

HISTORIC PROPERTY SURVEY
VAN NESS AVENUE BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT
City of San Francisco, California



Prepared for:

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Prepared by:

PARSONS
50 Fremont Street, Suite 1500
San Francisco, CA 94105

January 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION.....	1
	Alternative 1.....	2
	Alternative 2.....	3
	Alternative 3.....	3
	Alternative 4.....	4
2	AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS.....	4
	Archaeological APE.....	4
	Architectural APE.....	6
3	CONSULTING PARTIES/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....	6
	Local Government Agencies.....	6
	Community Stakeholders.....	8
	Public Information Meetings.....	8
	Native American Tribes, Groups, and Individuals.....	9
	Local Historic Societies/Local Preservation Groups.....	9
4	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	10
	Prehistoric Archaeological Resources.....	10
	Historic-Era Archaeological Resources.....	11
5	BUILT ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES.....	12
6	SOURCES CONSULTED.....	14
7	FINDINGS.....	15

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT 1	MAPS AND EXHIBITS
	Regional Project Location Map
	Map of Project Limits
	APE Map for Archaeological and Historic Built Environmental Resources
ATTACHMENT 2	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL RESOURCES SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT
ATTACHMENT 3	HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY AND EVALUATION REPORT

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), in cooperation with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), proposes to implement bus rapid transit (BRT) improvements along Van Ness Avenue in San Francisco. A regional location map is provided in Attachment 1. Van Ness Avenue, also designated as US 101, is one of San Francisco's key north-south arterials connecting freeway entrances and exits to the south of the City with Lombard Street and the Golden Gate Bridge providing access north of the City. Van Ness Avenue is a six-lane arterial that carries a mix of cars, trucks, transit, pedestrians and bicycles. Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) totals approximately 46,000 vehicles within the project limits. The proposed BRT would be implemented along a 2.2 mile stretch of Van Ness Avenue (including a one-block portion of South Van Ness Avenue) in San Francisco, from Mission Street at the south to North Point Street at the north. A map depicting the project limits is provided in Attachment 1. Project improvements would be confined largely within the right-of-way along Van Ness Avenue. Four alternatives have been defined for the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT Project, including one no-build alternative and three build alternatives. All of the build alternatives include the following elements:

- Dedicated bus lanes/BRT transitway. BRT buses would operate in a lane dedicated to transit (except for Alternative 2, which would be traversable for turning and parking mixed traffic);
- Bus Vehicle. BRT would employ low-floor, higher capacity bus vehicles;
- High-quality stops/stations. Station platforms would be upgraded, providing larger shelters and improved wayfinding and information. Fewer stop locations would be provided than existing bus service, intended to reduce dwell time delays;
- Level boarding. The BRT buses would provide level boarding from curb to bus;
- Proof of payment / all-door boarding / fare prepayment. All-door boarding allows passengers with proof of payment, such as a Fast Pass, to board through any door;
- Transportation System Management (TSM) capabilities. The BRT build alternatives would include transit signal priority and other TSM features;
- Replacement of signal poles. Traffic signal poles may require replacement in order to implement TSM capabilities for the proposed BRT system. The center lane running BRT alternatives require replacement of existing signal poles at intersections to provide poles with mast arms;
- Streetscape improvements and amenities. Each BRT build alternative would include pedestrian safety improvements (corner bulbs and median refuge upgrades). Proposed amenities include pedestrian-scale sidewalk lighting, pedestrian countdown and audible signals at all BRT stations, and improved landscaping that also serves to buffer

pedestrians and waiting passengers from motor vehicle traffic. Additional pedestrian design guidelines include:

- No restrictions on pedestrian crossings at intersection legs;
 - Maximum of four lanes between pedestrian refuges;
 - Minimum four-foot wide pedestrian refuge, which extends through the crosswalk.
- OCS support pole/streetlight replacement. The SFMTA, together with San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) would replace the streetlights and trolley poles which function as support poles for MUNI's Overhead Contact System (OCS). This construction would be coordinated as part of the build alternatives, and would include removal of existing OCS support poles/streetlights, and installation of new poles with lights. In most cases, the new poles would be installed approximately three to five feet from existing poles longitudinally, and designed to handle modern loads as required by the BRT, and modern lighting requirements as required by the PUC.

