and an Italianate cottage in Bayview——to help them determine if their properties are eligible for the Register and advising them so that work on qualified buildings conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and complies with Section 106 rules.

Financial assistance. Now that state and federal support is drying up, west of San Francisco's public funding of rehab efforts is done through a CDBG-supported loan pool known as the City Defered Payment Loan Program (CDPL). Since 1981 the City has offered CDPL loans in nine target areas, but only for code-compliance work. That restriction means that facade improvement and exterior painting are often neglected. It's easy to bring a building up to code without altering its appearance, and a number of owners have been disappointed that a dilapidated exterior has remained unchanged even though the building has been rehabilitated. The PLP is the logical entity to fill that gap. We have proposed a system for "piggybacking" our loan services onto CDBG's financing for code work. Not only could a broader scope of work be accomplished for each project, but we'd be able to assist a wider range of borrowers and buildings than we could in the past. The City will match, dollar for dollar, funds raised from private sources to replace our original allocation of loan capital, which is now completely committed. With the City's match, we hope to raise funds that will enable us to leverage $150,000 in new PLP loans. (The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development and the California State Office of Historic Preservation are funding the PLP's 1982-83 administrative costs.)

We are excited about the restructured PLP and the prospects it offers us for having a greater impact on rehabilitation efforts in San Francisco. If you'd like further information about the program, please call Ward Hill at 441-3000.

Technical assistance. The PLP will work with neighborhood groups to help them understand the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act and to determine whether the work they propose to do qualifies for the tax credit. Heritage's "conscience" for all historic preservation will be able to monitor the quality of work that is done, enhancing our ability to act as a "historic preservation conscience" for all historically significant buildings.

The PLP's purpose under its new contract is being expanded to create what might be called the Preservation Loan Program's "Preservation Building Resource Center". Through it, Heritage will be able to promote the goals of preservation while we reduce the means for restoring the exteriors of 20 historic buildings. The PLP's purpose under its new contract is being expanded to create what might be called the Preservation Loan Program's "Preservation Building Resource Center". Through it, Heritage will be able to promote the goals of preservation while we reduce the means for restoring the exteriors of 20 historic buildings.
The national historic preservation program is in trouble, and it needs your help to survive. The Reagan Administration has proposed a zero appropriation in fiscal year 1983 for the Historic Preservation Fund. This means no money for state programs or for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, both of which depend on the federal funding for their existence.

This proposal makes no sense. The national historic preservation program is a model federal-state-private partnership — just the sort of thing President Reagan supposedly wants to promote. And it is one that is working well.

The states, through their State Historic Preservation Offices, carry out critical activities for the federal government, such as:
- Handling the nomination of historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places (see the report on the National Register that was included with the Heritage Newsletter, Winter 1980).
- Certifying historic properties and their rehabilitations to qualify for federal tax incentives. The State Historic Preservation Offices have reported a 500-800% increase in tax project activity in the months following the enactment of the new preservation incentives in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981. Through the Tax Act, Reagan is specifically encouraging investment in preservation. But without the State Offices to administer the program, that encouragement becomes ineffective and meaningless. A visible program must be in place if the Tax Act provisions are to have any preservation benefit.
- Reviewing federal programs that affect historic properties. Over 177,000 federal actions were reviewed or assisted at the state level in fiscal 1981 to protect historic properties.
- Local entities benefit from the state programs. The California State Historic Preservation Office has provided a valuable service to San Francisco and Heritage by giving financial assistance to our Preservation Loan Program since 1977.
- Studies by the National Park Service and the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation show that providing federal money to the states to carry out these responsibilities is cost-effective and efficient. All of the other alternatives considered were found to increase federal costs and decrease the delivery of services. The states themselves provide over half the funding, and they perform over 90% of the administration functions for the entire federal-state program. The federal government supplies no more than 50% of the money — but it is a crucial 50%.
- The National Trust for Historic Preservation also receives half of its funding from the federal government. The National Trust, a private nonprofit organization with over 130,000 members (and a model for Heritage), was chartered by Congress in 1949 to preserve historic properties and to encourage public participation in the preservation of buildings, sites, objects and maritime property that are important to American history and culture. The Trust aids in the preservation of our heritage in three principal ways:
  - Directly saving and protecting landmarks. It holds historic house museums in trust for the public, protects more than 60 other significant properties (including the Hale-Biallennial House, through a facade easement), and assesses National Historic Landmarks through its unique Endangered Properties fund, the only source of emergency money to protect them from immediate threats. The Trust helps save their community's heritage. The Trust provides direct assistance to over 600 communities each year. Recently, in San Francisco, it has provided funding for Heritage's study of downtown conservation measures. These activities are currently successful in other cities and has given the Chinese Community Housing Corporation a grant to use in rehabilitating a residential hotel for low-income housing.
  - Seeks new as the national voice for preservation. The Trust educates the public through a variety of programs and publications, promotes private involvement and investment in preservation, and carries the case for preservation to Congress and the White House.

"Preservation holds such promise for the economic and spiritual revitalization of the country," says Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the National Trust's Board of Trustees. "Preservation is not a luxury to be discarded in these hard economic times; it is a part of the solution to the problems of unemployment, poor housing, blighted and depressed inner cities, declining small towns and energy conservation."

Heritage is the national trust. If it is not protected now, it will be gone, and we can never regain it.

Send a message to your representative(s) all over the country in campaigning for an appropriation of $30 million for the Historic Preservation Fund. Our voices have been heard before when Congress voted to restore funding after drastic cuts had been proposed for the Fund in fiscal 1982.

Tell Congress about your support for preservation. Write or phone Senators Chabot and Hayakawa and your representative. Tell them about the benefits that preservation confers on the country. Ask them to express their support and yours for the state programs and the National Trust to the rest of Congress and to the Reagan Administration. Tell them that funding these efforts is the most cost-effective means of preserving our heritage and ensuring the utilization of the 1981 preservation tax incentives.

Congress is making critical budget decisions right now. For your voice to be effective, you must act today.

We would appreciate it if you would send Heritage copies of your letters, and we thank you for your support.

