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A Message From Our Commission Presidents and the Director

We're pleased to present the Annual Report for the San Francisco Planning Department. This report highlights the Department’s core services, finances, and major achievements during the 2021-2022 fiscal year. We're proud of all we’ve accomplished and are pleased to share the highlights with you.

Recent years have brought tremendous challenges to San Francisco, yet there are many reasons to be optimistic about the future. We share a common goal: making San Francisco the world’s most livable urban place and creating a long-term vision for the City that will guide and shape its future. We take that goal and our responsibilities seriously, particularly in this time of recovery and change.

This year, much of the Department’s work focused on creating housing opportunities, but a good portion of our staff is committed to environmental protection, economic and environmental resiliency, historic preservation, and creating great public spaces. Most importantly, we remain committed to our ongoing efforts to bring issues of racial and social equity to the forefront of all we do.

Regardless of our various responsibilities, we all work to improve the quality of life in San Francisco as a diverse, sustainable, and thriving city of neighborhoods, and to address the challenges we face with optimism and hard work.

We thank the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, our sister City agencies, and our diverse community partners for their support, guidance, and collaboration toward the best future possible for San Francisco.

Joel Koppel
President
Planning Commission

Diane Matsuda
President
Historic Preservation Commission

Rich Hillis
Director
San Francisco Planning Department
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Highlight: Senate Bill 35

Senate Bill 35 (SB 35) went into effect on January 1, 2018 and created a streamlined local review process for certain housing projects with increased levels of affordability. SB 35 applies to localities where production of new housing has not met state-mandated Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) targets and provides for a ministerial review process for housing projects containing on-site affordable units at elevated numbers. Decreased builder risk and truncated review timelines owing to removal of review under the California Environmental Quality Act dramatically enhance affordable housing production.

Two projects that maximize the number of permanently affordable homes and that partnered SB 35 with the State Density Bonus are of particular note: 730 Stanyan with 160 units for low to moderate-income families and families who have experienced homelessness and 2550 Irving with 90 units of multi-family housing intended for San Francisco’s essential workers.

Both projects are 100 percent affordable and will be built on underutilized sites in neighborhoods that have historically produced little affordable housing.
Highlight: Sunset Forward

Approved in October 2022, Sunset Forward is a long-term vision that aims to stabilize low- and moderate-income families and seniors in the Sunset, enhancing community connection and quality of life by addressing unmet needs in housing, transportation, and neighborhood services. At the center of this work is identifying the Sunset community’s priorities and vision for a healthy, thriving, and inclusive neighborhood with access to affordable housing, neighborhood services, small business support, and vibrant commercial corridors. This community-led process was completed in coordination with SF Planning, Supervisor Gordon Mar, and the District 4 Youth and Families Network, a collaboration of Sunset-based nonprofits serving families, youth, and seniors.

sunsetforward.com

Highlight: Housing Element 2022 Update

The Housing Element 2022 Update analyzes San Francisco’s housing needs and provides detailed strategies to provide for those needs, both existing and projected, for all economic segments of the community. It is required by law to be updated every eight years to preserve, enhance, and develop housing; identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs; identify sites to meet the City’s regional housing needs at all income levels; and be approved by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

Actionable steps are especially significant for the 2022 Update, as this is San Francisco’s first housing plan centered on racial and social equity. The Update includes policies and programs that express the City’s collective vision and values for the future of housing in San Francisco and were developed in collaboration with community organizations, members of the public, and sister agencies. A final draft of the Housing Element, which plans for a state-mandated goal of 82,000 new housing units by 2031, was approved by the Planning Commission and submitted to HCD in late 2022.

sfhousingelement.org
Highlight: Legacy Business Registry

The Legacy Business Registry works to preserve longstanding, community-serving businesses that so often serve as valuable cultural assets. The Registry is a tool for providing educational and promotional assistance to Legacy Businesses to support their continued viability and success. Long-standing small businesses can join the Registry for recognition, marketing and business help, and grants.

More than 50 San Francisco businesses were officially added to the Legacy Business Registry in the last fiscal year, including Suppenküche, Club Deluxe, Latin Bridal, Small Frys Children’s Store, and Sai’s Vietnamese Restaurant.

