

4.9 CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. SUMMARY

Implementation of the proposed Main Campus Master Plan would not disturb any known archaeological resources. In addition, construction of most Master Plan projects would occur in areas that have already been developed. However, there is the potential for project construction to disturb previously unknown prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. This potential impact would be significant and would be mitigated by the cultural resource recovery requirements included in this section.

The proposed Main Campus Master Plan would result in the removal or demolition of a number of buildings on the campus, including the South and North Gymnasiums, all of the bungalows, the existing Child Care building, PE Field Storage, and (possibly) the California Bookstore. None of these buildings is considered a significant historic resource; in addition, the campus as a whole does not qualify as an historic district. Therefore, building removal and demolition activities would not result in a significant impact.

As the Master Plan would be implemented over a number of years, some existing buildings would be affected that do not meet the age requirement for consideration as a historic resource now, but might at the time of demolition. In particular, the Creative Arts building could be 50 years old by the time it is renovated as part of the Pan American Studies Center project. Given that the significance of the structure cannot be evaluated at this time, potential impacts to it are considered significant. The impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

B. INTRODUCTION

As part of the preparation of this EIR, Architectural Resources Group conducted an historic resources evaluation. The following discussion is taken primarily from the October 2003 report, *Historic Resources Evaluation, City College of San Francisco, Main Campus Facilities Master Plan*. In this report, the preservation consultant evaluated the historic resources at the campus and the potential effects the project would have on these resources. This report is on file and available for review by appointment at the CCSF Administrative Offices, 33 Gough Street, San Francisco.

C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

C1. Prehistoric Resources

No recorded prehistoric sites are located on the Main Campus.¹ This conclusion is consistent with the record of sensitivity of archaeological resources in the San Francisco area; sensitivity tends to cluster around the bayshore and ocean front setting. However, the general area of the campus is within a swale-like environment between hills, and historic maps show a tertiary tributary to Islais Creek east of the campus. Native American archaeological sites in this portion of San Francisco County tend to be situated in valleys near creeks and sand-dune settings. Therefore, the project area is considered to have a moderate potential for Native American sites.

C2. Historic Resources

Early History of the Site

While under Mexican rule in the early nineteenth century, the future site of the CCSF Main Campus was within the boundaries of the Rancho San Miguel, a Mexican land grant. Even before the United States and Mexico signed the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which transferred California to the United States, Euro-American settlers had begun establishing ranches and farms in the area. Downtown San Francisco developed quickly in the 1850s after waves of Argonauts were drawn to the area by the Gold Rush. Although the future Main Campus site was far from the city center, structures were built on it fairly early; sometime before 1859 the San Francisco Industrial School for the benefit of depraved juveniles was located there. Historic activity east of the campus in the 1850s and 1860s is known from the existence of an adobe dwelling and two other structures that may have been situated along the “Old County Road” in the general vicinity of the campus.² According to local historian Richard Brandi, from the turn of the century until 1934, the site was home to the Ingleside County Jail. The building was razed when City College acquired the property. However, the 1915 Sanborn Map shows a large empty parcel labeled “Balboa Park,” and the jail is not indicated.

Creation of the San Francisco Junior College/Works Progress Administration Involvement

In 1935 the creation of San Francisco Junior College (the original name of the City College of San Francisco) was authorized by the San Francisco Board of Education as part of the San Francisco Unified

¹ California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, correspondence, October 14, 2003.

² Hendry 1851, as cited in CHRIS/NWIC, October 14, 2003.

School District. The College was intended to serve as the “apex of the public school system” and to provide students with an option other than attending a four-year university or accepting a low-skill vocation. The College offered typical academic courses and semi-professional classes for students intending to stop their formal education and seek employment after a two-year degree. To meet their immediate needs, the College temporarily held classes in locations such as the University of California Extension Building and Galileo High School. Rapidly increasing enrollment in the first couple of years caused college officials to seek additional temporary quarters; classes were held in fourteen facilities located throughout San Francisco.

While classes were held in other locations, the College proceeded with plans to develop a main campus at Phelan and Ocean Avenues. Timothy Pflueger, a noted local designer, was selected as the college architect. The foundation for the first structure, the Science Building, was laid in 1938. After a hiatus, the construction of the building resumed. The Science Building and two other buildings, the Women’s and Men’s Gymnasiums, were occupied in 1940. Fred Olmstead painted two murals in the lobby of the Science Building in 1941. Olmstead also sculpted two tufta stone busts, Leonardo da Vinci and Thomas Edison, which were placed to the rear of the Science Building. The murals and sculptures were commissioned as part of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s Works Progress Administration (WPA), a Depression-era, make-work program. The WPA was created on May 6, 1935 under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act. The main purpose of the Act was to create work for the unemployed. WPA crews built thousands of roads, bridges, schools, post offices and other public works. The WPA Arts Program hired actors, writers, musicians, photographers, and artists and included: the Federal Art Project, Federal Music Theatre Project, Federal Writers Project, and Historical Records Survey. The program funded more than 2,500 murals for public schools, hospitals, and public centers around the nation, including the Coit Tower murals in San Francisco.