Sara Travis Joins Heritage Staff

Sara Travis has joined the Heritage staff in the newly created position of Director of Administration and Development.

A skilled administrator, Sara has experience in program management, marketing and communications, and organizational problem-solving. In her new role at Heritage, she's handling tasks in two key areas.

On the administrative side, she is coordinating meetings, acting as liaison between the staff and the Board of Directors, and organizing systems that will enable us better to process all of the information that flows into and out of the Heritage office. She has also taken on most of our fundraising activities: preparing grant applications, working with foundations and corporations, providing staff support for major projects like the Hale-Biallennial House Campaign, and coordinating our membership-expansion efforts.

Sara recently returned to the Bay Area after several years on the East Coast. She was a faculty member at the University of Maryland's School of Social Work and Community Planning, where she developed training programs for professionals in those fields. Prior to that she supervised task forces on child protection and home-support services for seniors and handicapped citizens for the Maryland and Howard County governments. She was a Hopkins Fellow in Organizational and Community Services at Johns Hopkins University in 1979-80 and a White House Fellow Regional Finalist in 1979.

Sara has been described as an "energetic, creative and organized individual with a sense of humor and perspective in difficult situations." She is certainly a welcome addition to the Heritage staff.
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Can a woman be an architect? The question was frequently asked in architectural periodicals in the first few decades of this century, and the answer was generally affirmative—as long as the ladies stuck to bungalows. Several women in Berkeley established small residential practices. Only Julia Morgan broke all the rules to become a major California architect.

Daughter of a prosperous Oakland mining engineer, Morgan was the first woman to graduate with a degree in engineering from Berkeley, in 1894. With the encouragement of her teacher, Bernard Maybeck, she became the first woman to enter the revered École des Beaux-Arts in 1897, receiving her diplôme in 1901. From the moment she opened her own practice in 1905 until she retired in 1950, she was seldom without work, producing an estimated 1,000 buildings and consistently working 14-hour days.

Morgan is usually given credit for the superb trading hall in the Merchant's Exchange, although conclusive proof has been unavailable to historians. She did, however, for many decades maintain handsome offices in the building, where her staff of up to 16 functioned as a surrogate family.

Morgan drew on a wide range of traditional stylistic sources for her buildings. The Chinatown YWCA on Clay Street is, of course, Chinese, while the nearby Donaldina Cameron House of 1907 is a utilitarian structure of dark clinker brick showing strong Craftsman influence. Miss Burke's School of 1917-18 on Jackson Street and the 1922 Emmanuel Sisterhood Building (now the Zen Center) at Page and Laguna are Mediterranean in inspiration, though the latter is finished in dark brick.

For Morgan, the exterior appearance of a building was secondary to the commodity and convenience of the interior. Her plans and spaces are simple, direct and graceful, no matter how richly detailed. They avoid the spatial eccentricities of Maybeck's buildings, or Willis Polk's, or Ernest Coxhead's. In the 1920s and 1930s, Morgan collaborated with her old mentor, Maybeck, on a number of monumental projects; though the nature of their relationship is unclear, it appears that Maybeck concocted scenographic exterior effects while Morgan devised the efficient plans, structures and utilities that Maybeck didn't want to be bothered with.

Without doubt, Morgan's greatest patrons were the Hearst family. For Phoebe Apperson Hearst, she designed an addition to the great Hacienda at Pleasanton and received innumerable commissions for YWCAs and women's buildings. Though best remembered for her work on the castle at San Simeon for Phoebe's son, she designed a "Bavarian village" for Hearst at his Wintoon estate near Shasta and supervised the dismantling and redesign of an entire Spanish monastery, which was intended for the same property but eventually was donated to San Francisco. (Its remnants lie behind the deYoung Museum and scattered throughout Golden Gate Park.)

July Morgan was both conservative and extraordinarily competent. In turn, she attracted a steady stream of conservative clients. Grace, refinement, and understatement, rather than innovation and personal eccentricity, distinguish her works; it is her very self-effacement in favor of the wishes of her clients that causes her buildings to please rather than to thrill. However, in certain projects, like the camp she designed for the YWCA at Asilomar, one cannot help but respect and admire the exquisite attention to detail, to plan and, especially, to siting, and acknowledge that Morgan ranks with the best of Bay Area architects, despite the ostensible handicap of her sex.

Gray Brechin
Haas-Lilienthal House
(Continued from page 1)

that make the room so inviting. A number of tables have been refinshed and specially touched up to enhance the protection of their veneers, and the floors are being refinished in this year the House Committee, depending on available funds will be locking toward some further raucheling, as many ploquets are still in desperate need of level. The refinished of additional tables is also on the agenda.

The excitement built through the spring as time to repay the House approached. The House Committee, Heritage staff and color consultant Bob Backer worked closely on this project, developing a historically appropriate color scheme featuring three shades of grey. Late in April the same thing went up. Extensive work was done by San Francisco Restorations to restore the woodwork and metalwork that trim the House (the points of the roof are capped once again with tiles, as they originally were), and Chel- sey Fainting handled the task of cleaning and repainting the House.

Despite the tremendous progress that’s been made, we’ve just touched the lip of the iceberg. We have several very urgent repair—plumbing, foundation work, roof work and painting—have been completed or are in progress. Much more, however, needs to be done to protect and enhance the House’s beauty: Insulation of a fire protection system, a major electrical overhaul, repair of the antique toy train, art conservation, interior painting and refinishing, and upgrading of the furnishings—all are not only necessary but urgent.

Though a house as complex as the Haas-Lilienthal can never be caught up to date on all repairs, it can be brought to a level where cyclical maintenance is the primary concern. House Manager Barbara Stanion has prepared a cyclical plan. Once the major repairs have been completed, it can be put into action as a fairly simple but cost-effective system, maintaining one of San Francisco’s most elegant examples of the Victo- rian lifestyle.

As of March 1982, $215,700 had been raised of the total goal of $250,000 that the Heritage Board established when it launched the House raising drive for the House last year. Some of these funds have already been put to good use: a small fund has been set up into an endowment fund that will generate the income to pay for the cyclical maintenance over the years. If you have not yet donated, please remember—your gift is still needed! It will still help.