For a full list of Legacy Businesses and to learn more about the program, please visit: legacybusiness.org

Highlight: Historic Landmark Designations

Landmark buildings, districts, places, and structures are among the City’s most treasured elements of our heritage. Recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission and approved by the Board and Mayor, a landmark can be a site of a significant historic event, relate to a significant culture or person, exemplify the work of master architect, or represent a significant design theme or a unique or distinctive visual feature. Since 2012, the HPC has prioritized properties relating to underrepresented communities with strong cultural and/or social associations, and property types such as landscapes, buildings of Modern design, and sites located in geographically underrepresented areas of the City.

There are now more than 300 designated landmarks in San Francisco, with sixteen designations made in the last fiscal year. They include the Lyon-Martin House (#292) and the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts (#303). The Lyon-Martin House, located at 651 Duncan Street, is recognized for its association with the homophile movement in San Francisco through the founding in 1955 of the Daughters of Bilitis (DOB), the nation’s first lesbian-rights organization, and for association with Phyllis Lyon and Del Martin, both pioneering lesbian-rights and feminist activists. The Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts, located at 2868 Mission Street, is recognized for its association with California’s Latino cultural center movement of the 1970s and with the social and ethnic history of the Mission District as a predominately Latino enclave.

Find more information on the Historic Landmark Designation program and recognized properties, please visit: sfplanning.org/project/designated-landmarks-and-landmark-districts
Preservation Project Highlights  FY 2021/22

Historic Landmark Designations

1. Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts
2. Clay Theatre
3. Trocadero Clubhouse
4. Golden Gate Valley Carnegie Library
5. Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building
6. Fresco titled “Allegory of California”
7. One Montgomery Street (Crocker National Bank Building)
8. Casa Sanchez
9. San Francisco Eagle Bar
10. Fresco titled “The Making of a Fresco Showing the Building of a City”
11. Ingleside Terraces Sundial and Sundial Park, Entrada Court

Small Businesses Added to Legacy Business Registry

1. Biordi Art Imports
2. Blue Danube Coffee Houses
3. Button Down
4. Dee Dee Boutique
5. Harris' Restaurant Inc.
6. Shear's Beauty & Barber Shop
7. Teevan Company
8. VJ Grocery
9. Dark Garden Unique Corsetry, Inc.
10. Hyde Street Studios
11. Performing Arts Workshop, Inc.
12. Tia Margarita
13. Tú Lan Vietnamese Restaurant
15. Buena Vista Cafe
16. Far East Café
17. Helmand Palace
18. Latin Jewelers
19. Paxton Gate
20. Sai's Vietnamese Restaurant
21. San Francisco Carts and Concessions
22. Small Frys Children's Store
23. Valentino Market
24. Glen Park Chiropractic
25. Goat Hill Pizza
26. San Francisco Microscopical Society
27. Trattoria Contadina
Project Highlights **FY 2021/22**

**Southeast Rail Station Study**

The launch of Caltrain’s electric service in 2024, the extension of service to the Salesforce Transit Center, and the arrival of High-Speed Rail will expand travel options and benefits for residents, workers, and visitors within San Francisco and throughout the region. To realize these benefits, San Francisco needs improved access to Caltrain service in the form of new and improved Caltrain stations between the future underground Fourth and Townsend station and the Bayshore station at the county line. The Southeast Rail Station Study (SERSS) began in 2020 to address these needs and explore options for future station locations on the Caltrain corridor in southeastern San Francisco.

In June 2022, the final Southeast Rail Station Study was released. In July 2022, the Planning Commission endorsed the Study, urging decision makers to restore Caltrain service to the Bayview, commit funds to advance an Oakdale Avenue station location, and move forward with design and siting considerations for the Potrero / Dogpatch / Mission Bay neighborhoods.

**Transportation Network Companies and Land Use Planning**

The use of ride hailing services offered by Transportation Network Companies (TNCs, like Lyft and Uber) has grown substantially. Studies show that TNCs generate more car trips and shift people away from other means of travel, including walking, bicycling, and transit, but less is known about TNC’s interrelationship with land use planning and the built environment.

SF Planning led a study to research and analyze the impact of TNCs on land use and transportation planning in San Francisco and identify policy options to address those impacts. For the study, the Planning Department collected qualitative data through focus groups with TNC drivers, targeted online surveys for TNC drivers, reviewed permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, and conducted interviews with developers.