Alternative 1: No-Build Alternative/Baseline/Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative

Alternative 1, the no-build alternative, would not include a BRT service. Alternative 1 considers projected demographic and land use characteristics in addition to proposed infrastructure and TSM capabilities improvements expected to be implemented independent of the Van Ness Avenue BRT Project by the near-term horizon year 2015. These infrastructure and transportation system improvements are planned to occur within the identified horizon years regardless of implementation of any proposed BRT build alternative. The infrastructure and transportation system improvements considered in Alternative 1 include the following:

- SFgo (Traffic signal infrastructure for real time traffic management). SFMTA plans to replace signal poles and install a new fiber optic traffic signal communications network on Van Ness Avenue that will allow traffic conditions to be monitored and adjusted in real time to actively manage operations and delays. Some replaced signal poles at intersections will include mast arms. SFgo will also implement transit signal priority, a TSM technique to speed up bus services at signalized intersections. Buses signal their impending arrival at the intersections to receive green lights.
- Low-floor buses. SFMTA is gradually converting its fleet to low-floor buses which will provide relatively level boarding and alighting.
- NextMuni real time passenger information. SFMTA is installing real-time bus arrival information displays (NextMuni) at major stops with shelters along Van Ness Avenue.
- Sidewalk/street lighting improvements. The DPW plans sidewalk landscaping improvements along Van Ness Avenue as part of the Van Ness Avenue Enhancements

Project. Proposed streetscape improvements include removal of sign clutter, enhanced existing bus stops and street furniture, installation of planter boxes, decorative paving, pedestrian scale lighting, and new landscaping along Van Ness Avenue between Mission and McAllister Streets. Although these measures do not affect transit operations directly, these programs will make stops more convenient, safer and attractive and thereby contribute to increased transit use.

- Pavement resurfacing. Caltrans plans to address pavement rehabilitation on Van Ness Avenue between Golden Gate Avenue and Lombard Street.
- OCS support pole/streetlight replacement. The SFMTA, together with DPW and the PUC, plans to replace the overhead wire catenary system and trolley pole/streetlights along Van Ness Avenue, which lack sufficient structural integrity to support existing and future loads. This effort may be implemented as a comprehensive replacement project, depending on funding availability, or as a phased maintenance program that would replace the most structurally compromised poles on a priority basis.

The aforementioned infrastructure and TSM improvements are planned by local transportation agencies to occur by 2015, independent of the build alternatives proposed as part of the Van Ness Avenue BRT Project.

Alternative 2: Curb Lane BRT with Parallel Parking

Alternative 2 is a build alternative that would provide a dedicated bus lane in the rightmost lane of Van Ness Avenue in both the northbound and southbound directions, next to the existing parallel parking strip. The bus lanes, though distinguished by colored pavement, would be traversable for mixed traffic which would enter the bus lanes to parallel park in the curb strip or make a right turn. BRT stations would be located within the parking strip as extensions to the sidewalk, eliminating the need for buses to pull out of the bus lane to pick up passengers.

Under this alternative, the existing OCS support and power delivery system would remain in service, although the existing OCS support poles/ streetlights (trolley poles) would be replaced.

Alternative 2 includes the following features of BRT previously described: dedicated bus lanes, higher capacity bus vehicles, level boarding, high-quality stops/stations, streetscape improvements and amenities, proof of payment/all door boarding/fare prepayment, replacement of signal poles, TSM capabilities, OCS support pole/streetlight and power delivery system replacement.

Alternative 3: Center Lane BRT with Right-Side Boarding/Dual Medians

Alternative 3 is a build alternative that would convert the existing landscaped median and portions of the two inside traffic lanes, both northbound and southbound, to dedicated bus lanes separated from mixed traffic by dual landscaped medians. The medians would be approximately four feet to nine feet wide in many locations. Station platforms would be located on the right-side median, allowing right-side boarding.

Alternative 3 includes the following features of BRT previously described: dedicated bus lanes, higher capacity bus vehicles, level boarding, high-quality stops/stations, streetscape improvements and amenities, proof of payment/all door boarding/fare prepayment, replacement of signal poles, TSM capabilities, OCS support pole/streetlight and power delivery system replacement.