Heritage would like to express its grati- tude to the individuals and or- ganizations who have contributed to the Haas-Lilienthal House Fundraising Campaign:

MAJOR DONORS
Lincoln Aton, Jr. & Mrs. Joachim Aton
Bothin Helpung Foundation
Cathays & Edward

Bransten
S. S. Coates Foundation
Decker Electric Co. Inc.
Elizabeth Ceretti
James C. Gerstl
Henry T. Harris
Walter & Ellis Hauze Foundation
Jane & David Hauze in
memory of Sarah Lilienthal
William & Rachel Heimbach

Foundations

The Richard Hampton
Jennerse Foundation
Mr. & Mrs. Revery Johnson

Helen Weber Kennedy
Ernest Lilienthal
Mr. & Kate Lilienthal

Nancy Lilienthal
Mrs. B. E. Miller, Jr.
Mr. & Mrs. Stuart Noonan

Norton Company
Jane Ophuls (Mrs. Ernst)
Pacifica Gas & Electric Company

Alice C. Russell
Christine Ross
Madeleine Haas Russell

Mr. John Singer
William R. Shapiro

Sor Printng

Standard Oil Company of California

Stanford Court Hotel

Mrs. Lawrence C. Stein
Sobot & Company, Inc.
Mr. & Mrs. George R.

Tinelle in

Peter S. Schmidt

Tweed Painting
Mr. & Mrs. Robert Young

OTHER CONTRIBUTORS
Shirley Pinfrock
Irene Fleming
Margaret Frasier
Mrs. Howard A. Astra

Bernice Franckento

GRI Planning & Design
D. A. Gallagher

Lincoln Canfield

Charles Gill
Manny Glick
Richard N. Goodman and
Campaign

Pauline S. Goldsmith

Donna & Robert M. Gregory
Marjorie A. Gregory

Donald M. Gregory

Mr. & Mrs. Donald M. Gregory

Mrs. Howard A. Frame
Margaret Furness

Ingrid Fussler

Ingrid H. Peterson, M.D.

Page, Clowdsley & Bale
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1981 marked the completion of Heritage's first decade of service to San Francisco. The 10 years saw us grow from an idea shared by a few concerned San Franciscans to a potent organization, 1,500 strong, with a proud record of accomplishment: saving a building, converting the Haas-Lilienthal House into a popular and respected house museum; helping low-income homeowners through our Preservation Loan Program; publishing Splendid Survivors, the first comprehensive architectural survey of a major American downtown; making San Franciscans more appreciative, through our publications, lectures, house tours and walking tours, of their city's great architectural heritage -- and many more.

But our work during the year was on the future, not the past. We celebrated a victory as the Planning Commission voted for the first time to save a historic downtown building, hoping that the action portended a more positive climate for preservation in the city. We acquired new leadership as several capable, qualified people joined our staff: Grant Dehart as Executive Director, Linda Camaballo as Administrative Assistant, Leslie Flint as Assistant Director for Education Programs, and Michael Cusbert as Assistant Director for Conservation (and, early in 1982, Saia Travis as Director of Administration and Development). And we laid the groundwork for a variety of important projects, such as a comprehensive program of downtown conservation studies: 1) an extension of the Splendid Survivors survey to development-pressured areas surrounding the downtown core, 2) an evaluation of the most effective techniques and incentives used successfully in other cities and applicable to San Francisco, and 3) preparation of nominations to the National Register of Historic Places for important downtown historic districts. We expect to complete the projects over the next two years.

With city decision-makers working actively to develop policies to govern downtown development, Heritage realized that there was a critical need to have the best information possible on significant buildings and ways to conserve them.

Downtown Conservation Studies
With city decision-makers working actively to develop policies to govern downtown development, Heritage realized that there was a critical need to have the best information possible on significant buildings and ways to conserve them.

To fill that need, we launched a comprehensive three-part program of conservation studies: 1) an extension of the Splendid Survivors survey to development-pressured areas surrounding the downtown core, 2) an evaluation of the most effective techniques and incentives used successfully in other cities and applicable to San Francisco, and 3) preparation of nominations to the National Register of Historic Places for important downtown historic districts. We expect to complete the projects over the next two years.

Heritage Walks
A year-long planning effort resulted in a careful refocusing of Heritage Walks, our program of architectural walking tours. In July we reintroduced our popular walk in eastern Pacific Heights, an exploration of that neighborhood's excellent Victorian and Edwardian exteriors. The revised and to offer low-interest loans to low-income owner-occupants of vintage San Francisco homes. Loan commitments for the year totaled $149,000. The money lent was used for exterior restoration and housing code compliance work, with Heritage helping to plan the work and monitor its progress.

At the year's end, the PLP's initial $200,000 in loan capital was fully committed. PLP Administrator Ward Hill worked out a new contract with the City government (effective February 1, 1982) that will expand the program's scope and tie it more closely to the City's rehabilitation efforts.

Heritage Preservation Loan Program
Five projects were completed and planning and rehabilitation began on six more as the Heritage Preservation Loan Program continued...
Early in the year, the Heritage Board of Directors launched a major two-year campaign to raise funds for maintaining the House. Part of the money obtained was earmarked for immediately needed repairs -- fixing the foundation, resealing the roof, replacing the plumbing, painting the exterior and other work. Most of the funds will be added to the House endowment to generate income that will provide for regular, cyclical maintenance in the future. By the end of 1981, we had reached our goal for the year of $150,000. The total goal for the campaign is $250,000.

Other Educational Programs

After a hiatus in the first half of the year, we revived our Monthly Programs with a series of slide-talks by architectural historians Gray Brechin on aspects of our local heritage. Volunteer Ken Wood worked with Heritage staff to create a slide show on preservation in San Francisco. The show runs in the Haas-Lilienthal House ballroom during tour hours.