Planning’s TNC and Land Use Planning study was published in June 2022. The findings from this study will inform updates to the General Plan, including the Transportation Element, which is anticipated to be presented to the Planning Commission for consideration in 2024.
Portsmouth Square

Portsmouth Square, widely known as “the heart of Chinatown,” is one of San Francisco’s most significant historic, cultural, and civic spaces. However, portions of the space no longer meet the needs of the surrounding neighborhood and City. A joint effort of San Francisco Planning and the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, the goal of the Portsmouth Square Improvement Project is to create an enhanced public space that is dynamic, adaptable to diverse users and events, and reflective of local culture and history. The project includes a new children’s playground, exercise equipment, shade structures, seating areas, wayfinding signage, sidewalks, landscaping, terraces, ramps, the removal of the Kearny Street pedestrian bridge, and a new 8,300 square foot clubhouse. SF Planning completed the Final Environmental Impact Report in January 2022, and the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department is proposing to begin construction 2023.

Fourplex Legislation

Signed in October 2022 following extensive discussions with staff and at the Planning Commission, Supervisor Rafael Mandelman’s “fourplex” legislation amends the Planning Code to allow up to four units of housing on every Residentially zoned lot in the City and up to six units of housing on corner lots. This ordinance was among several others that proposed additional and different methods to maximize density in high opportunity areas and was the only one to be signed into law. This legislation an important step toward helping the City meet its housing goals by allowing small and medium-sized apartment buildings in every San Francisco neighborhood.
Racial and Social Equity Plan

Racial equity is a set of social justice practices rooted in understanding historical and present-day oppression, aiming toward a goal of fairness for all. Social equity is fairness and justice in public services, considering historical and current inequities among classes include gender identity, sex, religion, and disability status. San Francisco Planning envisions a city where a person’s race does not determine their lives’ prospects and success. Planning’s Racial and Social Equity Action Plan aims to proactively advance equity in the Department’s internal and external work, including community planning, community engagement, policy development, hiring, and internal operations.

Phase I of the Plan aims to implement and track progress on our internal racial and social equity goals. The Department is currently implementing Phase I, which includes applying the newly developed Racial and Social Equity Tool to assess the budget; continuing to adjust our work to better center equity; and addressing diversity through hiring and promotion.

Currently under development, Phase II of the Racial and Social Equity Plan will focus on Planning’s external functions, such as community planning, policy-making, public information, and historic preservation.

Racial & Social Equity Action Plan Update

FY2021–2022 marked two full fiscal years since the Planning Commission adopted the Phase I Racial and Social Equity Action Plan.

The following summarizes the status of actions from the Racial & Social Equity Action Plan. This summary is not intended to be comprehensive as racial and social equity is centered in all of our work programs. The Equitable Hiring Guidelines and Promotions Standards were a key deliverable this past fiscal year that completed 38 actions in the Plan.

115 Total actions in the Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION STATUS</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete (one-time action)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete (ongoing monitoring)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo source: Office of Racial Equity SF
Project Submittals & Approvals Map

- **13,151** Planning Cases & Permits Filed FY 2021/22
- **4,787** Planning Cases & Permits Approved FY 2021/22

San Francisco Bay

San Francisco County

Pacific Ocean
Environmental Review Documents

- **8** Draft and Final EIRs
- **14** Community Plan Exemptions
- **7** Mitigated Negative Declarations

### Projects

- **Portsmouth Square Improvement Project** (733 Kearny Street)
- **770 Woolsey Street**
- **1101-1123 Sutter Street**
- **Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Project**
- **Lake Merced West Project** (520 John Muir Drive)
- **Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project**
- **Housing Element 2022 Update** (Not shown on map)

### Not shown on map

- **1196 Columbus Ave**

---

EIR Addenda: One Oak St.; Hetch Hetchy Water and Power Transmission Lines 7/8 Upgrade Project; Sutro Tower Digital Television Project.  
MND Addenda: 1196 Columbus Ave.
### Planning Cases & Building Permits

#### Case & Permit Volume Trends

**Fiscal Year 2016/17 - 2021/22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cases Filed</th>
<th>Permits Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016/17</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017/18</td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2021/22</td>
<td>5,373</td>
<td>9,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building Permits

- **Permits reviewed over the counter**: 7,464 (82%)
- **Permit intake / staff review**: 1,620 (18%)

**Planning Case Type**

- CEQA Categorical Exemptions: 256
- Conditional Use Authorizations: 166
- Condominium Referrals: 77
- Discretionary Reviews: 77
- Enforcement: 361
- CEQA: Other Environmental Review: 476
- Permit Referrals from Other City Agencies: 1,034
- Preliminary Project Assessments: 28
- Project Review Meetings: 260
- Short Term Rentals: 835
- Transportation Demand Management: 36
- Variances: 135
- All other cases: 1,632

