

APPENDIX B
HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION RESPONSE



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

Case No.: 2011.0558E
Project Name: SFMTA Transit Effectiveness Project
Project Address: Various throughout the City
Date of Review: January 7, 2013

Staff Contact: Debra Dwyer (Environmental Planner)
(415) 575-9031
debra.dwyer@sfgov.org

Richard Sucre (Preservation Planner)
(415) 575-9108
richard.sucre@sfgov.org

PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

Historic Architectural Context

To assist in establishing the setting of the historic architectural context, the following excerpt provides a brief context and historical overview of the development of San Francisco, as noted in the 2007 Draft Preservation Element of the *San Francisco General Plan*:

[In 1776] Spanish government established a military outpost, or *Presidio*, at the northern end of the peninsula near the mouth of the Golden Gate. At the same time, Catholic missionaries established the sixth in a chain of 21 California missions near what is now 16th Street and Dolores Street, today called Mission Dolores. Beginning in 1821 with Mexico's independence from Spain, the area became a territory of the Mexican government. By 1835 the civilian port settlement, the Pueblo of Yerba Buena, had been established in the area of California and Montgomery Streets, initially supported by the export of California hides and tallow and the import of goods from the eastern United States and Europe.

In 1847, during the Mexican-American War that began the year before, the name Yerba Buena was officially changed to San Francisco. When the war ended and the United States officially assumed control of the territory in 1848, the population had reached about 400, including traders from the eastern United States and other countries. That soon changed, however, with the discovery of gold on the American River in the Sierra Nevada foothills that same year. [San Francisco's population boomed, and] by 1852 the population stood at approximately 34,776.

With an increasing population came new construction to support housing, commerce, and industry. [The port and related commercial structures developed in the area of today's Financial District and industrial activities established in the South of Market area. Residential areas developed along transportation corridors.] By the late 19th century, streetcar lines ran on nearly every major street, extending earlier housing patterns further westward.

At 5:12 a.m. on April 18th, 1906, a massive earthquake with a moment wave magnitude of approximately 7.9 struck San Francisco, and became one of the most significant events in the city's history. [Damage from the quake and resulting fires devastated the city.] For three days the fire blazed, and some 28,000 buildings that housed an estimated 250,000 people were destroyed...Rebuilding began immediately. New construction included both reconstruction on previously developed lots and expansion onto formerly vacant lots. New architectural styles emerged, both to address safety concerns more effectively and as a reflection of changing trends in design. In response to earlier fires, the use of brick and other fireproof construction materials had been required within specified commercial zones, and those zones were extended after 1906.

The building boom that began after the 1906 earthquake and fire continued nearly unabated through the 1920s. Much of the city had taken the physical shape that prevails today by the time of the Great Depression in the 1930s, during which new construction slowed dramatically. Despite the economic downturn, the Depression years provided the city with some of its finest public works projects [including the Bay Bridge, the Transbay Terminal, the Coit Tower, and numerous firehouses, libraries, police stations, and schools]. During the first half of the 1940s, World War II preempted all construction projects except work that supported military efforts.

Until the 20th century, architecture in San Francisco tended to utilize contemporary styles popular in the East, though on a somewhat delayed timeline. Greek Revival flourished in the 1850s and 1860s, Italianate in the 1870s, Stick Eastlake in the 1880s, Queen Anne in the 1890s, and Classical or Colonial Revival in the early 20th century. There were also a smaller number of homes built in the Gothic Revival, First Bay Area Tradition, and Craftsman styles. In the 1910s and 1920s, styles with origins in California were popularized, such as Mission, Spanish Colonial, and Mediterranean Revival. Art Deco was used beginning in the late 1920s, most often on commercial rather than residential buildings, as was the related Streamline Moderne style that emerged in the postwar era. International Modernism also appeared as early as the 1930s in San Francisco in the form of dramatic hillside residential buildings by architects such as Richard Neutra. The 1950s brought the concept of 'urban renewal' to San Francisco, resulting in the loss of many historic resources and a surge of new construction, often in the International style vernacular, in areas including Yerba Buena, the Western Addition, Golden Gateway, Diamond Heights, and parts of the Bayshore District. Brutalist styles and Postmodernism followed, and the Bay Area's Tech Boom of the late 1990s and early

2000s resulted in further development pressure and new construction in emerging 21st century styles. San Francisco's built environment today displays a tremendous variety of architectural periods and styles that reflect the city's layered historical development.¹

Determination of Historic Architectural Resources

The Department concurs with the determination of historic architectural resources present within the Project Site, as prepared by the environmental consultant for the SFMTA Transit Effectiveness Project Draft Initial Study. This list of historic resources includes the following properties:

- Designated within Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code;²
- Designated within Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code;
- Listed in or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;³
- Listed in or determined-eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources;⁴ and,
- Other resources identified as individual historic resources, historic districts, historic landscapes and that have yet to be identified.⁵

Additional information on the historic context associated with the City and County of San Francisco is available within the "Cultural and Paleontological Resources" section of the Draft Initial Study for the Proposed Project.