Historic Preservation — 1981 and Beyond

The preservation movement is in the midst of a challenging and contradictory period, well illustrated nationally by the Reagan Administration's attitudes — on the one hand, providing unprecedented tax incentives in the Economic Recovery Act of 1981 to encourage the retention and rehabilitation of historic buildings, while on the other, proposing to wipe funding for important preservation programs totally out of the federal budget for fiscal 1983. In San Francisco, the city is faced with balancing the continued pressure for office and commercial development with the growing concern for the effect that development is having on housing, transit and our historic fabric. The city government and the Chamber of Commerce began work in 1981 on a comprehensive "downtown environmental impact report" to evaluate a variety of approaches that have been suggested for controlling downtown growth. The Department of City Planning has proposed new guidelines for downtown development that recognizes the need to preserve our irreplaceable historic and architectural resources. The attempts to reconcile development and preservation have led to a mixed bag of solutions, some good and some . . . well, less good.

- A major project underway in the Dollar Block, bounded by California, Battery, Sansome and Pine, has been designed to preserve four corner buildings, three rated "A" and one "C."
- The Planning Commission required the developer of a Montgomery Street site to retain the California Pacific Building at the corner of Pacific Street (see above). A battle between the developer (Citcorp) and preservationists over the "A"-rated banking temple at One Sansome Street ended in an odd compromise — three-fifths of the landmark building's outer shell will be saved, while the interior will be ripped out and turned into a sort of public conservatory.
- Walter Shorenstein has announced plans to paste the facade of the Classical Mining Exchange building at 350 Bush Street onto the wall of the recently torn down historic building.
- San Francisco Federal Savings and Loan is proposing to "preserve" the "B"-rated Markay Building, which is in the way of a scheduled project on Haasey Street. By moving the interior staircase and adding an adjacent site at the foot of Maiden Lane, 1985 may prove to be a pivotal year for preservation and for Heritage. Issues were raised that will be debated for a long time. Is facade preservation really preservation? What is the federal government's proper role in preservation efforts? And projects were begun that will have a profound impact on the policies and decisions that affect our urban environment.

Heritage will continue to work with decision-makers in the city to ensure that what remains of the best of San Francisco's past will also be part of its future.

Financial Report

The pie charts at right show how the money flowed at Heritage in 1981. The income graph gives the percentages of our total income that derived from each of our main funding sources. The expenses circle shows what percentage of the total money flowed at Heritage in 1981. The expenses graph gives the percentages of our total expenses that went to each of our principal program areas.

The figures on which both charts are based exclude the income and expenditures of our Preservation Loan Program, which is separately funded.

The deficit of expenses over income in 1981 was $1,649.

Complete financial statements for the year are available upon request from The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco, California 94109, (415) 441-3000.
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Heritage Surveys Cities on Successful Preservation Techniques

(Continued from page 1)

cities are finding solutions to these problems would be helpful — not necessarily to give us absolute answers but to provide a fresh perspective and to stimulate some creative thinking about approaches that might work well in San Francisco's particular situation.

Last fall we began a comprehensive program of downtown conservation studies designed to give us the technical information we need if we are to influence the decisions being made for the city. With the help of a grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, we contracted with urban planners John M. Sanger Associates, Inc., to help us with an important segment of the program — an evaluation of the downtown conservation experiences of other major North American cities. The information we're gathering will enable us to make an effective case for the adoption here of workable preservation policies.

“The purpose of the study is to improve San Francisco's laws and policies for conserving significant buildings in the downtown area by evaluating the conservation experience of other major cities and by transferring the best of conservation techniques to San Francisco.”

The first steps were to identify cities using specific conservation techniques and to compare their economic, legal, political, and administrative situations with conditions here. The consultants then made a telephone survey of planning departments and preservation groups in 11 places — Baltimore; Boston, Chicago; New Orleans, New York; Philadelphia; Portland, Oregon; Seattle; Toronto; Vancouver, British Columbia; and Washington, D.C. — to learn about their successes and failures in preserving historic buildings in their central business districts.

The survey concentrated on several measures that have been used in some form in San Francisco or have been proposed for use here, among them:

- Landmarks and historic district ordinances. The most common and traditional mechanism for preservation, these ordinances typically spell out procedures for designating an official landmark or historic district and set up a board or commission to review permit applications for all projects — demolition, construction or alteration — that would affect a designated property.

Every city surveyed has a landmarks ordinance (ours is Article 10 of the City Planning Code), but they vary widely in nature and strength. Some are merely advisory; others give stringent control over historic properties. Several cities, including Baltimore, Chicago, New Orleans, New York and Washington, have stronger laws than San Francisco's, measured by their ability to prevent the destruction of a significant building.

There is usually a trade-off involved, however. Typically, the stronger the law, the fewer the downtown buildings that are designated as landmarks. Where development pressures are most intense, strong landmarks laws have generally been least effective in saving substantial numbers of significant buildings.

- Economic incentives. Local tax-abatement measures have had little if any effect on preservation in the cities surveyed, with the possible exception of Portland. In Oregon a state program provides for a 15-year freeze on property taxes for historic buildings, which results in both an incentive for preserving a property and, potentially, available cash for fixing it up. (Correct, California law, however, rules out the possibility of any such property-tax abatement here.) Portland also has a loan fund for preservation projects.

- Transfers of development rights. Transfers of development rights (TDRs) could prove useful in cases, common in central business districts, where a small historic building falls short of the height and bulk compared to the substantial benefits that federal income-tax rules make available to owners who rehabilitate historic properties.

- Special zoning districts. When used as a preservation tool, special zoning usually accompanies a historic district designation or adds supplemental controls to the regular zoning in an area where important buildings are concentrated. The restrictions imposed might include lower height limits, smaller floor-area ratios or stipulations aimed at maintaining a particular scale or type of development. When it makes it more profitable for a developer to reuse a building than to tear it down, special zoning seems to work quite well, although it is more effective at the fringes of a central business district than in a downtown core.

- Transfers of development rights (TDRs) could prove useful in cases, common in central business districts, where a small historic building falls short of the height and bulk compared to the substantial benefits that federal income-tax rules make available to owners who rehabilitate historic properties.

- Economic incentives. Local tax-abatement measures have had little if any effect on preservation in the cities surveyed, with the possible exception of Portland. In Oregon a state program provides for a 15-year freeze on property taxes for historic buildings, which results in both an incentive for preserving a property and, potentially, available cash for fixing it up. (Correct, California law, however, rules out the possibility of any such property-tax abatement here.) Portland also has a loan fund for preservation projects.

