

## **5.14 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

The regulatory framework governing treatment of historic and cultural resources is detailed in Section 4.16. This DEIS/DEIR affords the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) early notice, pursuant to California PRC 5024.5(a), of a project potentially affecting resources listed in, or eligible for, the California Register of Historic Resources. A summary of effects to historic resources has been prepared in advance of the formal Finding of Effects document and its results are presented herein. A formal Finding of Effects report will be prepared and submitted to the SHPO for concurrence once a preferred alternative has been identified.

There are no impacts to historic and cultural resources as a result of the No-Project Alternative. The remainder of this section focuses on impacts of the three components of the proposed project.

### **5.14.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: IMPACTS**

#### **5.14.1.1 Prehistoric Archaeology**

Although five prehistoric archaeological sites have been recorded within approximately one mile of the area of potential effects (APE), no known prehistoric archaeological sites are documented within the APE. Unidentified sites may exist, however, and could be affected by the implementation of any project alternative. Appropriate procedures for the treatment of such finds are identified in the mitigation section below.

#### **5.14.1.2 Historic Archaeology**

Nineteen known or potential historic-era archaeological sites have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the APE.

The entire APE is covered by buildings or pavement, as well as great depths of artificial fill, and it is not possible to determine the locations of archaeological sites that may be affected by construction without extensive fieldwork. An archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan, as described in the mitigation section, will be prepared once detailed construction plans for the proposed project are approved. This plan will govern testing, evaluation, and assessment of impacts to any such resources, and describe appropriate treatment strategies.

Areas of high historic archaeological sensitivity include the whole Transbay Terminal Redevelopment Area, the Second-to-Main Alternative alignment, and the Second-to-Mission Alternative alignment – particularly those portions that are not within areas that have long been used as roadways. Portions of the alternative alignments that pass under existing/long-standing roadways – for example Second and Townsend Streets – are generally less sensitive than areas where development has been present for many years.

**5.14.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: MITIGATION**

Mitigation measures for archaeological and historic architectural resources would be set forth in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to be executed by the JPB, the City and County of San Francisco, FTA, ACHP, and SHPO, as appropriate.

The MOA would include an Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan to avoid and mitigate potential impacts to archaeological resources. The plan would provide for organizing the various phases of archaeological work – identification, evaluation, and data recovery – into a single pre-approved plan covering the treatment of all on-site archaeological properties, and help to avoid lengthy interruptions of construction activities. The Plan would cover any additional archaeological research investigation standards and procedures, field excavation strategies, monitoring, artifact handling and analysis procedures, treatment of human remains, and ownership and curation of materials. Requirements for final reporting of all field methods, results, and findings would also be specified. Finally, the Plan would ensure that all federal and State laws and regulations regarding the treatment of Native American cultural materials and Native American burials would be adhered to, including appropriate notification of the California Native American Heritage Commission and local Native American organizations regarding findings of Native American artifacts.<sup>18</sup>

The Plan would be developed with the coordination and concurrence of ACHP, FTA, SHPO, and the City and County of San Francisco’s Environmental Review Officer (ERO) in accordance with ACHP and the Secretary of the Interior’s standards and guidelines (36 CFR 800.9 (c) (1)). The various phases of work would be performed under the supervision of professional archaeologists who meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior’s qualification standards.

Copies of the final reports on these archaeological investigations would be provided to the ACHP, SHPO, the Historical Resources Information System, the Northwest Information Center of California Archaeological Inventory, the San Francisco Planning Department, and the San Francisco Public Library.

If human remains are encountered during construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.88.

---

<sup>18</sup> Reference would be made to the Archaeological Research Design/Treatment Plan for the Embarcadero Freeway Replacement/Terminal Separator Structure Project, Holman & Associates, 1996, which covers a similar geographic area and deals with many of the same potential archaeological resources as the proposed project.