Alternative 4: Center Lane BRT with Left-Side Boarding/Center Median

Alternative 4 would convert the inside lane of mixed traffic in each direction into a dedicated bus lane operating adjacent to the existing landscaped median. Station platforms would be located on the single center median, requiring left-side passenger loading and unloading. Bus vehicles serving this route would need doors on the left and right sides of the vehicle to allow service to both the left-side BRT platforms and right-side stops throughout the non-BRT portions of the routes.

Alternative 4 includes the following features of a BRT previously described: dedicated bus lanes, higher capacity bus vehicles, level boarding, high-quality stops/stations, streetscape improvements and amenities, proof of payment/all door boarding/fare prepayment, replacement of signal poles, TSM capabilities OCS support pole/streetlight and power delivery system replacement.

2. AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

The archaeological and architectural Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the project are shown on maps (six sheets) provided in Attachment 1. The APEs have been set large enough to accommodate minor project changes. The proposed project will reconfigure the existing roadway cross section to provide for dedicated bus lanes and transit platforms, while upgrading pedestrian safety and urban design features. Left and right turn pocket locations will be adjusted to smooth traffic flow and reduce conflicts with transit. With the exception of localized improvements for turn lanes and intersection corner bulbs, modification to existing traffic signals and replacement of existing OCS support poles/streetlights, the majority of the improvements occur within the existing curb-to-curb pavement. No right of way acquisition is anticipated for the project. A description of the archaeological and architectural APEs follows.

Archaeological APE

The archaeological APE boundary represents the maximum footprint anticipated for areas that may be disturbed by the project. It includes reconfiguration and reconstruction of the existing pavement structural section, curb bulb and other sidewalk improvements, station platform improvements, potential relocation of handicap parking areas and associated curb ramps, replacement of the existing OCS support poles/streetlights and associated trenching, potential utility relocations, and on-site construction staging areas. The archaeological APE nominally follows the back of sidewalk (right of way line) on Van Ness Avenue throughout the project

limits, but extends an additional 50 feet on certain cross streets, where a potential need to provide for replacement handicap parking has been identified. Approximate areas and depths of anticipated construction activities requiring earthwork are provided in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, traffic signal poles will require the deepest excavation, up to 16 feet below modern ground surface (bgs) in an approximate three foot diameter area. Additional deep excavations will include removal and replacement of the existing OCS support poles and relocation of a sewer pipeline at proposed station platform locations. Remaining earthwork would occur within 5.5 feet bgs.

Table 1. Anticipated Construction Areas and Excavation Depths

Construction Item	Area	Depth¹
OCS Support Pole Replacement	3.0 ft diameter excavation area, within sidewalk; located throughout project limits.	11.0 ft
OCS Conduit Trench	2.0 ft wide trench, within sidewalk; located throughout project limits.	3.0 ft
Sewer Pipeline Relocation	6.0 ft wide trench, within street; replace or relocate within the BRT lanes under project Alternative 3; relocate outside of platform areas proposed under project Alternative 4.	11.5 ft
Traffic Signal Poles	3.0 ft diameter excavation area, located at intersections throughout project limits.	16.0 ft
Controller Cabinets	2.5 ft x 4.0 ft excavation area, located within the sidewalk at intersections throughout project limits.	3.0 ft
Curb Bulbs & Sidewalk Reconstruction	Approximate 30 ft of full-width sidewalk disturbance area, located at intersections throughout project limits (vary by project alternative).	1.5 ft
Pavement Rehabilitation	Curb-to-curb rehabilitation or resurfacing under each project alternative.	0.7 ft
Pavement Reconstruction	Spot improvements as needed to travel lanes and parking lanes to remedy failed pavement areas.	1.5 ft
New Pavement	22.0 ft wide area within median throughout project limits, under project Alternative 3.	1.5 ft
Station Platform	8.0 ft – 14.0 ft wide by 150.0 ft long area at platforms, platform locations vary by project alternative.	1.0 ft
Station Canopy Foundation	2.5 ft diameter excavation area at platforms, platform locations vary by project alternative.	5.0 ft

¹ Depth below ground surface (bgs).