On the whole, local financial incentives seem to have little potential impact
Preservationists in Washington, D. C., won a victory after a long battle when the landmark Willard Hotel was saved and incorporated into the redevelopment plan for Pennsylvania Avenue. Washington is another city that was surveyed in Heritage's study of preservation techniques used successfully in other places.

limits allowed by zoning — and therefore doesn't meet the full economic potential of the site. The TDR mechanism would allow the owner of the property to sell or transfer the unused development rights to be applied at an approved nearby site. The owner then would no longer need to tear down the historic structure and rebuild in order to obtain his return on his investment in the property, and the building, with no more unused economic potential, would be protected. A TDR could compensate the owner in cases where the destruction of the historic structure would be forbidden by the city.

New York is the only city that has had any extensive experience with TDRs so far, although Denver, Seattle, Toronto and Vancouver all either provide for TDRs in their regulations or have experimented once or twice with some version of the technique. There have been some successes, indicating that the concept could be refined into a tool that might prove valuable in some situations.

Regulatory measures, which have a greater certainty of result, are often favored by preservationists. Developers prefer incentives that encourage voluntary action because they're more flexible and don't impose a general burden on economic development. In San Francisco's situation, what is likely to prove most workable is a combination of the two.

One thing that has become apparent in the Sanger study is that preservation seems to be more easily achieved, and developers more receptive to preservation alternatives, when preservation policies and measures are incorporated into the overall planning approval process. The informal approach that San Francisco has been using recently, which integrates preservation decisions into the approval process, has worked fairly expeditiously, although uncertainty about the final decision may result in lengthy negotiations, redesign of projects and delays. Other cities, among them Seattle and Toronto, have also had some success in achieving preservation goals through informal measures and persuasion, despite heavy development pressures.

But success is relative. In San Francisco we haven't done badly in comparison with other cities. Our record is not good, however, when measured in terms of the destruction of our heritage that has already taken place. We still need to determine the form and substance of policies that will allow the city to retain its treasures from the past and its livable urban environment — and at the same time to incorporate new projects that will, we hope, contribute positively to the city's overall design and economic vitality.

"The study is intended to enable Heritage to effectively ... recommend and advocate the adoption of the most effective techniques for maximizing the retention and restoration of threatened significant buildings in downtown San Francisco."

With the information now in hand, Sanger Associates has begun the process of evaluating various measures and their usefulness for San Francisco, singly and in combination. By summer they plan to have developed recommendations on conservation policies for downtown San Francisco, which they will present to the Heritage Board.

The results will be reviewed by an Advisory Committee of professionals in the areas of preservation, development and finance, including: Marty Abel of Environmental Science Associates, director of the "downtown environmental impact" study; Robert Berner of Aegis Financial Corporation, former Executive Director of Heritage; Carl Imperato of San Francisco for Reasonable Growth; Patrick McGrew, President of the Landmarks Board; attorney Antonio Rossmann; Nancy Shanahan, attorney with the National Trust for Historic Preservation; Susan Shipley of Norland Properties; and George Williams of the Planning Department.

Heritage will use the report in assessing the proposals that evolve from the work on development guidelines being done by the city's decision-makers. With it, we will have a strong basis for urging the adoption of effective preservation solutions for San Francisco.
Development Proposal Would Move Maskey Building Facade
(Continued from page 3)

stick it onto an incompatible new structure. Heritage encouraged the sponsor and the architects, Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, to explore ways that the complete Maskey Building might be integrated into the new development.

After discussions over the ensuing months with Heritage and the Planning Department, San Francisco Federal has come up with a proposal that they feel should answer preservationists' concerns. This scheme would entail moving the Maskey's facade, in whole or in part, down the street to a new spot at the edge of the project site, then constructing a new building behind it. In its new location, the Maskey facade would cap the view down Maiden Lane from Union Square.

"The sponsor feels that this alternative would preserve the architectural character of the Maskey Building," according to the environmental impact report on the project. "When viewed by pedestrians, the original (although moved) exterior of the building would be retained, and would appear as a separate building. Surrounding or interlacing the Maskey Building with new construction is believed by the project sponsor to diminish the architectural context of the building."

The Heritage Board, at its May 20 meeting, adopted a resolution that states: "Heritage opposes the demolition of the Maskey Building and opposes any alternative that would save only part of the Maskey building facade, or would recreate the appearance of the Maskey building using new materials."

We feel that San Francisco Federal could incorporate the full Maskey Building into their plans with no real detriment to the project. Several alternatives described in their environmental impact report indicate that a structure with a floor-area ratio and a per-floor area similar to those of their preferred design can be constructed around the existing Maskey Building.

As to the proposal to "preserve" the Maskey by moving and reconstructing its facade, that raises some serious questions. One is whether the plan is technically feasible: knowledgeable sources suggest that there is considerable risk of the terra cotta being badly damaged as it is moved and reassembled on a new structure.

Another question involves the whole issue of facade preservation, which is being looked to increasingly as a solution by developers and planners. Is the saving of facades, or of shells or pieces of buildings, truly preservation? Yes, important design elements are saved, but the integrity of the building is lost. To what extent does that matter? Is it an acceptable compromise?

In the case of the Maskey Building, we think the answer is no. Heritage believes that it is a landmark-quality building that should survive for the benefit of present and future San Francisco.

Heritage Loses Appeal on Maskey Building Landmark Status
(Continued from page 3)

AIA's National Committee for Historic Resources; Brad Paul, Director of the North of Market Planning Coalition and former staff member of the Heritage Preservation Commission; Mrs. G. Bland Platt, former President of the Landmarks Board; Michael Corbett, author of Splendid Survivors and a number of Heritage's staff; architectural historian Gray Brechin; historian Bill Kostura; Victoria Hutchison, a representative of the Haas-Lilienthal Society; the Heritage Executive Director Grant Dehart.

Additional supporters of Heritage's position attended the meeting and others had sent letters to Supervisors encouraging them to vote for the landmark designation.