The three buildings were designed to accommodate 2,500 students, but by the time the buildings were completed in 1940, approximately 3,200 were enrolled. However, plans for expansion were put on hold when the enrollment declined dramatically due to U.S. entry into World War II and the departure of students for the armed forces. During the war, the enrollment was approximately 900 students.

Post-World War II Developments

Once the conflict ended, returning soldiers flocked to colleges encouraged, in part, by the G.I. Bill. The student population at the College soon exceeded 5,500 students. To meet the growing enrollment, classes were scheduled from 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM. In 1946, the College secured a lease for the temporary buildings and grounds of the United States Navy Waves Separation Center located directly across Phelan Avenue. The temporary buildings were called the West Campus and opened in the fall semester of 1946. The fourteen former naval buildings were used as college classrooms, laboratories, auditorium, cafeteria, dormitories, and faculty offices. The College required no tuition fee or laboratory fee at this time and

housing was provided if requested. Quonset huts, housing two student apartments each, were located along the north edge of the Main Campus. In 1948, the name San Francisco Junior College was changed to City College of San Francisco. By 1951, the temporary buildings had deteriorated significantly. The College's lease on the West Campus expired in 1952, and the Public Utilities Commission, the titleholder to the land, reclaimed the site. The 1950 Sanborn Map of the main campus shows the "Science Unit," "Women's Gymnasium," greenhouses, outbuildings, and a "Floriculture Building." The Quonset huts, which served as "Student Veteran Housing City College of San Francisco," were located at the northeast corner of the campus.

In 1952, the College began construction on Cloud Hall, a building that greatly increased the school's capacity. The building was the largest building on campus. Cloud Hall housed a library, classrooms, offices, and laboratories and was named after a former president of the College, Dr. Archibald Cloud. After Cloud Hall was constructed, the library and several other functions were moved out of the Science Building and into the new structure. In 1954, the Hotel and Restaurant School built their first structure, Smith Hall. The building also served as a cafeteria for the CCSF students. Smith Hall was named in honor of George D. Smith, the late chairman of the Hotel and Restaurant Department Advisory Committee and former president and general manager of the Mark Hopkins Hotel.

The Arts-Classroom Building was constructed in 1959. The building was occupied in 1962 and housed classrooms, faculty offices, broadcasting facilities, and the college theater. The theater lobby featured a 28-by-75 foot Diego Rivera fresco created during the 1939-40 Golden Gate International Exposition. Timothy Pflueger, the college architect and one of a five-member board of architects that designed the Exposition, invited Rivera to complete the mural for the College. Pflueger had intended the murals to be housed in a new college library, but this building was never constructed. Timothy died in 1946, but his brother Milton Pflueger inherited his practice and continued to lobby for the murals to be installed in a campus building. Finally, in 1961 the murals were moved to the lobby of the theater within the Arts-Classroom Building.

The Public Utilities Commission began construction of two large water reservoirs on the former West Campus in 1957. After three years the project stalled; the basins had been excavated and paved with asphalt, but the Water Department had run out of money to complete the project. The reservoirs were never finished or filled, and by 1963 the basins were used as parking lots for City College. Dramatic changes were also taking place east of the campus. Construction of Interstate 280 began in the early 1960s. The freeway was built below grade level and required the demolition of large numbers of buildings. The construction did not directly affect the College structures, but significantly changed the character of the area and isolated the campus from Balboa Park until a bridge was constructed. The freeway provided students with easy transportation to the campus. Soon thereafter, Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) built tracks paralleling the freeway and a station near Ocean Avenue providing students with another transit option.

In the 1960s the campus continued to expand at a dramatic rate. The athletic field was completed in 1960. The Statler Wing, an addition to Smith Hall, was built in 1963. The new structure housed laboratories, classrooms, the Alice Statler Library, the Evening Division Office, and the Financial Aid Office. In 1964, the Horticultural Center, which included classrooms, laboratories, greenhouse, lath houses, and garden areas, was built. Construction on the Educational Services Facility Building began in 1966 and was completed in 1968. The building was an addition to Smith Hall and was named in honor of Dr. Louis G. Conlan, an original member of the faculty, second president of the college, first president/superintendent of the San Francisco Community College District, and a member of the first San Francisco Community College District Board of Governors. The building included space for a lecture hall, bookstore, administrative wing, and registrar's office.