### 5.14.3 HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES: IMPACTS

Historic architectural resources identified within the project APE consist of individual buildings and structures, some of which are contributors to two districts that are eligible or appear to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). These are the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse-Industrial District and the Second and Howard Streets Historic District. Both NRHP districts have boundaries somewhat overlapping two local historic districts designated by the City of San Francisco, the South End Historic District, and the New Montgomery – Second Street Conservation District. Resources listed on or determined eligible for listing on the NRHP, either individually or as contributors to an historic district, are identified in Table 4.16-1. The NRHP and City of San Francisco historic districts are described in Sections 4.16.6.3 through 4.16.6.7.

Impacts to historical architectural resources are reported by major project component; impacts to individual resources are presented first, followed by impacts to the NRHP and local historic districts.

#### 5.14.3.1 Impacts of Transbay Terminal Alternatives

Either Transbay Terminal alternative would require demolition and removal of the existing Transbay Terminal, a resource that is individually eligible for the National Register and that is also a contributing element to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, an NRHP-eligible resource. Both Transbay Terminal alternatives would also require demolition and removal of the existing Terminal Loop Ramp, another contributing element of the Bay Bridge property. The demolition of these structures would constitute an adverse effect on the historical resources under Section 106 and under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

#### 5.14.3.2 Impacts of Caltrain Downtown Extension Alternatives

Either Caltrain Downtown Extension alternative would result in the acquisition and demolition of buildings that are eligible or contributory to a district that is eligible for listing in the NRHP.

**The Cut-and-Cover Option** for either the Second-to-Main Alternative or the Second-to-Mission Alternative would result in the demolition of 13 historic buildings, 10 of which are contributors to the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse-Industrial District, and three of which are contributors to the Second and Howard Streets Historic District. These demolitions would constitute an adverse effect on the historical resources under Section 106 and under CEQA. A construction easement through the corner of the property occupied by a fourteenth contributory property (Rincon Point/South Beach Historic Warehouse-Industrial District) would also be required. The construction easement would be necessary to construct the Caltrain subway beneath the southeast corner of the building at 166-78 Townsend Street. The building would be underpinned during construction and maintained in place. There would be no adverse effect to this building from the construction easement.

**The Tunneling Option** for either the Second-to-Main or Second-to-Mission Alternative would substantially reduce the impacts to historic resources. This Option would result in the demolition of three historic buildings that are contributors to the Second and Howard Streets Historic District but would not affect the buildings within the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic District. The buildings that would be demolished under the Tunneling Option are the same three contributors to the Second and Howard Streets District that would be demolished under the Cut-and-Cover Option. The demolitions would constitute an adverse effect on the historical resources under Section 106 and under CEQA.

A construction easement through the southeast corner of the property occupied by the building at 166-78 Townsend Street, which is a contributory property to the Rincon Point/South Beach Historic Warehouse-Industrial District, would also be required. There would be no adverse effect to this building from the construction easement. The building would be underpinned during construction and maintained in place.

### **5.14.3.3 Redevelopment Components**

Neither of the redevelopment component alternatives (Full Build or Reduced Scope) would result in an adverse effect to historic properties.

### **5.14.3.4 Affected Properties**

Brief descriptions of the historic properties that would be affected by the project are provided in the following paragraphs and accompanying figures. Individual NRHP-eligible properties are described first, followed by the NRHP districts and their contributory properties. The effects on the NRHP and locally designated districts are then discussed. The NRHP and City of San Francisco historic districts are described in detail in Sections 4.16.6.3 through 4.16.6.7.

**Transbay Terminal.** The Transbay Terminal at 425 Mission Street occupies land extending from Mission Street on the north to Natoma Street on the south; the terminal building crosses Fremont Street on the east and First Street on the west. It was designed by Timothy Pfleuger, Arthur Brown, Jr., and John J. Donovan, consulting architects. Built in 1939, the Transbay Terminal was the “functional successor to the Ferry Building. When electric trains began arriving over the Bay Bridge, use of the Ferry Building dropped to almost nothing overnight, and the Transbay Terminal took over as the primary gateway to the city.” (Caltrans, 1983). The Terminal has been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by consensus of the SHPO and a federal agency (FHWA) and is considered as a contributory element to the historic significance of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB). The present owner of the Transbay Terminal is Caltrans. Its current use is for commuter and inter- and intra-regional bus transportation.