By contrast, only one person spoke in opposition to the appeal.

Still, we were voted down. Supervisors Britt and Walker supported the landmark designation, and Supervisor Honn was absent. All the others voted to uphold the Planning Commission decision.

Although the decision did not go the way we had hoped, the appeal nevertheless gave us a valuable opportunity to educate the Supervisors about the landmarks process and the provisions of Article 10. Some Supervisors, for instance, thought that designation as a landmark automatically prevents the tearing down of a historic building. It does not: City Landmark status merely provides for a delay of six months (or 12 months if the Board of Supervisors approves the extension) in the issuance of a demolition permit, so that there is a little time in which alternatives to destruction can be explored.

New Docents Begin Giving Tours

Another superb docent class has celebrated its graduation and begun leading tours of the Haas-Lilienthal House. After an intensive 10-week training course, which included information about early San Francisco history, the Haas and Lilienthal families, the architecture and furnishings of the House, and tour techniques, this enthusiastic group is eager to share what they have learned with the public. This class had the benefit of extensive research done by long-time docent Barbara Kerrigan, who revised the section of the House's contents. After her graduation and begun leading tours of the Haas-Lilienthal House.

We welcome the following people to the docent ranks:

- Piers Anderton
- Ann Berman
- Megan Breenan
- Iris Crossley
- Rita Dickey
- Joseph DiNallo
- Galil Huvien
- Rachel Hull
- Katie Lesnak
- Marjorie McCaughan
- Veronica McKenna
- Jean Michall
- Philip Partipilo
- Jay Baker
- Laura Ryan
- Lynn Stevens
- Ann Wheeler
Heritage members and friends will have a one-time opportunity to tour the new building just completed in San Francisco's first Historic District, Jackson Square. Pacific Lumber Company will show off its handsome new headquarters at 500 Washington Street on Thursday, June 24, from 5:00 to 7:30 with a benefit for Heritage: a reception and tour of five of the eight floors, which are occupied by four major companies. There will be live music on each floor. Tickets to the reception are $15.00; the proceeds will help us continue our work to conserve our unique cityscape. (The June 24 date is a change from the originally scheduled May 20.)

Pacific Lumber, a firm that has been part of San Francisco for over a century, wanted to continue its tradition of being a good neighbor when it constructed its new building. The company and its architects, Environmental Planning & Research, Inc., worked together with city officials and Jackson Square residents for more than two years to ensure that what rose on the long-vacant site would harmonize with the historic character of the area.

The building presented a challenging problem: how to relate the new structure to both its neighbors — Jackson Square's historic low-rise brick buildings and the sleek modern towers of the downtown Financial District. The solution was to design the building as a transition between two architectural eras, with gradually rising stepped roof levels, an exterior in the customary brick of the historic district, and an innovative pattern of diagonal bays that create a passive-solar effect while being reminiscent of traditional bay windows.

At the June 24 reception, you will be treated to a look at the fine interior spaces of the building, not usually open for public viewing, and a major redwood sculpture by the noted New York artist Linda Howard, of ConStruct, Inc. Pacific Lumber's own offices on the fifth and sixth floors are a showcase of woods. The workmanship and attention to detail are exquisite, both in the showpieces, like the grand central staircase and the exaggerated sawtooth-style conference-room ceiling, and in the small elements, like the fit of the corner joints in the paneling.

The event will give you a look at a variety of interesting approaches to office-space design. Open for viewing along with the Pacific Lumber floors will be the offices of the BA Mortgage and International Realty Corporation and Highlands Energy Corporation. All three were designed by EPR. The tour will also include the San Francisco Foundation's suite, designed by Arthur Gensler & Associates and occupying the whole top floor. Wine and hors d'oeuvres will be served, and attendees will enjoy live music on each floor visited — as well as grand close-up views of Jackson Square, North Beach and Nob, Russian and Telegraph Hills.

Heritage members will be receiving invitations. Reservations are required and limited.

To help celebrate this event, free 45-minute walking tours of Jackson Square will be given June 21, 22, 23, and 24. Meet Heritage Walks guides at 12:00 noon under the redwood sculpture in the walkway of the Pacific Lumber Company Building, 500 Washington Street.

**Bonus Reception at an Art-Filled Queen Anne House**

A unique Pacific Heights home built in 1894 will be the setting Tuesday, July 6, for an intimate evening open house and reception benefiting Heritage. This Queen Anne towered house is complete with witch’s cap, classical garlands, pilasters and even a palladian window.

Werner Erhard, founder of est, is graciously making his home available to Heritage members and friends for a special evening. The main floor, consisting of library, living room, and parlor, features an eclectic mix of art objects in a dramatic setting. The collection includes important pieces of modern painting and sculpture blending with Chinese talking jars and Japanese sake containers. Heritage volunteers and Werner Erhard and Associates staff members will be on hand to answer questions about the art work.

A contribution to Heritage of $25 will admit two people to this delightful event. Space is limited so we are offering two different times: 5-6:30 p.m. and 7-8:30 p.m. Please indicate your preference and make your reservations early.

Two years ago, Heritage began a program of these small fundraising events, which we call “bonus receptions.” For an increase in the amount of a member’s annual dues or for a contribution to Heritage of a specific amount, Heritage members are given the opportunity to see buildings of outstanding architectural merit which they would not otherwise ever have a chance to see. In addition to giving Heritage members a special treat, they benefit Heritage.

Past bonus receptions have been held at the Ross House, 3550 Jackson; the Arthur Conan Doyle House, 2151 Sacramento; the law offices of Fred Furth in the Royal Globe Insurance Company Building and of Antonio Rossmann of Jencks and Maximor at 445 Bush; at Red Gables in Sausalito; and most recently, at the Winslow Gibson House on Bush Street.

We appreciate the support our membership has given to these events and encourage you to participate in these special quarterly receptions.

Please send me *invitations to Heritage’s open house and reception on Tuesday, July 6. My check for $__ is enclosed ($25 for an invitation for 2 people).

My preference for times is: 5-6:30 pm

7-8:30 pm

Name ________________________________

Address ________________________________

Day phone ________________________________

Please send this coupon with your check and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to: HERITAGE, 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco 94109.