The next year, 1969, the Visual Arts Building was completed. The building was occupied in the fall of 1970 and housed facilities for graphic arts, topography, and photography as well as two lecture halls, classrooms, and offices. The Smith Hall complex was expanded further in 1969 when the Student Union was constructed east of the original structure. The Creative Arts Extension, a broadcasting/music facility and classroom building, was built in 1970. Numerous portable buildings were moved to the campus from the 1960s through the early 1990s.

As new buildings were constructed, non-science functions were moved out of the Science Building. Around 1970 it was remodeled to become a facility devoted solely to science. That year the College was separated from the San Francisco Unified School District to become the Community College District of San Francisco.

Batmale Hall, a social sciences classroom and laboratory building named after Chancellor Dr. Louis F. Batmale, was completed in 1977. After Timothy Pflueger's death, the Pflueger firm continued to design structures on the campus, including Batmale Hall and the Creative Arts Building. The Louis and Claude Rosenberg Jr. Library Learning Resource Center was constructed in the mid 1980s.

Building Name	Year Constructed
Science Building (Planetarium)	1940
North Gymnasium (Women's Gymnasium)	1940
South Gymnasium (Men's Gymnasium)	1940
PE Dance Studio Addition to North Gymnasium	1949
California Bookstore	1949
Child Care (Children's Center)	1949
Cloud Hall	1954
Smith Hall (Cafeteria)	1955
Creative Arts (Diego Rivera Theatre)	1961
Statler Wing	1963
Environmental Horticulture and Floristry	1965
Conlan Hall (Educational Services/College Bookstore)	1968
Bungalows 201-208	1969

Building Name	Year Constructed
Bungalows 209-213	1969
Bungalows 214-223	1969
Bungalow 400 (EOPS)	1970
Student Union	1970
Visual Arts	1970
Bungalows 301-317	c. 1970
Creative Arts Extension	1972
Bookstore Annex	1975
Batmale Hall (Social Science Classroom and Laboratory Building)	1978
Stadium Building	c. 1990
Louis and Claude Rosenberg Jr., Library Learning Resource Center	1995
Bungalows 602-623-D	1998
Central Shop Facility	c. 2000
PE Field Storage	c. 2000
Shop Annex	2001
Childhood Mentoring	2001

Architect Involved

Born to German immigrant parents in 1892, Timothy Pflueger was raised in San Francisco's Mission District. Although Pflueger never received formal education past high school, at fifteen he found work in the offices of a local architect. At thirty he became a partner in the firm of J.R. Miller. Pflueger's work was located primarily in San Francisco and the Bay area. In addition to office buildings, Pflueger was known for his theater designs and schools. One of his earliest projects with Miller was the monumental task of designing the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, the biggest corporate headquarters in the West (1925). The building was unique in its vertical emphasis and corner windows. Other early works include: the Castro Theatre (1921), Roosevelt Junior High School (1924), Alhambra Theatre (1928), Medical and Dental Building (1929), Paramount Theatre (1931), the remodel of the New Mission Theatre façade and lobby (1932), George Washington High School (1932), Bal Tabarin Night Club (1933), the Circus (*Le Cirque*) Lounge of the Fairmont Hotel (1934), and the El Rey Theatre (1936).

In addition to his building designs, Pflueger served on several prestigious committees; he was appointed Chairman of the Board of Consulting Architects on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge project. He was also one of a five-member board of architects who designed the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939-1940. His later works included the Transbay Terminal (1939), the Top of the Mark at the Mark Hopkins Hotel (1939), the Patent Leather Lounge (Orchid Room) at the St. Francis Hotel (1939), several of the earliest buildings on the City College Campus (1940), Union Square Plaza and Garage (1942), and the I. Magnin store on Union Square (1946).

Although Pflueger did not use the term himself, his buildings have been described as Art Deco or Art Moderne. Vertical emphasis, geometric patterns, and Mayan themes were often employed in his work.

He frequently used corner windows to express the thin skin and steel structure of his buildings. Pflueger was also well known for his interior designs, which utilized many of the geometric forms of his exteriors and added colorful murals and rich materials. Although Timothy Pflueger died in 1946, the firm continued under the direction of his brother Milton Pflueger.

Building Descriptions

To be eligible for the California Register, properties must have either reached 50 years of age or “sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resources.” There are 7 buildings on the CCSF campus that are currently 45 years of age (the 50-year age requirement with a standard 5-year buffer): the Science Building, North Gymnasium, South Gymnasium, Cloud Hall, Smith Hall, California Bookstore, and Child Care Center. (Buildings that will be 50 years old by the horizon year of the CCSF Master Plan are discussed later in this section.)