**Transbay Terminal Loop Ramp.** The Transbay Terminal loop ramp structure constitutes two of the six approach spans that remain from the original SFOBB project. It is considered a contributing element of the Bay Bridge. Originally designed to carry trolley trains from the bridge to the terminal, the ramp's tracks were removed as electrified trains gave way to buses in the late 1950s. The terminal loop ramp currently serves bus traffic exclusively and is used for midday storage of transit buses.

**San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge.** The San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB) is an eight and one-half-mile-long series of connecting structures carrying two levels of traffic between San Francisco and Oakland. Opened to service in 1936, in its original design, the bridge upper level carried two-way auto traffic while the lower level carried truck and trolley traffic. Structurally, the bridge is distinctive in its use of a variety of bridge-building technologies, the length of its 1,400-foot cantilever channel span on the east (Oakland) side, and the length of the two 2,320-foot suspension spans on the west (San Francisco) side. The outstanding engineering feature is the center pier between the two suspension spans of the western half of the bridge. The tunnel connection between the east and west spans on Yerba Buena Island was the first double-decked highway tunnel in the United States. Notable individuals connected with the project were Charles H. Purcell, Chief Engineer; Charles E. Andrew, Bridge Engineer; Glenn B. Woodruff, Design Engineer; and T. L. Pfleuger, Arthur Brown, Jr., and John J. Donovan, consulting architects. The SFOBB was evaluated by Caltrans in 1983 as meeting National Register eligibility criteria A, B, and C at the national level; it was determined eligible for listing in 1985.

**Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse-Industrial District.** The Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse-Industrial District was identified and designated by the 1983 survey by Caltrans. It was developed beginning in the 1850s and 1860s, when landfill efforts and warehouse construction changed the physical appearance of the “point” and “beach” forever. This district contains the greatest concentration of architectural resources within the project vicinity. The district was identified as appearing eligible for the NRHP in 1983, based on research completed by Caltrans historians for the I-280 Transfer Concept Project. That research found that the district appeared eligible under all four National Register criteria. About 60 buildings within the district have been identified as contributing to the district's significance. Approximately eight of these buildings date from before the 1906 San Francisco earthquake, with several from the mid-1800s.

The Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse Industrial District has also been designated locally significant and is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Places.

In 1985, the San Francisco Department of City Planning (DCP) proposed the “South End Historic District,” and the City Planning Commission designated this district in February 1990 under Article 10, Historic Preservation. The South End Historic District had nearly identical boundaries and was nearly the same size as the Rincon Point District identified by Caltrans; it is described in detail in Section 4.16.6,7. The National Register status of properties, whether

recognized as part of the South End District or Rincon Point / South Beach District, is the same. For purposes of CEQA, these properties are considered historic resources.

**Second and Howard Streets Historic District.** Ann Bloomfield prepared a National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Second and Howard Streets District in 1998. This small district consists of 19 contributing properties and three non-contributors (two heavily-altered buildings and a vacant lot) with addresses on Second, Howard, Natoma and New Montgomery Streets. The contributing buildings date from 1906 to 1912; the primary original uses of these buildings were wholesaling, light manufacturing, and printing. The area was built for services to the construction industry. The permit for the first building to be erected in the District was approved on July 5, 1906, just two and a half months following the 1906 earthquake and fire.

The Second and Howard Streets Historic District is partially surrounded by a locally recognized district known as the “New Montgomery – Second Street Conservation District.” This district is described in detail in Section 4.16.6.5. The San Francisco Planning Commission uses the conservation district designation to recognize parts of the city that have substantial concentrations of “special architectural and aesthetic importance.” For purposes of CEQA, these properties are considered historic resources.