---

**Plain, Fancy, Old, Renewed: The Heritage Monthly Programs**

"Architecture" includes buildings grand and small, built for many purposes and to suit many tastes. The upcoming Heritage Monthly Programs will give you a sampling of the great variety of architectural expression that contributes to our heritage and tell you about efforts being made to conserve some of it.

Join us at 7:45 p.m. on the following evenings in the Haas-Lilienthal House Ballroom:

- The Restoration of the Audiffred Building (Tuesday, July 13). What does it take to return an 1869 landmark, badly damaged by fire in 1978 and further injured by the rumblings of minor earthquakes, to a vision of its former self? Dusan Mills will speak about the restoration and the tax ramifications of the Audiffred Building — a $6—7 million project. His firm, the Mills-Ryland Company, has been involved in eight restorations in Northern California.
- Van Ness Revisited (Tuesday, August 10). Van Ness Avenue, the broad boulevard that stopped the 1906 fire, has always eluded its own promise of grandeur. Architectural historian Gray Brechin will trace the street’s evolution from sand dunes to projected parkway to enclave of mansions to auto row with its own palaces. Mayor Feinstein predicts that Van Ness will be the city’s Champs Elysees. What are the prospects?
- Plain Old Houses: Folk Building in 19th Century California (Tuesday, September 14). Folk building represents a small but important part of the architectural record of California which has long been neglected. Few quintessential symbols of California frontier buildings survive. But we do have a wealth of folk housing representing the 19th century immigrant experience, whether American, Sicilian or Chinese. National Park Service folklorist Karana Drayton will particularly look at the interrelationship of "text" (house) and "context" provided by oral history.
- A Look at Art Deco (Tuesday, October 12). Architectural historian Michael Crowe will give us a visual survey of Art Deco architecture in San Francisco — its history, stylistic elements and numerous structures that show the variety in the Art Deco expression that developed here.

Above: The 1906 fire shaped the future of Van Ness Avenue, subject of the Heritage Monthly Program on August 10. Left and below: The July 13 program will talk about the challenging restoration of the Audiffred Building on the San Francisco waterfront.
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Downtown Heritage Walks
Get Off to a Running Start

Volunteers, Beacons, buonarsio, and curtain walls — all these mysterious things and more helped our "Brown Bag" tours get off to a smashing start on March 25, with six Heritage Walks guides giving tours in three new Financial District locations. If you haven't yet joined one of these lunchtime walks, set aside any Thursday from 12 noon to 1 p.m. to do so. They're free to Heritage members, $1 for others.

These are the walks that will reveal the meanings of those strange words:
- Jackson Square Historic District. The business district of the Gold Rush era. Meet at the corner of Clay and Montgomery, near the Transamerica Building.
- Banking Temple. San Francisco’s monumental temples to finance. Meet at the corner of Clay and Montgomery, near the Transamerica Building.
- Splendid Survivors. The development of the skyscraper, pre-fire to the present. Meet in front of the Hallidie Building, 130 Sutter Street.

Heritage Walks guides Frances Whites organized a Media Walk that was held April 15 for members of the press and persons responsible for corporate newsletters. After taking one of the three Financial District tours, the media people gathered at the 46th floor of the Transamerica Pyramid, where wine, cheese and an introduction to Heritage were provided by Heritage Walks guides and staff. We hope this wonderful idea will give us more media coverage for the Walks program.

From June 21 through 24, Monday through Thursday, the Walks guides will be conducting free walking tours of Jackson Square in conjunction with the Heritage benefit-reception at the new Pacific Lumber Company Building at 500 Washington Street that Thursday evening. Pat Farquhar is coordinating the special walks, which will begin each day at noon in the building’s entrance portico.

We welcome the following people to the ranks of Heritage Walks guides in the Financial District:

Phil Ablistrand
Vicki Bandel
Jane Bressler
Perry Calaghan
Michael Crowe
Pat Farquhar
Betty Feinsteine
Ann Franklin
Lani Friedel
Ruth Friedman
Dick Gahart
Lin Gales
Marty Gordon
Becky Hayden
John Hudson
Molly McMurty
Richard Norris
Deb Polfus
Richard Rothman
Marabeth Seaton
Deborah Seymour
Nancy Stults
Andre Urruty
Frances Whisler
Jacqueline Young

Heritage Welcomes New Members — Help Us Spread the Word

You, as a member of Heritage, are among our best promoters. You may have joined because you wanted to work with others who share your pride in and concern for San Francisco’s unique architectural character. You may have been attracted to our advocacy and courage them to join us.

Heritage is an urban conservation organization dedicated to encouraging and assisting in the preservation of San Francisco’s cityscape. Members receive the quarterly Heritage Newsletter and other publications, reduced rates on programs and tours, Bookshop discounts and invitations to special events. Contributions and dues are tax deductible.

Please pass the coupon below to a colleague or friend who might be interested in helping our historic preservation efforts by joining Heritage. Or use it to let us know about someone who might like information about us. Thank you.

**YES, I WOULD LIKE TO JOIN HERITAGE.** Enclosed is my membership contribution ($15 minimum).

**PLEASE SEND ME MORE INFORMATION ABOUT HERITAGE.**

**PLEASE SEND INFORMATION ABOUT HERITAGE TO THE PERSON LISTED BELOW (AT THE REQUEST OF):**

Name
Address
City, zip
Phone (day) ______________________________ (evening)

HERITAGE 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco, California 94109, (415) 441-3000.

Heritage Contributors: February — April 1982

WELCOME NEW MEMBERS

MAJOR DONOR

George E. L. Stewart

NEW MEMBERS

Dan Allen
Piers Anderson
Jacqueline Brillago
Steve Baum
Elizabeth Ann Becker
Thomas H. Ball
Daniel L. Bergvist
Elisabeth M. Bernier
Lucy Blount
Suzanne P. Booth
Barry Brepoli
Richard Broder
Lynn Carol Bryer
Kathleen Lee Canaletti
Sandra Maril Chandler
Portland N. Coats
Deborah L. Conner
Sheila Cooper
Iris T. Crossley
Haire M. Demore
Rita M. Dickey
Hugh J. Dickson

Architectural historian Greg Brechin (at top) describes the Pacific Coast Stock Exchange at Pim and Summer to an enthusiastic Walks guide class on a training tour of the Financial District.