Science Building

The Science Building is a large three-story structure, which sits atop a knoll facing Phelan Avenue. The footprint of the building is a long rectangle running parallel to Phelan Avenue and four shorter wings extending eastward. Lower, two-story additions are located on the north and south ends of the building. All sections of the structure’s roof are flat, with the exception of the spherical observatory. The foundation and walls of the structure are reinforced concrete. Ceramic tile veneer laid in a stacked arrangement with every fifth row laid in a stretcher pattern sheaths the reinforced concrete walls. Several window types are evident, but the majority are six-light (pane) windows with operable awning sash in the lower and upper lights. The muntins and mullions are wood.³

The principal façade (west elevation) is symmetrical. A central projecting portico, supported by simple square columns, marks the center of the building. Along a simplified entablature the words “The Truth Shall Make You Free” are shown in raised letters. Behind the portico are three vertical bands of windows above three doors and transoms.⁴ Directly above the portico, there is a flat-roofed attic with five small windows placed so that they match the spaces between the portico columns. The planetarium’s observatory sits on top of the attic and is made of thin metal strips.

On either side of the portico, there are 14 bays of 6-light windows. Recessed vertical bands of divided-light windows flank each end of the structure. These windows are divided at the first and second floor levels by small, recessed balconets. The north and south additions step back from the main building. There are no windows on the first and second floor, but there are simple concrete colonnades at the

³ Sash is the framing that holds the glass in a window. Muntins are part of the window framing and hold and separate the window panes; mullions are the fixed bars that divide the panes of a window.

⁴ Transoms are the small windows above doors (or the crosspiece separating the two).

foundation level. The south end of the south additions is open at the foundation level creating a drive-through opening.

The east elevation of the building is also symmetrical; four evenly-spaced wings project from this elevation. Nine-light windows wrap the corners of the wings. The eastern faces of the inner two wings are plain. Two vertical bands of glass bricks, which run from the first floor to the third, divide the wall planes of the outer wings. At the base of the bands, entrances are sheltered by simple post-and-lintel concrete porches with gently-pitched shed roofs. The attic is visible above the center of the building. Along the inside faces of the wings, on each floor, there is a nine-light window (part of the corner window) and five of the six-light windows found on the front façade. Between each of the wings, there is a three-story projecting bay. The bays are composed of glazing supported by a thin metal frames. The muntins and spandrels appear to be copper. On either side of the bays, on each floor, there are smaller windows and as well as six-light windows.

The north elevation of the main building is divided into fourteen bays of openings. Each floor of each bay is fitted with a window, with the exception of the seventh through thirteenth bays of the first and second floor, where the addition projects. The openings are fitted with six-light windows except those on the eastern ends of the building; those windows wrap around the corners. The north face of the north addition has a plain entablature supported by two square columns and solid end walls. The portico is two stories in height. Behind the portico, at the first floor level, there is a door and transom flanked by windows. The surrounding wall is completely covered by a mural. The south elevation is a mirror image of the north.

Although the building is relatively unornamented and has plain massing typical of PWA-era buildings, the symmetrical façade, porticos, attic, and central dome form a classical composition. The corner windows, geometric shapes, and use of murals are typical of architect Timothy Pflueger's other designs.

Character-Defining Features: Science Building

Overall

- Flat roof
- Ceramic tile veneer
- Spherical observatory
- Six-light windows with awning sash in the lower and upper lights and wood muntins and mullions

West (Principal Façade)

- Symmetrical massing and fenestration
- Recessed vertical bands of windows with balconets at the north and south ends
- Porticos with simple concrete colonnade

East Elevation

- Symmetrical massing and fenestration
- Corner windows
- Vertical bands of glass bricks on east wings
- Simple flat-roofed porches on east wings
- Three-story metal projecting bays

North and South Elevations

- Corner windows
- Porticos with simple concrete colonnades
- Murals behind north and south colonnades

North Gymnasium/Women's Gymnasium

The North Gymnasium sits close to the east edge of the campus. The building is one over-height story and has an irregular-shaped footprint. The roof is flat with overhanging eaves. The walls of the building are reinforced concrete, and a steel truss supports the roof. Numerous patched cracks are visible along the wall surface. A band of glass block forms a clerestory on most facades. Many of the glass bricks are broken, and some sections have been painted. Simple coping divides the wall at the watertable level and below the band of glass bricks.⁵ Pairs of six-light windows surround the base of the building. The lower lights are operable awning sash. On the west elevation, small awning windows puncture the walls between the larger windows and the glass brick. At the north end of the building, there are several additions. There are also several I-beams and bolted metal panels on this elevation, the remains of an earlier addition.