### **130 Townsend Street**

A one-story warehouse of brick masonry construction, this property lies within the boundaries of the Rincon Point/South Beach Historic Warehouse - Industrial District and is considered a contributor to the district. The Caltrans 1983 survey dated this building ca. 1910, but information



obtained for the 1996 survey from the San Francisco Architectural Heritage (SFAH) indicated that the building appears to have been built in 1895 or 1896 and was first occupied by Stevens, Arnold and Co., agents for Inglenook Vineyard of Napa County. By 1906, the property was owned by Gustave Niebaum of the Alaska Commercial Company. Under the name B. Arnhold Company, the original tenants remained until the 1920s.

**136 Townsend Street**

This two-story and clerestory industrial building was dated 1902 by the Caltrans 1983 survey, but information obtained from SFAH for the 1996 survey suggested that it was designed in 1913 by engineer R.V. Woods for L.A. Norris of the Clinton Fireproofing Company and was originally used for wire and iron storage. The building was twice its current width, but in 1922, the southern half was replaced with the more substantial structure at 144 Townsend Street for the same company. It lies within the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse Industrial District, to which it is considered a contributing element.



**144-46 Townsend Street**

This three-story reinforced concrete warehouse with decorated façade was designed and built in 1922 by architect H.C. Bauman for the Clinton Construction Company (L.A. Norris, owner); it was originally used for storage of wholesale wire. This building is within the Rincon Point / South Beach



Historic Warehouse Industrial District and is considered a contributing element to the district.

**148-154 Townsend Street**

This building is within the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse Industrial District and is considered a contributing element to the district. A three-story, reinforced concrete warehouse in the Mediterranean style, it was designed by H.C. Bauman and Edward Jose in 1922



for the Winchester-Simmons Company, wholesale dealers in hardware, guns, and ammunition. By 1950, the building was occupied by Western Asbestos Company.

**162-164 Townsend Street**

This building was designed by H.C. Bauman for the L.A. Norris Company and was built by the Clinton Construction Company in 1919. By 1929, it was occupied by the Central Warehouse and Drayage Company. Work being done on the building during the 1996 survey included removal of the



sign for West Coast Ship Chandlers at the front. This building is within the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse Industrial District and is considered a contributing element to the district.

**166-168 Townsend Street**

This distinctive building was dated 1910 by Caltrans in 1983, but information obtained from SFAH for the 1996 survey suggests that it was designed by Percy and Hamilton in 1888 for the California Electric Light Company, which may have been the first public electric power company in the state; it first generated electricity for the public in 1879.



On August 1, 1888, the company was awarded the contract for lighting outlying districts of San Francisco, and this building may have been built to address the need for extra capacity. By 1894, ownership was held by the Edison Light & Power Company and by 1901, it had passed to the San Francisco Gas and Electric Company, which made it their Arc Light Plant Station B. By December of 1905, this building was no longer in operation for electricity service, probably because a new plant was built across Townsend Street.



From 1908 to 1927, the building was used for hay and grain storage and as a feed mill (W.W. Robinson Co., 1908-1910 and Producers Hay Co., 1913-1927). The high stack at the rear of the building was removed in 1995, following damage in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. This alteration would affect its potential for individual eligibility, but the rest of the large building remains, and it remains a contributor to the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse District.

### 640 Second Street

Another Bauman design for L.A. Norris, this building lies within the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse Industrial District and is considered a contributing element to the district. It was built in 1925- 26 and was first occupied by the United States Radiator Corporation.



### 650 Second Street

This building is within the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse Industrial District and is considered a contributing element to the district. A six-story reinforced concrete office and warehouse with a Spanish tiled parapet, this building was designed in 1922 by Baumann (sic) and Jose, architects for J. Sheldon Potter, capitalist. It was occupied by B.F. Goodrich Rubber Company until 1934, when it was altered inside for use as a bottling plant.