---

**San Francisco Planning Department**

---
Monthly Building Permit Volume

**BUILDING PERMITS FILED: ALTERATIONS**
- **FISCAL YEAR 2021/22**
- **PREVIOUS YEAR (FY 2020/21)**

**BUILDING PERMITS FILED: NEW CONSTRUCTION**
- **FISCAL YEAR 2021/22**
- **PREVIOUS YEAR (FY 2020/21)**
## Case & Permit Volume Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application/Fee Type</th>
<th>FY16/17</th>
<th>FY17/18</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Bonus (AHB)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-76% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium Referral</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Appropriateness</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-33% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone Permit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>500% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Authorization</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>-1% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Planning</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-63% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-50% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Exceptions (309.1, 309.2, 309.3, 309.4)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Review - Mandatory</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Review - Public Initiated</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-21% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>18% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exemptions (EEC and ECA)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-21% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>-7% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Neighborhood Exception (329)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-14% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Time and Materials (ETM)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>12% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Section (106)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreement Design Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator Penthouse Height Exemption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-60% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Advertising Sign Relocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Advertising Sign Annual Inventory Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Assessment 5 or less units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>66% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Assessment 6 or more units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Application-Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0% -100% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Requests</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>44% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station Conversion Determinations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpoena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>700% ↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Use Permits</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Hotel Conversions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Referral</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application/Fee Type</td>
<td>FY16/17</td>
<td>FY17/18</td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
<td>FY20/21</td>
<td>FY21/22</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Master Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Business Registry (LBR)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Line Adjustment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Map Amendment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Permit</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Act</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Allocation (321)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Code Text Amendment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Project Assessment</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Review Meeting</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit to Alter (Major, Minor)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Study (295)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Survey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Rental</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Section (106) / Subdivision Referral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Statement of Eligibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Certificate of Transfer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Notice of Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 -100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) - Letter of Determination</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) - Notice of Special Restrictions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) - Verification</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Cannabis Dispensary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 311</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Book Notification</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits (New Construction)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits (Existing Alterations)</td>
<td>8,297</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>6,689</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>8,964</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,718</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,669</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,995</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,433</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></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 & Expenditures

**Total Revenues**

- **FY 2021/22**
  - **Total Revenues**: $62 M

**Revenue by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees / Charges for Services (see below)</td>
<td>$45,074,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$6,634,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies</td>
<td>$3,010,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$7,258,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,977,580</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fee Revenue by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Revenue</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Alterations</td>
<td>$23,586,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit New Construction</td>
<td>$3,545,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review Fees</td>
<td>$5,252,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Short Range Planning Fees</td>
<td>$3,806,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Fees</td>
<td>$4,395,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Fees</td>
<td>$715,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Appropriateness Fees</td>
<td>$159,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Program &amp; Code Enforcement</td>
<td>$3,413,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fee Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,874,375</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**

- **FY 2021/22**
  - **Total Expenditures**: $62 M

**Expenditure by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$39,857,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$689,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Services, Materials &amp; Supplies, Capital &amp; Projects</td>
<td>$12,923,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services of Other Departments</td>
<td>$8,507,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,977,580</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Report: Revenue Trends

DEPARTMENT TOTAL REVENUE TREND
FISCAL YEAR 2016/17 - 2021/22

FISCAL YEAR 2021/22
- 73% Charges for Services (Fees)
- 10% Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees
- 5% Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies
- 12% General Fund Support

FISCAL YEAR 2020/21
- 80% Charges for Services (Fees)
- 12% Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees
- 5% Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies
- 3% General Fund Support

FISCAL YEAR 2019/20
- 73% Charges for Services (Fees)
- 10% Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees
- 5% Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies
- 12% General Fund Support

FISCAL YEAR 2018/19
- 70% Charges for Services (Fees)
- 10% Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees
- 5% Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies
- 15% General Fund Support

FISCAL YEAR 2017/18
- 65% Charges for Services (Fees)
- 10% Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees
- 5% Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies
- 20% General Fund Support

FISCAL YEAR 2016/17
- 60% Charges for Services (Fees)
- 10% Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees
- 5% Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies
- 25% General Fund Support