South Gymnasium/Men's Gymnasium

The South Gymnasium also sits close to the east edge of the campus. The building is one over-height story and has an irregular-shaped footprint. The roof is flat with overhanging eaves. The walls of the building are reinforced concrete, and steel trusses support the roof. Numerous patched cracks are visible along the wall surface. A band of glass block forms a clerestory on most facades. Many of the glass bricks are broken, and some sections have been painted. Simple coping divides the wall at the watertable level and below the band of glass bricks. Pairs of six-light windows surround the base of the building. The lower lights are operable awning sash. On the west elevation, small awning windows punctuate the walls between the larger windows and the glass brick.

⁵ Coping is the top layer of a brick or stone wall.

Cloud Hall

Cloud Hall is a large building with a symmetrical but unusual footprint composed of a “C”-shaped main building, smaller perpendicular wings on the north and south ends, and a large projecting auditorium block in the center of the west elevation. The building is three stories, but because of its location on a hillside, one story is visible on the west side, and all three are visible on the east side. All sections of the roof are flat. The walls of the structure are covered with stucco and panels with a pebbledash finish. The windows are arranged in bands of three-light windows divided by metal muntins and mullions. The lower two lights of each window are awning sash.

The west elevation is symmetrical. In the center there is a large projecting auditorium block, which is covered in stucco and is taller than the rest of the building. On either side of the auditorium block, on the main building, there are entrances composed of two pairs of doors with transoms overhead. The metal doors have three, square, evenly-spaced glazed sections. A flat roofed porch, supported by three square columns and the walls of the projecting auditorium block, covers the entrances. On either side of the auditorium block and porches, there are bands of 30 three-light windows. Alternating windows have operable sash.

The north and south wings are lower than the main block of the building, and small square windows are located along the inner faces of the wings. The outer elevations of the wings have bands of windows similar to those on the front façade.

In contrast to the west façade, which is broken by the auditorium block, porches, and projecting wings, the east elevation is relatively simple and dominated by massive bands of windows on each of the three floors. The window bands span from one end of the building to the other. The form of the building, a shallow “C” shape, creates a three-part façade. The central section has bands of 42 windows on each floor, and the outer sections have 36 windows on each floor. Beneath each band of windows are strips of pebbledash finish panels. The horizontal emphasis created by the bands of windows, panels, and stucco cornice is broken only by entrances located on the first floors of the outer sections. The entrances are over-scaled and are composed of a pair of doors surrounded by sidelights and large divided-light transoms. The entrance is framed by cement coping. A horizontal band of coping also outlines the top of the third floor windows and runs vertically along the sides of the windows and pebbledash panels. On the north and south ends of the main block of the building, there is a pair of doors. Above, there are two columns of nine small square openings.

Overall, the building has a strong horizontal emphasis. A square motif is repeated in some windows, door glazing, and vents.

*Character-Defining Features: Cloud Hall***Overall**

- Flat roofs
- Stucco bands and panels with pebble-dash finish
- Cement coping
- Bands of windows
- Three-light windows with metal muntins and mullions

West Elevation

- Symmetrical elevation
- Unornamented projecting auditorium block
- Metal doors with square glazing
- Flat-roofed porches

East Elevation

- Symmetrical elevation
- Strong horizontal emphasis of east façade
- Flat elevation uninterrupted by projecting porches, cornices, or bays
- Long continuous bands of windows
- Over-scaled entrances with doors and large divided-light transoms

Wings

- Small square windows along inner and outer faces of wings
- Bands of windows along exterior wings

Smith Hall/Cafeteria

Many parts of the exterior of Smith Hall have been obscured by additions: the College Bookstore and Conlan Hall on the west, EOPS building on the south, and the Statler Wing on the south and east elevations. The north elevation (principal façade) is the only face of Smith Hall that is entirely visible. The original structure is one story and is divided into two sections, a taller block covered in aggregate stone, and a second lower section composed primarily of glazing and doors. The building has a flat roof.

California Bookstore

The bookstore is a small one-story building with a roughly rectangular footprint and a flat roof. The walls are covered with stucco with brick veneer on the front (east) façade. The east façade is a typical storefront composed of large banks of windows angled inward at two separate doorways. The windows are composed of narrow divided-lights. Above the windows and doorways, separated by a lintel, there is a row of divided-light clerestory windows. A modern canvas awning stretches across the front façade. Scalloped trim lines the otherwise unornamented cornice of the east elevation and wraps around to the

north elevation. There is fourteen-light ribbon window on the north elevation, and there are no openings on the south elevation.

Child Care Center

The Child Care Center is a one-story building with an “L”-shaped footprint. A circa-1990 addition forms the ell. The walls of the wood-framed building are covered with asbestos siding on the main building and horizontal siding on the addition. A shallow-pitched gable clad in rolled strip asphalt roofing covers the main building, and a flat roof with tar and gravel roofing tops the addition. Various vent pipes break through the roof slope, and there is a skylight on the addition. A shed-roofed porch supported by wood posts abuts the south side of the building. Corrugated plastic panels fill the spaces between the porch posts. A single row of divided-light clerestory windows lines the wall of the building between the porch roof and main roof. A band of clerestory windows also lines the eaves of the north elevation, but these are in two rows of divided lights. Some of the lights are functioning awning sash. The windows in the addition are divided lights: the top lights are awning sash. All of the windows, those in the original and addition, appear to have metal frames and sash.