CEQA HISTORIC RESOURCE DETERMINATION

No Historic Resource Present

If there is no historic resource present, please have the Senior Preservation Planner review, sign, and process for the Environmental Planning Division.

No Historic Resource Present, but is located within a California Register-eligible historic district

If there is a California Register-eligible historic district present, please fill out the *Notice of Additional Environmental Evaluation Review* and have the project sponsor file the **Part II: Project Evaluation** application fee directly to the Environmental Planning Division.

Historic Resource Present

¹ The 2007 Draft Preservation Element of the *General Plan* has not been adopted as of writing of this report.

² Refer to Article 10 and Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code:

[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/planningcode?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\\$sync=1](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/planningcode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sync=1)

³ Refer to National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places Database:

<http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natreghome.do?searchtype=natreghome>

⁴ Refer to State of California, Office of Historic Preservation: http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068

⁵ For additional information on other historic resources, refer to San Francisco Planning Department, *Preservation Bulletin No. 16-CEQA and Historic Resources* (March 2008). The San Francisco Planning Department maintains information on the potential historic resource located within the City and County of San Francisco.

If a historic resource is present, please fill out the *Notice of Additional Environmental Evaluation Review* and have the project sponsor file the **Part II: Project Evaluation** application fee directly to the Environmental Planning Division.

PART I: SENIOR PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature: 
Tina Tam, *Senior Preservation Planner*

Date: 1-15-2013

PART II: PROJECT EVALUATION

PROPOSED PROJECT Demolition Alteration New Construction

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Proposed Project is described in detail within the Initial Study for the Transit Effectiveness Project. See A. Project Description. In short, the Project consists of the following:

The project components being reviewed consist of the a transit Service Policy Framework, which establishes transit service delivery objectives and identifies actions that will be taken to fulfill these objectives throughout the City; and the TEP, a program comprised of the following distinct groups of proposals that are described in more detail in Section A.3 of this Chapter: a) Service Improvements reflecting a transit service plan for Muni; b) 12 Service-related Capital Improvement Proposals; and c) Transit Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs) for 17 Rapid Network Corridors. Details have been developed for the transit service plan referred to collectively as the Service Improvements, for seven of the Service-related Capital Improvement Proposals, and for eight of the TTRP corridors. For the remaining five Service-related Capital Improvement Proposals, the SFMTA has set forth conceptual designs. For the remaining nine TTRPs, the SFMTA has proposed a Transit Preferential Streets (TPS) Toolkit of traffic engineering changes that would reduce transit travel time. However, the locations where the specific TPS Toolkit elements would be implemented to improve Muni service along these nine TTRPs have not yet been identified.

This Historic Resource Evaluation Response is focused on Cultural and Paleontological Resources section of the Draft Initial Study. Specifically, the project evaluation is focused on impacts resulting from physical alterations to the physical environment. Within the overall project description, these elements include Transit Preferential Streets (TPS) Toolkit Elements, Service-Related Capital Improvements, and limited construction of curb ramps in some locations and roadway striping for the Service Improvements.

TPS Toolkit Elements are the physical improvements necessary to implement Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs) of the TEP. TPS Toolkit Elements in the Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRP) corridors could include alteration to or construction of at-grade improvements within existing public roadways, such as transit stop changes, lane modifications, parking and turn restrictions, traffic signal and stop sign changes, and pedestrian improvements. These physical improvements are described in detail in the Draft Initial Study within Section A.4.3.2 Description of TPS Toolkit Elements.

Service-Related Capital Improvements are physical improvements necessary to implement TEP Service Improvements, and fall within three categories:

- Transfer and Terminal Point Improvements (TTPI);
- Overhead Wire Expansion (OWE); and,
- Systemwide Capital Infrastructure (SCI).

These physical improvements are described in detail in the Draft Initial Study in Section A.3.3 Service-Related Capital Improvements.

Inasmuch as the Service Policy Framework and other components of the TEP (i.e., the Service Improvements, and TTRPs) may necessitate physical alteration of the physical environment, the physical alterations are embodied under the TEP as TPS Toolkit elements for the TTRPs, the Service Improvements, and the Service-related Capital Improvements.