**670-680 Second Street**

This building was designed in 1913 by Leland S. Rosner, engineer, for Moore and Scott Iron Works as a castings, forging, machine shop, and boiler works. The company was an important ship builder during World War I under



the name, Moore Shipbuilding & Dock Company. The building is within the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse Industrial District and is considered a contributing element to the district.

**301-321 Brannan Street**

This building was determined individually eligible for the NRHP by Caltrans in 1982. It also lies within the Rincon Point / South Beach Historic Warehouse Industrial District and is considered a contributing element to the district. It was designed by architect Lewis P. Hobart and built in 1909 as the west coast headquarters of an eastern pipe and plumbing supply company, the Crane Company.



**165-173 Second Street**

This six-story, brick clad Electric Building was designed in 1906 by John Cotter Pelton. In 1910, it was being used by the Westinghouse Electric Company. It lies within the Second and Howard Historic District and is a contributing element to the district.



**191-197 Second Street**

This four-story, brick clad building was designed in 1907 by Ross & Burgen. In 1910, it was being used for wholesaling by the American Chicle Company, Badische Company (chemicals) and Jesse Moore Hunt Company (liquor wholesaling). It lies within the Second and Howard Historic District and is a contributing element to the district.



**580-586 Howard Street**

The first building to go up in the Second and Howard Historic District, this four-story, brick clad building was designed in 1906 by A. W. Smith and constructed by the R.W. Kinney Company for its own business, plumbing supplies. The building permit was approved July 5, 1906, only two and a half months after the 1906 earthquake and fire. This use may have sparked the whole District's specialization in construction services. In 1910 the building was still being used for plumbing supplies wholesaling as well as printing. It lies within the Second and Howard Historic District and is a contributing element to the district.



**5.14.3.5 Effects on Properties and Historic Districts**

**New Montgomery-Second Street Conservation District (City of San Francisco) and Second and Howard Streets District (National Register of Historic Places).** Both proposed Caltrain Downtown Extension alternatives (Second-to-Main and Second-to-Mission) would involve demolition of three buildings located near the intersection of Second and Howard Streets in San Francisco. These impacts would occur under either the Cut-and-Cover Option or the Tunneling Option.

Many of the buildings in this area are located within two overlapping districts of historic buildings, one designated by the City of San Francisco, the New Montgomery-Second Street Conservation District, hereafter “Conservation District,” and the other certified by the Keeper of the National Register, the Second and Howard Streets District, hereafter “National Register District.” The three buildings within the Historic Architectural APE for this project that would be demolished under the Caltrain Downtown Extension alternatives are listed below and shown in the following photographs:

580 Howard Street,  
APN: 3721-091

171 Second Street,  
APN: 3721-025

191 Second Street,  
APN: 3721-022

This summary of effects on these buildings and districts has been prepared in advance of the formal Finding of Effects document required under Section 106 and which will be prepared for this project once a preferred alternative has been identified.



**View of buildings at corner of Second and Howard**

(Building at the corner is 191 Second Street.  
Immediately to its right is 580 Howard Street.)

The two Second Street buildings listed above are located within the Conservation District. All three buildings listed above are contributing elements of the National Register District. The demolition of these buildings would be an adverse effect to each individual building and to the National Register District to which they contribute. Because the term “adverse effect” applies only to resources that are eligible for and/or that are listed on the National Register, there is technically no “adverse effect” to the Conservation District. However, as both buildings in the Conservation District would be historic resources according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, the demolition of these buildings would be considered a substantial adverse change under CEQA.



**View of 171 Second Street**

171 Second Street is brick building on the left.  
191 Second Street is building on the right).

The Conservation District covers a much larger area than the National Register District, so the quantitative effect of demolishing these buildings is less for the Conservation District than for the National Register District. The Conservation District would lose two of approximately 53 parcels located within its boundaries, while the National Register District would lose three of its total of 19 contributing buildings. Affected buildings make up less than four percent of the Conservation District, while the demolished buildings make up over 15 percent of the National Register District. However, loss of the two buildings would constitute a substantial adverse effect to the conservation district under CEQA, given that the loss could have an effect on the overall integrity of the district.