Evaluation of Historical Significance

Under CEQA, resources that meet the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources are considered historic resources. California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places are automatically listed on the CRHR. The CCSF Main Campus buildings have not been previously listed on or determined eligible for the CRHR or the NRHP.

Because of the number of modern buildings on the campus (only 7 of the approximately 70 buildings on the campus are over 45 years of age), the CCSF Main Campus does not meet the 50-year requirement or possess the exceptional significance necessary to qualify as a CRHR or NRHP district.

There are 7 buildings on the CCSF campus that are currently over 45 years of age and are potential historic resources: the Science Building, North Gymnasium, South Gymnasium, Cloud Hall, Smith Hall, California Bookstore, and Child Care Center. The Science Building and Cloud Hall are significant under National Register Criterion A and California Register Criterion 1, buildings associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history. In this case, the buildings are significant at the local level as representatives of the creation of the City College of San Francisco and the junior college movement in the Bay Area. Science Hall was built in 1940 and was the first structure constructed by the newly formed San Francisco Junior College. The building housed all functions of the campus including classrooms, library, and administrative functions. When Cloud Hall was constructed in 1954, the library was moved to the new structure as well as additional classroom space. The two buildings form the core of the historic campus.

The Science Building is also significant under National Register Criterion A and California Criterion 3, as the work of a master, in this case Timothy Pflueger. Pflueger was a noted architect in the San Francisco Bay Area from the 1920s until his death in 1946. The Science Building represents Pflueger's educational projects and includes some of his signature design features (geometric massing, corner windows, and the use of murals). Cloud Hall is not significant for its association with Timothy Pflueger because it appears to have been designed by the Plueger firm after Timothy Pflueger's death in 1946.

Although they meet the 50-year age requirement for the NRHP and CRHR, the North and South Gymnasiums do not appear to meet the level of significance necessary to be eligible. The buildings were constructed in 1940, the same year as the Science Building, but were ancillary structures, set away from the main building, with little architectural detail. Also, because the North Gymnasium has been altered by several additions, that building does not retain sufficient integrity to be eligible for the CRHR. Similarly, Smith Hall does not retain sufficient integrity for the CRHR. It has been significantly altered by additions, which surround the original structure on three sides.

Although the California Bookstore and Child Care Center meet the 50-year age requirement for the NRHP and CRHR, they do not appear to meet the level of significance necessary to be eligible. The buildings served as ancillary structures (a bookstore and childcare center) and are set away from the main campus buildings. The California Bookstore is a typical storefront and has no architectural distinction. Similarly, the Child Care Center is also a simple building and lacks integrity because of a c. 1990 addition at the southwest end of the building. Research has not identified a connection with significant events or persons for either structure.

In addition to the buildings noted above, there are three buildings that will be at least 50 years of age by the Master Plan horizon year of 2015: the Creative Arts Building (Diego Rivera Theatre), Statler Wing, and Environmental Horticulture and Floristry. Currently, none of these buildings appears to reach the level of exceptional significance required for buildings that are less than 50 years of age to be eligible for the National Register. Sufficient time (50 years is standard) has not passed to evaluate the buildings for the California Register. These buildings currently range in age from 38 to 42 years. It is not possible at this time to anticipate which buildings will be determined to be significant and whether the buildings will have retained the necessary level of integrity for eligibility when they reach 50 years of age.

D. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

D1. National Register of Historic Places

The NRHP is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service (NPS). The NRHP includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level.

Resources (structures, sites, buildings, districts, and objects) over 50 years of age can be listed on the NRHP. However, properties under 50 years of age that are of exceptional importance or are contributors to a district can also be included on the NRHP. This discussion is intended to be a brief summary of the criteria used to determine if a particular resource is eligible for listing on the NRHP. The following list of definitions is relevant to any discussion of the NRHP.

A structure is a work made up of interdependent and interrelated parts in a definite pattern of organization. Generally constructed by man, it is often an engineering object large in scale.

A site is defined as the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself maintains historical or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure.

Buildings are defined as structures created to shelter human activity.

A district is a geographically definable area—urban or rural, small or large—possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, and/or objects united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district may also comprise individual elements separated geographically but linked by association or history.

An object is a material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historical, or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, moveable yet related to a specific setting or environment.