PROJECT EVALUATION

Planning Department Preservation staff has reviewed the project description and concurs with the project evaluation provided by the environmental consultant and their associated subconsultants. Impacts upon archaeological resources are not addressed within this response.

Impact Summary

Provided below is a summary of the proposed project’s impacts upon historic resources:

Impact-Historic Architectural Resources

The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect upon historic architectural resources, including: resources designated in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code; resources listed in or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Place; and, resources listed in or determined eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. Staff has determined that this aspect of the proposed project will have a less than significant impact upon historic resources, as defined by CEQA.

To assist in the evaluation of impacts to historic architectural resources, the following provides a summary of the designated historic architectural resources located along TEP Corridors (Program-Level and Project-Level):

Table 8: Designated Historic Architectural Resources along TEP Corridors

Program-Level TEP Corridors	
TTRP.1	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	Richard E. Queen House 2212 Sacramento
	Chambers Mansion 2220 Sacramento St.
	Health Sciences Library 2395 Sacramento St.
	Grace Cathedral 1051 Taylor St.
	Fairmont Hotel 950 Mason St.

Program-Level TEP Corridors	
	Chambord Apartments 1298 Sacramento St.
	Old Flood Mansion 1000 California Street
	Glazer Keating House 1110 Taylor Street
	Donaldina Cameron House 920 Sacramento St.
	Clay St. Center 940 Powell St. & 965 Clay St.
	U.S. Mint & Subtreasury Building 608 Commercial St.
	PG&E Old Station J 569 Commercial St.
	Federal Reserve Bank Building 400 Sansome St.
	Italian American Bank 460 Montgomery St
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Jackson Square (Article 10 and National Register)
	Chinatown (National Register)
	Commercial-Leidesdorff (Article 11 Conservation District)
	Front California (Article 11 Conservation District)
	TTRP.9
Jackson Brewery Co. Complex 1475-1489 Folsom St. & 301-333 11th St.	
<i>Historic Districts</i>	
None	
TTRP.22_2	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	2501 Fillmore St. 2501 Fillmore St.
	Market St. Railway Substation 1190 Fillmore St.
	Saint Francis Lutheran Church 152 Church St.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Dogpatch (Article 10)
TTRP.28_2	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	Shriners' Hospital for Crippled Children 1701 19th Ave.
	S.F. Conservatory of Music 19 th Ave. & Ortega St

Program-Level TEP Corridors	
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Golden Gate Park (National Register)
TTRP.30_2	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	Survey Marker
	Washington Square
	Ghirardelli Square
	Polk & Beach & Larkin & North Point St.
	Phelan Building 760-784 Market St.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
Fort Mason (National Register)	
TTRP.71	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	Richard Doolanin/ Norman Larson Residence 1500-1512 Haight St.
	San Francisco State Teacher's College 55 Laguna St.
	McMorry-Lagan Bldg 188-198 Haight St.
	Dietle Residence 294 Page St.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Golden Gate Park (National Register)
TTRP.K	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	S.F. & San Mateo Railroad Co. Office Bld. 2301 San Jose Ave.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
TTRP.L	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
TTRP.M	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	S.F. & San Mateo Railroad Co. Office Bld. 2301 San Jose Ave.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
TTPI.2	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	The Presidio (National Register)
TTPI.3	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None

Program-Level TEP Corridors	
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
TTPI.4	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
OWE.6	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None

TTRP.5	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	Hibernia Bank 1 Jones St.
	City Hall Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
	War Memorial Building 401 Van Ness Avenue
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Alamo Square (Article 10t)
	Civic Center (Article 10 and National Register)
	Golden Gate Park (National Register)
TTRP.8X	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	S.F. & San Mateo Railroad Co. Office Bld. 2301 San Jose Ave.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
TTRP.14	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	The Old U.S. Mint 88 Fifth Street
	Saint Patrick's Cathedral 56 Mission St.
	Rincon Annex Post Office 101 Spear St. (at Mission & Howard & Stuart)
	Audiffred Building 1 - 21 Mission St.
	El Capitan Theater & Hotel 2353 Mission St.
	The New Mission Theater 2550 Mission St.