Another expected adverse effect to the National Register District would be the possible alteration of the district boundaries. The loss of the three buildings of the National Register District would create a wide gap that would separate the southeasternmost contributors (577-79, 583-87, and 589 Howard Street) from the rest of the district. None of these Howard Street properties is being proposed for demolition, but all would be adversely affected by the demolition of the resources listed above because they would become isolated from the larger, more cohesive group.

In summary, each of the individual buildings proposed for demolition in this part of the project would be adversely affected by either Caltrain Downtown Extension alternative. Although both districts would lose buildings that exist within their boundaries, only those that contribute to the National Register District would be “adversely affected.” Furthermore, the



**577-79, 583-87, and 589 Howard Street**



National Register District itself would be adversely affected through the loss of three contributing buildings, and by the fact that three additional buildings (not scheduled for demolition) would become more isolated from the rest of the contributors. The cumulative effects are not expected to result in a de-listing of the National Register District, nor would it necessarily result in rescission of the Conservation District. Both districts would retain numerous contributing buildings and each would still display the elements that define the character and nature of each district. It is important to note, however, that the piecemeal demolition of additional contributing resources would have a cumulative adverse effect on the National Register District. Additional demolitions could lead to de-listing of the district, especially if the district had already suffered previous losses of contributing buildings. Demolition of the two buildings within the boundaries of the Conservation District, on the other hand, must be approved via the processes set forth in Article 11 of the City of San Francisco Planning Code.

**The South End Historic District (City of San Francisco) and the Rincon Point/South Beach Historic Warehouse-Industrial District (Eligible for National Register of Historic Places).**

Both Caltrain Downtown Extension alternatives (Second-to-Main and Second-to-Mission) would involve demolition of ten buildings located near the intersection of Second and Townsend Streets, if the Cut-and-Cover Option is selected. Under the Tunneling Option these impacts would not occur. Many buildings in this area are located within two overlapping districts of historic buildings, one designated by the City of San Francisco, the South End Historic District, hereafter “Historic District,” and the other a National Register eligible district called the Rincon Point/South Beach Historic Warehouse-Industrial District, hereafter “National Register District.”<sup>19</sup> The ten buildings within the Historic Architectural APE for this project that would be demolished under the cut-and-cover alternative are listed below and shown in the photographs that follow:

Address	APN
164 Townsend Street	3788-011A
148-154 Townsend Street	3788-010
144-146 Townsend Street	3788-009A
136 Townsend Street	3788-009
130 Townsend Street	3788-008
670-680 Second Street <sup>20</sup>	3788-043 & 044
650 Second Street	3788-049
640 Second Street	3788-002
634 Second Street Street	3788-038
301 Brannan Street	3788-037

---

<sup>19</sup> This district has been fully documented and appears to be eligible for the National Register. Although it is not yet listed on the National Register, it has been submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation and is considered eligible for the National Register for the purposes of Section 106 review.

<sup>20</sup> The building at 670-680 Second Street rests on two legal parcels shown here, but was considered a single contributing building for the purposes of the National Register District.

This summary of effects on these buildings and districts has been prepared in advance of the formal Finding of Effects document that is required under Section 106 and will be prepared for this project once a preferred alternative has been identified.

The demolition of these buildings causes adverse effects to each individual building. The historic resources listed above are also all located within the boundaries for both the National Register District and the Historic District. The demolition of these buildings would be an adverse effect to the National Register District to which they contribute. Because the term “adverse effect” applies only to resources that are eligible for and/or that are listed on the National Register, there is technically no “adverse effect” to the local Historic District designated by the City of San Francisco. However, as these buildings are considered contributory to and in the Historic District, they would be considered historic resources according to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, and the demolition of these buildings would be considered a substantial adverse change under CEQA.



**View looking north on Second Street from intersection of Townsend and Second.**

Building at left is 698 Second Street. It would not be demolished, although the buildings to the north up to Brannan Street would be demolished under the cut-and-cover option.