Architectural APE

The APE for the built environment encompasses areas that could be directly or indirectly affected by the project. The proposed project will take place within the existing street right of way; therefore, direct effects are anticipated within the existing street and sidewalk area, while indirect effects could occur within specific areas adjacent to project facilities that could cause a change in character or use of historic properties.

The architectural APE boundary is generally aligned with the outside edge of the sidewalks along both sides of Van Ness Avenue (current right of way line). The APE encompasses Van Ness Avenue and the sidewalks along both sides, and an area one parcel deep at those locations where a side platform associated with a new BRT stop is proposed because the platforms could indirectly affect immediately adjacent historic resources. In the case of the San Francisco Civic Center Historic District, the APE is drawn to encompass those portions of the district directly fronting proposed side platforms, which includes City Hall and the War Memorial complex.

3. CONSULTING PARTIES / PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In compliance with NEPA and CEQA requirements, the SFCTA conducted a formal scoping process to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the Van Ness Avenue BRT Project. During the scoping period, the SFCTA gathered information from agencies and interested members of the public regarding their questions and concerns related to the proposed project. Comments received during the scoping process assisted the SFCTA and FTA in their review and evaluation of possible BRT alternatives evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

As part of preparation of the Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report (HRIER) and Archaeological Sensitivity Study, local historic preservation groups in addition to Native American tribes, groups, and individuals were contacted and provided the opportunity to review these reports and provide input. A summary of consulting parties and public participation follows.

Local Government Agencies

Since initiation of the Van Ness Avenue BRT Feasibility Study in 2004, the SFCTA has met with several local government agencies including: San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Planning Commission, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA – including the departments of parking and traffic, transit planning/operations/facilities management, and livable streets), Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District (GGT), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 4 and Headquarters, San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFDPW), and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC),

San Francisco Mayor's Office on Disabilities, Mayor's Office of Greening, San Francisco Department of the Environment, and the multi-agency Transportation Working Group (TWG) and Director's Working Group (DWG). Many of these government agencies are members of the project Technical Advisory Committee, discussed below. During the feasibility study starting in 2004, SFCTA met with many of these same agencies more than 30 times. As part of the Caltrans review process, SFCTA meets regularly with the Caltrans Project Development Team.

On August 6, 2009 the SFCTA held a meeting with historic preservation staff from the San Francisco Planning Department regarding cultural resources and the Draft HRIER. Planning Department staff questioned some of the recommendations for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources, and requested additional consideration of the OCS support poles/streetlights as possessing significance from the 1936 era. Also, Planning Department staff suggested that some of the buildings assessed for eligibility in the Draft HRIER be identified as requiring consideration in local planning due to potential local significance. As a result of this meeting, the text was revised in several locations in the Draft HRIER, as were the accompanying DPR evaluation forms. The OHP Status Codes for eight of the studied properties were re-assigned to status code "6L." Code 6L recognizes that a resource may merit special consideration in local planning. On September 2, 2009 and January 8, 2010, SFCTA hosted meetings to follow-up with Planning Department staff to allow for an internal dialogue among members of the local government project team, including DPW, PUC, MTA, and Planning. SFCTA further discussed the current status of the proposed project and explained how the Draft HRIER had been revised pursuant to the comments received from Planning.

On October 26, 2009 SFCTA met with Caltrans District 4 Office of Cultural Resources staff to discuss responses to Caltrans' comments on the Draft HPS/HRIER. Following review of the first Draft HPS, Caltrans requested improved documentation of Native American consultation, and sought more robust quantification of integrity findings on the OCS support poles/streetlights. A revised HRIER was submitted to Caltrans for review, which included additional information on the comprehensive, physical, pole-by-pole survey conducted as part of the integrity analysis. The revised HRIER was reviewed by qualified Caltrans District 4 staff and by three architectural historians at Caltrans Headquarters. Following review and discussion with SFCTA in a meeting on December 3, 2009, Caltrans concurred with the HRIER findings.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Based on agency interest expressed during the project scoping period, the SFCTA established the Van Ness Avenue BRT Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), composed of technical staff from the FTA, Caltrans, SFDPW, San Francisco Planning Department, GGT; PUC; and MTA. Between October 2007 and July 2009, the TAC has had six meetings to provide technical input concerning the project including focused meetings on engineering designs; station platform

designs; landscaping; OCS support poles/streetlights; construction approach; and circulation. Sub-TAC groups have been assembled and held technical input meetings to focus on the OCS support poles/streetlights replacement and upgrade component of the proposed project. This sub-TAC group organized an inter-agency contract between DPW (project management, engineering, and architecture), MTA, PUC, and the Authority to specifically cover the OCS support poles/streetlights replacement and upgrade, and describe how DPW is providing engineering and architectural services in support of replacement poles development.