Project-Level TEP Corridors	
	Juvenile Court and Detention Center 150 Otis St.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Second and Howard Streets (National Register)
TTRP.22_1	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	2501 Fillmore St. 2501 Fillmore St.
	Market St. Railway Substation 1190 Fillmore St.
	Mission San Francisco De Asis 300 Dolores St.
	Saint Francis Lutheran Church 152 Church St.
	Brown's Opera House 2961 16th St.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
TTRP.28_1	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	S.F. Gas Light Co. 3640 Buchanan St.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	The Presidio (National Register) Fort Mason (National Register)
TTRP.30_1	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	Clay Street Center 940 Powell St. & 965 Clay St.
	Met Life Pacific Coast Head Office 600 Stockton St.
	Hammersmith Building 301-303 Sutter Street
	The Mechanics Institute 57-65 Post St.
	Chronicle Building 690 Market St.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Apartment Hotel District (National Register)
	Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter (Article 11 Conservation District)

Project-Level TEP Corridors	
TTRP.J	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	Saint Francis Lutheran Church 152 Church St.
	Mission High School 3750 18th Street
	S.F. & San Mateo Railroad Co. Office Bld. 2301 San Jose Ave.
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Dolores Park (National Register)
TTRP.N	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
TTPI.1	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
OWE.1	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
OWE.2	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	The Presidio (National Register)
OWE.3	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Golden Gate Park (National Register)
OWE.4	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	Hibernia Bank 1 Jones St.
	City Hall Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
	War Memorial Building 401 Van Ness Avenue
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Alamo Square (Article 10t)
	Civic Center (Article 10 and National Register)
	Golden Gate Park (National Register)
OWE.5	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None

Project-Level TEP Corridors	
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	None
SCI.2	<i>Article 10 City Landmarks</i>
	None
	<i>Historic Districts</i>
	Jackson Square (Article 10 and National Register)


As noted within the Initial Study, both program-level and project-level components of TPS Toolkit Elements and Service-Related Capital Improvements would not result in the construction of any new structures that could have a substantial adverse effect on the visual setting of designated or eligible historic districts, including the Civic Center Historic District, Alamo Square Historic District, or Golden Gate Park Historic District. Physical alterations under program-level and project-level components of the TEP (such as, overhead wires, transit stop changes, lane modifications, parking and turn restrictions, traffic signal and stop sign changes, and pedestrian improvements) would not obscure views of historic architectural resources and would not be prominent features in the overall visual setting of historic architectural resources, where discernible at all. Both program-level and project-level components of TPS Toolkit Elements and Service-Related Capital Improvements would be visually unobtrusive and would not draw undue attention to themselves and away from character-defining features of historic architectural resources. Both program-level and project-level components of TPS Toolkit Elements and Service-Related Capital Improvements would be simple and utilitarian in design and would be visually differentiated from historic construction as to not create a false sense of historical development. Such alterations would also be reversible and could be readily removed in the future.

For the TPS Toolkit Elements and Service-Related Capital Improvements, the physical alterations would primarily occur within existing public roadways and facilities yards. Overhead wires would not be attached to any buildings under the proposed TEP, but would be affixed to existing or newly placed poles. No distinctive or historically significant street paving material is known to exist within any TTRP corridors or within the sites of Service-Related Capital Improvement Projects. Likewise, no historically significant street features (such as the Path of Gold Light Standards along Market Street [City Landmark # 200]) and landmark street trees (such as the palm trees within the Dolores Street median) are located within any TTRP corridors or within the sites of Service-Related Capital Improvement Projects under the proposed TEP.

As an example of the proposed work, a new boarding platform (measuring approximately 8-ft wide by 160-ft long) would be constructed on Church Street along the western edge of Dolores Park adjacent to 18th Street, as part of the TTRP.J. The construction of this boarding platform would result in a less than significant impact, since this area was once used for transit uses and would not impact any character-defining features of the Dolores Park. Additional analysis on this aspect of the project is provided within the environmental review for the proposed project at Dolores Park. Relative to the TTRP.J, this aspect of the project does not impact the overall historic character of Dolores Park, nor its eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Construction of program-level and project-level components of the TPS Toolkit Elements within TTRP Corridors and the Service-related Capital Improvement Projects would require various construction activities in the vicinity of historic architectural resources (e.g., asphalt and concrete removal, jack-hammering, excavation, compacting, paving, and construction equipment movements). However, these construction activities are commonplace in an urban environment and, with exercise of ordinary precautions, present no particular threat to historic architectural resources in the vicinity of such work resulting from vibration or collision. Additionally, no particularly fragile historic architectural resources have been identified within or adjacent to program-level and project-level components of the TPS Toolkit Elements within TTRP Corridors and the Service-related Capital Improvement Projects under the TEP.

PART II: SENIOR PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature: 
Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner

Date: 1-15-2013

cc: Debra Dwyer / Environmental Planning Division
Heidi Kline / Environmental Planning Division
Beth Skrondal / Historic Resource Survey Team
I:\Cases\2011\2011.0558

RS: G:\Documents\Environmental\2011.0558E SFMTA Transit Effectiveness Plan EIR\HRER_TEP_2013-01-07.doc