There are four criteria under which a structure, site, building, district, or object can be considered significant for listing on the NRHP. These include resources that:

- A) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history (such as a Civil War Battlefield or a Naval Ship Building Center);
- B) are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (such as Thomas Jefferson's Monticello or the Susan B. Anthony Birthplace);
- C) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (such as Frank Lloyd Wright's Taliesin or the Midwestern Native American Indian Mounds);
- D) have yielded or may likely yield information important in prehistory or history (such as prehistoric ruins in Arizona or the archaeological sites of the first European settlements in St. Augustine, Florida, or at the Presidio of San Francisco).

A resource can be considered significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. Once a resource has been identified as significant and potentially eligible for the NRHP, its historic integrity must be evaluated. Integrity involves seven aspects: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. These aspects closely relate to the resource's significance and must be intact for NRHP eligibility.

When nominating a resource to the NRHP, one must evaluate and state the significance of that resource clearly. A resource can be individually eligible for listing on the NRHP for any of the above four criteria. A resource can also be listed as contributing to a group of resources that are listed on the NRHP. In other words, the resource is part of an historic district as defined above.

Districts are comprised of resources that are contributing and non-contributing. Some resources within the boundaries of the district may not meet the criteria for contributing to the historic character of the district but the resource is within the district boundaries.

D2. California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) is the state's authoritative guide to significant California historical and archaeological resources. The State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC) has designed this program for use by state and local agencies, private groups and citizens to identify, evaluate, register, and protect California's historical resources.

The CRHR program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural significance; identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes; determines eligibility for state historic preservation grant funding; and affords certain protections under CEQA.

Types of resources eligible for nomination for listing in the CRHR are buildings, sites, structures, objects, or historic districts. Properties on or formally determined eligible for the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR. An historical resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following criteria for listing:

1. It is associated with events or patterns of events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or

4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, state or the nation.

Effects of Listing

Listing of an historical resource in the CRHR results in the following:

- Limited protection: Environmental review may be required under CEQA if the property is threatened by a project;
- The local assessor may enter into contract with the property owner for property tax reduction (pursuant to the Mills Act);
- The local building inspector must allow potential alternatives to complying with current code as provided under the State Historical Building Code; and
- The owner may place his or her own plaque or marker at the site of the resource.

D3. City and County of San Francisco Resources

As an entity within the State California Community Colleges system, CCSF is generally not subject to local regulations. In addition, CCSF may choose to exempt itself from local planning and zoning requirements with respect to classroom uses. Therefore, the following information regarding the City and County of San Francisco planning/regulatory context is not necessarily applicable to the Master Plan, and is presented for informational purposes and for assessing environmental impacts.

Preservation Element of the San Francisco General Plan

The Preservation Element is a component of the *San Francisco General Plan (General Plan)*. Within the context of the *General Plan*, the Preservation Element sets forth the following goals, objectives and policies for historic preservation:

- *Assess Cultural Resources.* Maintain a complete inventory of important cultural resources and disseminate information important to the understanding of these resources;
- *Protect Cultural Resources.* Preserve significant cultural resources;
- *Use Preservation Incentives and Government Regulations.* Develop and apply preservation techniques available as part of local, state, and federal programs;
- *Provide Public Information and Education.* Foster public awareness and appreciation of San Francisco's cultural resources and support the City's economy by encouraging tourism and attracting development and investment based on these cultural resources; and

- *Promote Sustainability.* Recognize the environmental values of San Francisco's built environment.

Preservation objectives and policies are included throughout the *General Plan's* Elements and Area Plans. Objectives and policies explicitly regarding the preservation of historic resources are contained in the following *General Plan* Elements: Air Quality, Arts, Commerce and Industry, Community Safety, Recreation and Open Space, Residence, Transportation, and Urban Design. (Project consistency with relevant General Plan policies is discussed in **Section 4.1, Land Use and Planning.**)

Project review is required for both individually eligible buildings and buildings within the downtown historic district. Such projects must meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. Additionally, the Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code promotes the preservation of historic properties.

San Francisco Planning Code and The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board

The purpose of the preservation of historical, architectural, and aesthetic landmarks as defined by Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code is to prevent the unnecessary destruction of these resources and to encourage the reuse of these valuable resources. The Planning Code spells out that the prevention of such needless destruction and impairment is essential to the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of San Francisco.

The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) advises the Department of City Planning and the Planning Commission on historical preservation matters.

The CCSF campus is not currently within a City-designated Historic District (Planning Code Article 10) or Conservation District (Article 11).⁶ In addition, the Main Campus is not currently a San Francisco Landmark.⁷

D4. Human Remains

According to the California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052). Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC.

⁶ San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 10, Historic and Conservation Districts in San Francisco, accessed through www.sfgov.org.