**View looking east on Townsend toward intersection with Second Street.**

These buildings are in the 100 block of Townsend Street.

The quantitative effect of demolishing these buildings is roughly equivalent for the two districts because the Historic District would lose ten of the approximately 60 buildings within its boundaries, while the National Register District would lose ten of its total of 60 contributing buildings. (While these counts are similar, the boundaries of the two districts are not identical.) Affected buildings represent about one sixth of the buildings within each district.

Another expected adverse effect to the National Register District would be the possible alteration of the district boundaries. The loss of the ten buildings of the National Register District would



be a substantial adverse effect to two streetscapes within the district: one on the northwest side of the 100 block of Townsend and the other on the southwest side of the 600 block of Second Street. The loss of these ten buildings would create a gap that would break up the continuity of the center of the district in a city block that includes a high percentage of contributing buildings. The National Register District currently contains three blocks of streetscapes with contributing buildings lining both sides of the street. If these buildings were removed, only the 500 block of Second Street would retain buildings along both sides.

The demolition of the two rows of buildings would also have an adverse effect on 698 Second Street, an important contributor to the National Register District. This building was built in 1910 as San Francisco Fire Department Pumping Station Number One and it was separately listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1982. While this building is outside the APE for this project, and not proposed for demolition, it would be adversely affected by the demolition of buildings on either side of its corner location. An additional portion of the National Register District would be largely separated from the rest of the district by the proposed demolitions. The contributing buildings along Third Street and those buildings on Townsend and Brannan Streets that are near Third Street would be isolated from the larger, more cohesive group. The loss of the ten buildings at the center of the district would substantially impair its visual continuity and the district's ability to impart a sense of time and place. The City's Historic District boundary may also need to be changed to reflect the loss of the same ten buildings on Townsend and Second Streets.

In summary, each of the ten individual buildings proposed for demolition in this part of the project would be adversely affected by the Cut-and-Cover Option under either Caltrain Downtown Extension alternative. Although both districts would lose buildings that exist within their boundaries, only those that contribute to the National Register District would be "adversely affected." The National Register District would not only be adversely affected through the loss of contributing buildings, it would also have the result that entire rows of adjacent contributors that form two sides of important streetscapes within the district would be demolished. Additionally, a contributor to the district that is already listed on the National Register (698 Second Street) would be adversely affected through its isolation from its existing historic streetscape. These cumulative effects may result in a de-listing of the National Register District. It would also have serious implications in terms of the integrity of the Historic District for the same reason.

Table 5.14-1 lists the affected properties with the assessor's parcel number, NRHP status, and type of impact for each. The table also groups the properties according to their respective district.