FEE REVENUE TREND
FISCAL YEAR 2016/17 - 2021/22

- Building Permit Alterations
- Environmental Review Fees
- Conditional Use Fees
- Other Short Range Planning Fees
- Building Permit New Construction
- Sign Program & Code Enforcement
- Variance Fees
- Certificate of Appropriateness Fees
# Financial Report

## REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services (Fees)</td>
<td>$44,012,250</td>
<td>$43,828,367</td>
<td>$43,519,481</td>
<td>$43,208,666</td>
<td>$45,808,270</td>
<td>$45,074,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$4,539,531</td>
<td>$6,968,618</td>
<td>$4,516,802</td>
<td>$5,129,892</td>
<td>$6,441,150</td>
<td>$6,634,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Recovery</td>
<td>$740,453</td>
<td>$1,120,332</td>
<td>$1,470,974</td>
<td>$1,813,777</td>
<td>$2,224,990</td>
<td>$3,010,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$1,991,842</td>
<td>$2,584,044</td>
<td>$3,848,730</td>
<td>$5,513,149</td>
<td>$5,971,704</td>
<td>$7,258,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$51,284,076</td>
<td>$54,501,361</td>
<td>$53,355,987</td>
<td>$55,665,484</td>
<td>$60,446,114</td>
<td>$61,977,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FEE REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Building Permit Alterations</td>
<td>$18,455,090</td>
<td>$22,598,344</td>
<td>$20,896,872</td>
<td>$20,371,542</td>
<td>$25,021,455</td>
<td>$23,586,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Building Permit New Construction</td>
<td>$3,936,266</td>
<td>$5,464,284</td>
<td>$3,067,613</td>
<td>$2,971,799</td>
<td>$4,355,340</td>
<td>$3,545,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Environmental Review Fees</td>
<td>$9,829,289</td>
<td>$7,394,694</td>
<td>$7,666,887</td>
<td>$7,261,343</td>
<td>$6,123,532</td>
<td>$5,252,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Other Short Range Planning Fees</td>
<td>$5,476,761</td>
<td>$3,123,049</td>
<td>$4,826,135</td>
<td>$5,027,646</td>
<td>$3,304,173</td>
<td>$3,806,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Conditional Use Fees</td>
<td>$5,112,250</td>
<td>$2,876,820</td>
<td>$4,519,875</td>
<td>$4,405,479</td>
<td>$2,812,279</td>
<td>$4,395,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Variance Fees</td>
<td>$557,546</td>
<td>$697,187</td>
<td>$751,124</td>
<td>$737,810</td>
<td>$714,002</td>
<td>$715,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Certificate of Appropriateness Fees</td>
<td>$103,809</td>
<td>$261,265</td>
<td>$250,116</td>
<td>$244,212</td>
<td>$226,140</td>
<td>$159,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Sign Program &amp; Code Enforcement</td>
<td>$866,497</td>
<td>$1,412,724</td>
<td>$1,540,859</td>
<td>$2,188,835</td>
<td>$3,251,349</td>
<td>$3,413,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fee Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$44,337,508</td>
<td>$43,828,367</td>
<td>$43,519,481</td>
<td>$43,208,666</td>
<td>$45,808,270</td>
<td>$44,874,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GENERAL FUND SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$2.0 M</td>
<td>$2.6 M</td>
<td>$3.8 M</td>
<td>$5.5 M</td>
<td>$6.0 M</td>
<td>$7.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Other Revenues</td>
<td>$49.3 M</td>
<td>$51.9 M</td>
<td>$49.5 M</td>
<td>$50.2 M</td>
<td>$54.5 M</td>
<td>$54.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$51.3 M</td>
<td>$54.5 M</td>
<td>$53.4 M</td>
<td>$55.7 M</td>
<td>$60.4 M</td>
<td>$62.0 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| General Fund Support % | 4% | 5% | 7% | 10% | 10% | 12% |

## EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$32,344,832</td>
<td>$33,989,545</td>
<td>$35,895,959</td>
<td>$38,655,168</td>
<td>$39,241,559</td>
<td>$39,857,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$554,786</td>
<td>$774,176</td>
<td>$980,944</td>
<td>$656,755</td>
<td>$965,663</td>
<td>$689,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Services, Materials &amp; Supplies, Capital &amp; Projects</td>
<td>$11,735,231</td>
<td>$13,672,238</td>
<td>$10,042,863</td>
<td>$9,072,012</td>
<td>$12,350,718</td>
<td>$12,923,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services of Other Departments</td>
<td>$6,649,227</td>
<td>$6,065,402</td>
<td>$6,436,221</td>
<td>$7,281,549</td>
<td>$7,888,174</td>
<td>$8,507,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$51,284,076</td>
<td>$54,501,361</td>
<td>$53,355,987</td>
<td>$55,665,484</td>
<td>$60,446,114</td>
<td>$61,977,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renderings of 770 Woolsey Street housing development by IwamotoScott Architecture.
The mission of the San Francisco Planning Department, under the direction of the Planning Commission, is to shape the future of San Francisco and the region by generating an extraordinary vision for the General Plan; fostering exemplary design through planning controls; improving our surroundings through environmental analysis; preserving our unique heritage; encouraging a broad range of housing and a diverse job base; and enforcing the Planning Code.

In order to implement its mission, the San Francisco Planning Department is made up of the following divisions:

» The Director’s Office
» Administration
» Commission Affairs
» Community Equity
» Current Planning
» Citywide Planning
» Environmental Planning

**Director’s Office**

The Director’s Office is responsible for a range of executive functions, including policy analysis and decision-making, media relations, and inter-agency coordination on development strategy and projects.

**Administration**

The Administration Division provides the support and resources to meet the Department’s mission and goals. The division includes the Finance Office, where staff oversees all financial, accounting, and budget functions, ensures compliance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) through regular financial reporting, develops the annual work program and financial budget, and manages all aspects of professional services contracts and awarded grants; Human Resources, Operations, and the Office of Analysis and Information Systems (OASIS).

**Commission Affairs**

The Office of Commission Affairs serves as the liaison between the Planning Department and members of the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission. Commission Affairs staff oversees Commission meeting agendas, maintains Commission reports and records, responds to Sunshine Ordinance public information requests, and drafts and maintains Rules and Regulations.

**Current Planning**

Planners in the Current Planning Division help maintain and enhance the physical development of the City. They are responsible for development applications for compliance with the San Francisco Planning Code, San Francisco’s General Plan, and relevant design
guidelines. They also interpret and ensure compliance with the Planning Code, implement the historic preservation work program, and comprise the core staff at the Planning Information Center.

Citywide Planning
The Citywide Planning Division is responsible for long-range planning in San Francisco. Citywide planners develop policy, maintain and oversee compliance with the City’s General Plan, prepare and implement community plans, and act as the urban design resource for the City. Citywide Planning develops plans and proposes policy and long-range plans on a wide range of topics, including housing, transportation, urban design, land use, and sustainability policy at the city-wide and neighborhood scales.

Community Equity
The Planning Department prioritizes racial and social equity across all divisions, and coordinates them through the Community Equity Division under the guidance of the Planning Commission’s Equity Resolutions. The Community Equity Division reflects upon our historical and current inequities and revises our policies and implementation strategies to reverse inequities for our American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, along with other historically marginalized communities. The Division includes three units: Racial & Social Equity Plan Team, Community Engagement, and Policies and Strategies.

Environmental Planning
The Environmental Planning Division assesses plans and projects for potential physical impacts on the environment and develops measures to mitigate those impacts, a process known as environmental review. Areas of analysis include transportation, cultural resources, and air quality. The Division’s work is conducted pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and local law.

COMMISSIONS

Planning Commission
The Planning Commission is a seven-member body that makes decisions on a wide range of development projects and advises the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and City departments on San Francisco’s long-range goals, policies, and programs on issues related to land use, transportation, and neighborhood planning, and has the specific responsibility for the stewardship and maintenance of San Francisco’s General Plan. The Planning Department reports to the Planning Commission through the Planning Director.

Four members of the Commission are appointed by the Mayor, while the other three members are appointed by the President of the Board of Supervisors. They serve four-year terms.

Historic Preservation Commission
The Historic Preservation Commission is a seven-member body that advises the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and City departments on San Francisco’s historic preservation goals, policies and programs. The Commission is responsible for identifying and designating San Francisco landmarks and buildings in the City’s historic districts as well as providing oversight and making decisions on the identification and treatment of properties with historic, social or cultural value to San Francisco. The Commission also convenes the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to evaluate complex design issues.