Community Stakeholders

During the Feasibility Study (adopted by the Authority and SFMTA Boards in 2006), SFCTA conducted extensive outreach including meetings with stakeholder groups in the project corridor and citywide to identify and discuss project concerns, potential impacts, and respond to questions with local community leaders and representatives. An agency scoping meeting was held on October 4, 2007, and since then SFCTA has met with more than 30 local community and business groups, including: Build SF Youth, Cow Hollow Association, Pacific Heights Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons, Lower Polk Neighbors, Russian Hill Neighbors, Middle Polk Neighborhood Association, Tenant Associations Coalition of San Francisco, Tenderloin Futures Collaborative, San Francisco Planning and Urban Research (SPUR), California Pacific Medical Center, Sierra Club, Civic Center Stakeholders Group (Opera House, Veteran's Memorial Building, San Francisco Symphony, San Francisco Ballet, San Francisco Conservatory of Music), Transportation and Land Use Coalition (now Transform), Lighthouse for the Blind, Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association, Pacific Heights Residents, Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee, WalkSF, Livable City, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, and conducted door-to-door merchant outreach.

Public Information Meetings

The scoping process included two officially noticed agency and public scoping meetings:

- Public meeting – Tuesday, October 2, 2007
Holiday Inn Golden Gateway on Van Ness Avenue at Pine
6:00 – 8:00 PM
- Public meeting – Thursday, October 4, 2007
SFCTA offices on Van Ness Avenue at Fell
6:00 – 8:00 PM

The scoping meetings drew 150 participants. Materials used during the scoping meetings included exhibits and handouts distributed at the meetings and through SFCTA's Internet website, in addition to comment cards.

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

The SFCTA established the Van Ness Avenue BRT Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) comprised of citizens living in or near the project area. Members of the committee were selected by SFCTA's Board of Commissioners to represent various interests of community and business stakeholders throughout the corridor. The CAC provides viewpoints of the community, as expressed by committee members. Between 2004 and September 2009, the CAC has had 12 meetings to provide community input concerning the project. All of these meetings are open to the public and are publicized on both the SFCTA website as well as through mailings and emails to the project outreach database which contains more than 700 contacts. The results of the HRIER were presented to the CAC on July 14, 2009. The CAC expressed positive feedback about the report and study findings. One CAC member requested that indirect impacts to historic properties from redirected traffic on surrounded streets be considered.

Native American Tribes, Groups and Individuals

A request was made to the California Native American Heritage Commission to conduct a search of their Sacred Lands Files to determine if known cultural sites were within or near the APE for the proposed project. The Commission responded stating that no Native American cultural resources were reported in the Sacred Lands Files records search. A list of interested Native American groups and individuals was also provided, and subsequently all five contacts on that list were sent letters requesting input on the cultural resources study. One individual responded, asking to receive a copy of the archaeological study upon its completion. A copy of the report was provided.

Local Historical Societies / Historic Preservation Groups

A "Letter to Interested Parties" summarizing the proposed project and intent to identify possible or existing historic resources within the project APE was mailed on June 12, 2009. The mailing included an APE map. The letter was mailed to individuals that during the public outreach process had identified themselves as interested in historic issues. The letter was also mailed to organizations and agencies known to have an interest in historic issues in San Francisco, including the following:

Organizations

- San Francisco Architectural Heritage
- San Francisco History Association
- San Francisco Beautiful
- San Francisco Museum and Historical Society
- San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
- The Victorian Alliance
- Civic Center Stakeholder Group

- Fort Point National Historic Site
- Art Deco Society of California
- California Heritage Council
- California Historical Society
- CSAA Archives & Historical Services
- Cathedral Hill/Van Ness Neighborhood Association
- American Institute of Architects
- International Committee on Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighborhoods of the Modern Movement (DOCOMOMO) US/Northern California
- National Trust for Historic Preservation, Western Office
- California Preservation Foundation

Agencies

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- San Francisco Planning Department
- California Office of Historic Preservation

To date, one response to the “Letter to Interested Parties” was received. Correspondence with James Haas, coordinator of Civic Center Stakeholders Group, is documented in Appendix C of the HRIER. He suggests a PhD thesis on the lighting of the Pan Pacific International Exposition may be of use to the project, and that replacement OCS support poles should maintain a look consistent with the existing poles. The thesis was reviewed by JRP, who determined that the OCS support poles/streetlights are not discussed.