**CHAPTER 5: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Table 5.14-1 Summary of Project Effects on Listed or Eligible Properties</b>					
<b>Address/ Assessors Parcel Number</b>	<b>NRHP Status</b>	<b>Contributing Property to</b>	<b>City Status</b>	<b>Const. Date</b>	<b>Type of Impact</b>
<b>Properties Affected by Either Transbay Terminal Alternative</b>					
425 Mission Street (Transbay Terminal) / 3719-003,3720-001,3721-006	2S2	S.F-Oakland Bay Bridge		1939	Demolition
Bay Bridge Approach / 3764-067	2S2	S.F-Oakland Bay Bridge		ca. 1935	Demolition
Bay Bridge Approach / 3763-112	2S1	S.F-Oakland Bay Bridge		ca. 1935	Demolition
Bus Ramps / 3718-025	2	S.F-Oakland Bay Bridge		ca. 1938	Demolition
Bus Ramps / 3739-008	2	S.F-Oakland Bay Bridge		ca. 1937	Demolition
Bus Ramps / 3721-015A	2	S.F-Oakland Bay Bridge		ca. 1937	Demolition
<b>Properties Affected by Either Caltrain Downtown Extension Alternative Either Construction Option (Cut-and-Cover and Tunneling Options)</b>					
165-173 Second Street / 3721-025	1D	Second & Howard District & New Montgomery/ Second Street	Article 11 Category V	1906	Demolition
191 Second Street / 3721-022	1D			1907	Demolition
580-586 Howard Street / 3721-091	1D	Second and Howard District		1906	Demolition
<b>Properties Affected by Either Caltrain Downtown Extension Alternative Cut-and-Cover Option Only</b>					
640 Second Street / 3788-002	2D2, 3D	Rincon Point/South Beach District & South End District.	Article 10 Contributing	1925-6	Demolition
650 Second Street / 3788-049	2D2, 3D			1922	Demolition
670-680 Second Street / 3788-043, 3788-044	2D2, 3D			1913	Demolition
301-321 Brannan Street / 3788-037	3D			1909	Demolition
130 Townsend Street / 3788-008	3D		Article 10 Contributing Altered	1910 [1] 1895-6 [2]	Demolition
136 Townsend Street / 3788-009	3D		Article 10 Contributing	1902 [1] 1913 [1]	Demolition
144-46 Townsend Street / 3788-009A	3D			1922	Demolition
148-54 Townsend Street / 3788-010	3D			1922	Demolition
162-164 Townsend Street / 3788-011A	3D			1919	Demolition
166-78 Townsend Street / 3788-012	3D			1910 [1] 1888[2]	Construction easement; no demolition
<p><b>Notes:</b> National Register Status Codes are as follows:</p> <p>1S Separately listed on the NRHP</p> <p>2S1 Determined eligible for listing by the Keeper of the Register</p> <p>2S2 Determined eligible for listing by consensus of the SHPO and a federal agency.</p> <p>1D Listed on National Register as a contributor to a district or multi-resource property</p> <p>2D2 Determined eligible as a contributor by consensus determination</p> <p>3D Appears eligible as a contributor to a fully documented district</p> <p>[1] Caltrans, 1983, [2] Corbett and Bradley, 1996</p> <p><b>Source:</b> JRP Historical Consulting, Parsons Transportation Group, 2001.</p>					

Mitigation measures will be set forth in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to be executed by the JPB, City and County of San Francisco, FTA, ACHP, and SHPO, as appropriate. They could include measures as discussed below.

- **Relocation.** Opportunities for relocation of historic properties will be evaluated. Should relocation be feasible, the properties to be relocated and the parties to receive title will be identified in the MOA. Given the scale of the majority of buildings and the relative scarcity of open land in San Francisco, however, it is unlikely that relocation would be feasible. In the case of the Transbay Terminal and loop ramp, there is no potential for relocation of the historic property and conveyance of title to another party.
- **Recordation.** Because it is unlikely that relocation of historic resources will be feasible, recordation is suggested to ensure a permanent record of the properties' present appearance and context. Under this mitigation proposal, FTA would ensure that properties to be demolished are recorded to Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards prior to any construction activities. The HABS/HAER documentation would be filed with the SHPO, the HABS/HAER collection in the Library of Congress, the University of California Bancroft Library, the San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board files at the San Francisco Planning Department, the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage (FSFAH), and the San Francisco Public Library.
- **Interpretive Display.** JPB staff and Caltrans would develop a display of the photographs produced in the HABS/HAER documentation, for public exhibition. This display would be provided by JPB in the proposed new Transbay Terminal.
- **Opportunities for Salvage.** After recordation and at least 30 days prior to demolition, the JPB, City/County of San Francisco, and TJPA have the opportunity to salvage architectural elements for re-use or curation. Items selected would be removed in a manner that minimizes damage.

The mitigation measures identified above are suggested measures; actual measures will be set forth in the MOA. Although recordation eliminates one adverse effect of demolition, the loss of historical information, it does not prevent the tangible loss of historically significant properties.

### **5.15 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

This section focuses on the risk of exposure to or releases of hazardous materials from project. Impacts of hazardous materials sites related to construction of the Transbay Terminal, the Caltrain Extension, and the redevelopment plan alternatives are discussed in Section 5.21.14.