All members are nominated by the Mayor and approved by the Board of Supervisors; they serve four-year terms.
Planning Staff  FY 2021/22

Administration
Reza Amindarbari
John Boldrick
Glenn Cabreros
Karen Carasi
Gary Chen
Theodore Chen
Yi Chen
Alton Chinn
Thomas DiSanto
Scott Edmondson
Michael Eng
James Glik
Shirley Hao
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Lulu Hwang
Biling Jiang
Yvonne Ko
Judy Lam
Deborah Landis
Michelle Littlefield
Bella Liu
Selina Liu
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Ken Qi
Michael Sanders
Jaron Sherba
Candace SooHoo
J ohn Speer
Martin Thibodeau
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Michael Webster
Barry Wong
Melissa Wong
Mike Wynne
Tony Yeung
Genta Yoshikawa
Karen Zhu

Citywide Planning
Robin Abad-Ocubillo
Allison Albericci
Amnon Ben-Pazi
Benjamin Caldwell
Celina Chan
Lisa Chen
Maria de Alva
Lisa Fisher
J ulie Flynn
Dylan Hamilton
Anna Harvey
Seung Yen Hong
Doug Johnson
Lily Langlois
Jessica Look
Danielle Ngo
Sheila Nickolopoulos
Patrick Race
AnMarie Rodgers
Ilaria Salvadori
Jeremy Shaw
Mathew Snyder
Joshua Switzky
Matthew Thompson
Reanna Tong
Tam Tran
Leslie Valencia
Annie Yalon

Current Planning
Christy Alexander
Kalyani Agnihotri
Laura Ajello
Linda Ajello-Hoagland
Claudine Asbagh
EvaMarie Atijera-Taylor
Tolu Atoyebi
Robelio Baезa
Ryan Balba
Luiz Barata
Chaska Berger
Melanie Bishop
Kurt Botn
Marcelle Boudreaux
Peter Byrne
Cathleen Campbell
Mathew Chandler
Josephine Chen
Michael Christensen
Stephanie Cisneros
Kate Conner
Lorabelle Cook
Moses Corrette
Matt Dito
Kimberly Durandet
Charles Enchill
Matias Eusterbrock
Claire Feeney
Shannon Ferguson
Nick Foster
Monica Giacomucci
Elizabeth Gordon-J onckheer
Trent Greenan
Carly Grob
Branden Gunn
Gretel Gunther
Kevin Guy
Alessandro Hall
J ordan Hallman
Bridget Hicks
E ffrey Horn
Ericka Jackson
Mary Jane Green
Sylvia J imenez
Dario Jones
Niloufar Karizmadegan
Heidi Kline
J ustin Kran
Emily Lane
Michelle Langlie
Margaret Laush
Pilar LaValley
Victoria Lewis
Xinyu Liang
Jennifer Lung
Milton Martin
Omar Masry
Christopher May
Frances McMillen
Elena Moore

Community Equity
Tameeka Bennett
Megan Calpin
Shelley Caltagiron
Sydney Cespedes
Mariah Chinchilla
Miriam Chion
Carla de Mesa

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Planning Staff FY 2021/22

**Director’s Office**
Julian Bañales
Veronica Flores
Rich Hillis
Audrey Merlone
Deborah Sanders
Daniel Sider
Aaron Starr

**Environmental Planning**
Lauren Bihl
Vimaliza Byrd
Alana Callagy
Rick Cooper
Florentina Craciun
Jenny Delumo
Debra Dwyer
Chelsea Fordham
Sherie George
Lisa Gibson
Justin Greving
Monica Huggins
William Hughen
Devyani Jain
Timothy Johnston (SFPUC)
Chris Kern
Ben Lamb
Kari Lentz
Don Lewis
Michael Li
Diane Livia
Laura Lynch
Jennifer McKellar
Julie Moore (SFPUC)
Sally Morgan
Joy Navarrete
Kristina Phung

**Office of Commissions Affairs**
Josephine Feliciano
Jonas Ionin
Laura Lynch
Brandi Robertson
Chanbory Son

**Interns**
Surbhi Agrawal
Kristin-Faith Avenis
Michael Bauer
Emily Biro
Kimberly Craige
Carlos Duran
Jeremy Epstein
Tracy Fenix
Glen Forrester
Emestina Hsieh
Heyaojing Huang
Mausam Jamwal
Jackie Kaiser
Seolha Lee
Kaylie Li
Albert Ma
Tara Mohtadi
Emma Mooney
Jonathan Quintanilla
Alexander Resnick
Gerardo Saavedra-Tapia
Tiffany Vu
Fiona Yim

**Staff Additions**
21

**Staff Departures**
23