4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Archaeological and Native American Cultural Resources Sensitivity Assessment prepared by Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc. discusses the types of potentially significant archaeological resources that could be present in the project area, and identifies general locations where these resources may be found with degrees of sensitivity based on geomorphology, historic land use, and previous investigations. These include prehistoric and historic-era archaeological resources.

Prehistoric Archaeological Resources

A records search did not reveal previous prehistoric investigations in the project area. Nonetheless, the study states that there is potential to encounter prehistoric archaeological resources within the project APE, as shown in Table 2 and depicted in Figure 6 of the Archaeological and Native American Cultural Resources Sensitivity Assessment (Attachment 2 of this HPS). The prehistoric archaeological sensitivity analysis distinguishes between sites that may be situated on the 1850s ground surface and those that may lie deeply buried below that

surface (assessed in relative terms from high to very low potential). Certain segments of the project APE have been identified as potentially sensitive to shallow impacts and other segments are potentially sensitive to deep impacts. The sensitivity analysis concludes it is likely that any intact prehistoric site with integrity discovered in these contexts will be National Register-eligible since few prehistoric sites have been documented on the northern San Francisco peninsula.

Table 2. Prehistoric Archaeological Site Sensitivity within the APE

Project Segment	1850 Ground Surface	Deeply Buried
Northern APE limit to Chestnut Street	High sensitivity potential	High sensitivity potential
Chestnut Street to Pacific Avenue	High sensitivity potential	Very low sensitivity Potential
Pacific Avenue to McAllister Street	Low sensitivity potential	Low sensitivity potential
McAllister Street to southern APE limit	Moderal to high sensitivity potential	Moderal to high sensitivity potential

Historic-era Archaeological Resources

A records search revealed 24 previous historic-era archaeological studies within or abutting the project APE. These include 15 surveys, six background studies, and three excavation/monitoring projects. These studies document seven historic-era archaeological resources that either abut or fall within the project APE, including: the Fort Mason Bateria National Register District (P-38-00032), a trash scatter (900 Van Ness Avenue), three historic features (two railway line remnants and an artifact feature), two isolated artifacts (a key and a bottle), and evidence of historic infrastructure elements underlying modern Van Ness Avenue. Historic era resources include Spanish and Mexican-era remains, evidence of city infrastructure including cable car lines, artifact deposits, and structural remains of buildings.

The assessment notes four types of potentially significant artifact deposits that might be encountered within the archaeological APE:

1. Artifact deposits associated with street or utility improvements and refuse disposal may have been used as fill. Trenching on Van Ness Avenue has encountered such evidence.
2. Artifact deposits or other cultural remains associated with Fort Mason may be present under pavement in the northern reaches of Van Ness Avenue. Early maps show the road meandered around natural landscape features. It is possible, therefore, that artifact deposits or other features pre-dating the current road may be preserved under fill.
3. The one block long Market Street to Mission Street section of South Van Ness Avenue in the southern end of the project area was constructed through an existing neighborhood in the 1920s. It is likely that extension of Van Ness Avenue through this area would have

encompassed back-yard refuse deposits and perhaps privies from these residences. Such features may have survived the road construction and subsequent roadway improvements.

4. Many commercial buildings located on Van Ness Avenue south of California Street had freight access via sidewalk openings, allowing for deliveries and shipments. These were filled-in prior to a road widening project in the mid-1930s, providing an opportunity for the disposal of unwanted refuse and potentially significant artifact deposits.

Because these potential archaeological resource locations are in a densely developed urban setting, subsurface investigation to determine presence of archaeological resources individually eligible for the NRHP and or any contributing site to a historic district was not possible.

5. HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report (HRIER) prepared by JRP Historical Consulting, LLC identifies 30 potential historic resources located within the Architectural APE. There are 27 potential individual historic built environment resources, and three multi-component historic resources, the latter consisting of the San Francisco Civic Center / Birthplace of the United Nations (War Memorial Complex) Historic District; the Van Ness Avenue corridor; and an OCS support pole/streetlight (trolley pole) system that is located along both sides of Van Ness Avenue, between Market Street and North Point Street.

Of the 30 potential historic resources, the study identifies three historic properties with previous standing in the NRHP, CRHR, or other formal listings. In addition, the study concludes that four properties evaluated as part of this project appear to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and CRHR. Table 3 lists these properties, which are discussed in detail in the HRIER provided as Attachment 3 of this HPS.

The remaining 23 resources identified within the APE do not appear eligible for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, and are not considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. The majority of the resources do not meet the criteria for listing because of a lack of significance; however, those few that do possess potential significance have all experienced substantial compromises in their integrity and do not appear eligible for listing because of these extensive alterations and changes over time. These 23 resources are discussed in detail in the HRIER (Attachment 3).

Table 3. Status of Historic Resources within the Project APE

Historic Resources	Status
<i>Properties with Previous Standing</i>	
San Francisco Civic Center Historic District/War Memorial Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Historic Landmark; • NRHP listed; • CRHR listed; • San Francisco Historic District.
11-35 Van Ness Avenue (Masonic Temple)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determined eligible for NRHP listing; • determined eligible for CRHR listing, • San Francisco Category I (Significant) building.
1699 Van Ness Avenue (Paige Motor Car Company Building)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRHP listed; • CRHR listed.
<i>Properties Identified Eligible</i>	
799 Van Ness Avenue (automobile garage)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets the criteria for NRHP listing; • meets the criteria for CRHR listing.
945-999 Van Ness (automobile showroom)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets the criteria for NRHP listing; • meets the criteria for CRHR listing.
1320 Van Ness Avenue (Scottish Rite Temple)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets the criteria for NRHP listing; • meets the criteria for CRHR listing.
1946 Van Ness Avenue (Oakland Motor Auto Company Showroom)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets the criteria for NRHP listing; • meets the criteria for CRHR listing.

6. SOURCES CONSULTED

- California Inventory of Historic Resources;
- California Historical Landmarks;
- California Points of Historical Interest;
- Caltrans Historic Highway Bridge Inventory;
- Archaeological Site Records (Refer to the Archaeological and Native American Cultural Resources Sensitivity Assessment for the Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project);
- American Museum of Natural History, New York;
- Anthropology Department, University of California-Berkeley;
- Archaeological Research Facility, University of California-Berkeley;
- California Department of Water Resources, Sacramento;
- California Division of Mines and Geology, San Francisco;
- California Historical Society;
- City of San Francisco Planning Department;
- Department of Anthropology, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park;
- Department of Anthropology, Texas A&M University, College Station;
- Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles;
- Map Libraries, United States Geological Survey;
- National Park Service;
- Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park;
- Office of Historic Preservation;
- San Francisco History Center;
- San Francisco Public Library;
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission;
- San Francisco State University Library;
- Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC;
- The Center for Archaeological Research, University of California, Davis;
- The Santa Cruz Archaeological Society, Santa Cruz;
- United States Coast and Geodetic Survey;
- University of California-Berkeley: Bancroft Library.

7. FINDINGS

There are properties eligible for inclusion in the National Register within the APE of the proposed project.

- Three properties are listed in or previously determined eligible for listing in the National Register. These properties are shown in Table 3 above, in addition to Tables 1 and 2 of the Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report which is provided as Attachment 3 of this HPS.
- Four properties appear to be eligible for listing in the National Register. These properties are shown in Table 3 above, in addition to Table 4 of the Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report which is provided as Attachment 3 of this HPS.

There are properties 45 years old or more that are not eligible for inclusion the National Register within the APE of the proposed project, and SHPO's concurrence in this determination is requested.

- Twenty-three (23) properties do not appear to be eligible for listing in the National Register. These properties are listed in Table 6 of the Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report which is provided as Attachment 3 of this HPS.

Finding of Effect on Historic Properties. Separate finding of effect documentation will be prepared pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for the SHPO's review and concurrence.