Electric Power Research Institute
Stephen M. Fenton
Mr. & Mrs. G. Stephen Fisher
Charles T. Flannery
Charles Q. Forester
Tow N. Foster
D. A. Gallagher
Robert Goldstein
Eleanor Gracewich
A. A. H. Sassemann
Gail F. Harling
June O. Hasselton
Rachel Hull
Mr. & Mrs. William J. Irakchi

Mrs. James E. Martin
Marjorie McCaughan
Jean A. Micheli
Microsoft Corporation
Magaret P. Peck
Phyllis Porter
Sue Rieders
Suzanne Rinehart
Nolyn Robbins
Mr. K. L. Robie
Eleanor K. Sampson
H. Dee Samuel/Lawrence H. Stotter
San Francisco Seporetary
Michelle Truhaft
Saundra Schlaes
Jeffrey Schneider
Vickie Simms
Lynn Stevens
Betty Jo Strong
Laurel Summar
Linda Thompson
Norma Thompson
Toby Enterprises
Lydia Tolmachoff
Timothy A. Tostra
USA Holidays

Sandra Schlaes
Suzanne Rinehart
Nolyn Robbins
Mr. K. L. Robie
Eleanor K. Sampson
H. Dee Samuel/Lawrence H. Stotter
San Francisco Seporetary
Michelle Truhaft
Saundra Schlaes
Jeffrey Schneider
Vickie Simms
Lynn Stevens
Betty Jo Strong
Laurel Summar
Linda Thompson
Norma Thompson
Toby Enterprises
Lydia Tolmachoff
Timothy A. Tostra
USA Holidays
Heritage Calendar:
What’s Happening This Summer and Fall

Every Wednesday and Sunday
Haas-Lilienthal House Guided Tours, 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco. 11 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. $3 general public; $1 under 12 and senior citizens; free to Heritage members.

Every Thursday
Heritage Walks in the Downtown, three 45-minute lunchtime walking tours in Jackson Square and the Financial District, led by Heritage Walks guides. 12 noon. $1. Call 441—3000 for information.

Jackson Square Historic District: Meet at the corner of Montgomery and Washington Streets, by the Transamerica Pyramid.

Banking Temples: Meet at the corner of Clay and Montgomery Streets, by the Transamerica Pyramid.

Splendid Survivors: Meet in front of the Hallidie Building, 130 Sutter Street.

Every Sunday
Heritage Walks in Pacific Heights, led by Heritage Walks guides. Meet at the Haas-Lilienthal House, 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco. 12:30 p.m. $3 general public; $2 Heritage members. Call 441-3046 for recorded information.

Bernard Maybeck: Drawings and Photographs,” an exhibit of post-modernist architecture by such designers as Bernard Maybeck, Willis Polk, Timothy Pflueger, Ernest Coxhead and John Galen Howard. The exhibit illustrates the dreams architects envisioned for San Francisco as well as completed buildings. Sponsored by the San Francisco Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. Downtown Gallery, 9th floor, 130 Montgomery Street, San Francisco. Gallery hours: 9 a.m. - 5 p.m., closed weekends.


June 21-24
Heritage Walks in Jackson Square. The 45-minute walk is being offered free in conjunction with the Heritage benefit reception at the Pacific Lumber Building on June 24. Meet the Heritage Walks guide under the redwood sculpture in the walkway of the building, 500 Washington Street. 2 noon.

June 24
Pacific Lorber Company’s Opening Reception and Tour of its new headquarters building in historic Jackson Square. The event is a benefit for Heritage. 500 Washington Street, San Francisco. 5 - 7:30 p.m. $15. Invitations will be mailed to all Heritage members. For information call 441-3000.

July 6
Open House and Reception at the art-filled Queen Anne home of Werner Erhard, founder ofest. For a $25 donation to Heritage, you will receive an invitation admitting two people. For information call Leslie Flint at 441-3000.

July 12
“Rehab Right: How To Rehabilitate Your House Without Sacrificing Architectural Assets,” a talk by Melanie Kaplan Freeman and Blair Prentice, co-authors of Oakland’s award-winning publication Rehab Right. Sponsored by Oakland Heritage Alliance. St. Paul’s Recreation Center Auditorium, 116 Montecito Avenue, Oakland. 7:30 p.m. $2 general public; $1 OHA members. Call Leslie Flint at 658-4915 (evenings) for information.

July 13
Dusan Mills on “The Restoration of the Audiffred Building.” An 1899 landmark on the waterfront is getting a new lease on life thanks to 66—7 million rehab project. The Heritage Monthly Program. Haas-Lilienthal House Ballroom. 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco. 7:45 p.m. $2 general public; free to Heritage members.

July 31 – August 29
Oakland Neighborhood Walking Tours. A different walk each weekend day. Explore Fernwood, Hue Garden, Lakeshore/Trestle Glen and other areas. Sponsored by Oakland Heritage Alliance. 11:30—3:30 p.m. $3 general public; $1 OHA members. Call Leslie Flint at 658-4915 (evenings) for information.

August 10
Gray Brechin on "Van Ness Revisited." A look at the history and future of what is. potentially, San Francisco’s grandest boulevard. The Heritage Monthly Program. Haas-Lilienthal House Ballroom. 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco. 7:45 p.m. $2 general public; free to Heritage members.

September 14
Karana Drayton on "Plain Old Houses: Folk Building in 19th Century California." A trip back to our roots to see what was expressed in the "vernacular architecture" of the ordinary people who immigrated to California. The Heritage Monthly Program. Haas-Lilienthal House Ballroom. 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco. 7:45 p.m. $2 general public; free to Heritage members.

October 12
Michael Crowe on "A Look at Art Deco." A visual survey of San Francisco’s Art Deco architecture. The Heritage Monthly Program. Haas-Lilienthal House Ballroom, 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco. 7:45 p.m. $2 general public; free to Heritage members.
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