⁷ Appendix A to Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, landmarks designated as of April 2003, accessed through www.sfgov.org, October 2003.

E. SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

For purposes of this EIR, thresholds were used from both the City and County of San Francisco Initial Study Checklist and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (Environmental Checklist Form).

The City and County of San Francisco typically uses the following criteria (from the City's Initial Study Checklist) when determining whether a project could have a significant effect on the environment:

Could the project:

- a. Disrupt or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as part of a scientific study?
- b. Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area?
- c. Conflict with the preservation of buildings subject to the provisions of Article 10 or Article 11 of the City Planning Code?

In addition, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (Environmental Checklist Form) lists the following items to be considered when determining whether a project could have a significant effect on the environment:

Would the project:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; or
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.

If implementation of the project exceeds any of the standards outlined above, the project would result in a significant impact.

The following analysis addresses impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources (as well as human remains) and historic architectural resources. A records search as indicated that no paleontological finds have been made in the geologic units that underlie the campus (within or near the

project area); therefore, impacts to unique paleontological resources will not be analyzed further.⁸ The project would represent a continuation of the educational uses on the campus and thus would not conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area. As stated in the Setting, the campus does not contain any historic or conservation districts or any historic landmarks, as defined by Articles 10 and 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code.

To determine whether cultural resources could be significantly affected for CEQA purposes, the significance of the resource itself must first be determined. Section 15065 of the CEQA *Guidelines* mandates a finding of significance if a project would eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or pre-history.

In addition, pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA *Guidelines*, a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it “may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.” A “substantial adverse change” means “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource is impaired.” Material impairment means altering “in an adverse manner those characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.”

As noted above, according to Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* (Environmental Checklist Form), a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or disturb any human remains.

Impacts to these cultural resources not determined to be significant according to the significance criteria described above are not considered significant for the purposes of CEQA.

E1. Historical Resources

Pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA *Guidelines*, an historical resource is presumed significant if it is listed on the CRHR or has been determined to be eligible for listing by the SHRC. An historical resource may also be considered significant if the lead agency determines, based on substantial evidence, that the resource meets the criteria for inclusion in the CRHR.

CEQA contains additional guidelines for defining an historical resource:

- California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in the NRHP (Section 5024.1.d.1);

⁸ Records search through the Museum of Paleontology, University of California-Berkeley, November 5, 2003.

- those resources included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the *Public Resources Code*, or identified as significant in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the *Public Resources Code*;
- those resources that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (generally, if it meets criteria for listing on the CRHC), provided the determination is supported by substantial evidence; or
- those resources a local agency believes are historical for more broadly defined reasons than identified in the preceding criteria.

Generally, under CEQA, a project that follows The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Structures is considered to have mitigated impacts to an historical resource to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5). Although documentation of an historic resource also reduces significant historical impacts, Section 15126.4 (b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines notes that in some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource may not mitigate the effects to a less-than-significant level.

E2. Archaeological Resources

Pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA *Guidelines*, archaeological resources, not otherwise determined to be historical resources, may be significant if they are unique. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, a unique archaeological resource is defined as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets one of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
2. Has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

A nonunique archaeological resource means an archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the above criteria. Nonunique archaeological resources receive no further consideration under CEQA.

F. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Cultural-1 Disturbance to Archaeological Resources

Impact

Master Plan Buildout

As stated previously, no recorded prehistoric sites are located on the campus. In addition, earth-moving and other project construction activities would generally occur in areas that have been developed previously. For example, the development proposed west of Phelan Avenue would be constructed on the site of the existing Balboa Reservoir, which was excavated in the 1950s; that site was used in the 1940s by the U.S. Navy and then for the CCSF "West Campus." The embankments of the reservoir may include slopes constructed with fill material as well as areas of native soil and rock. The proposed parking structure would be built on the site of the North and South Gymnasiums, which were constructed in 1940 and are underlain by sand fill. The site of the proposed Community Health & Wellness Center is underlain by sandy fill (sand with varying amounts of silt, clay, and gravel) as well as organic material and debris placed there in the 1950s.

Therefore, the Master Plan would not result in any impacts on known or suspected prehistoric archaeological resources. However, the general area of the campus has a moderate sensitivity to prehistoric resources, and unknown archaeological deposits could be discovered during construction activities. Depending on the nature of the resource, disturbance of unknown deposits could be a significant impact.

No recorded historic archaeological sites are located on the campus. As with prehistoric resources, earth moving and other construction activities would generally occur in areas that have been developed previously. Therefore, the Master Plan would not result in any impacts on known or suspected historic archaeological resources. However, unknown archaeological deposits could be discovered during construction activities. Historic-period artifacts have been recovered during a pipeline replacement project along Ocean Avenue east of I-280.⁹ In addition, parts of the campus could contain historic archaeological features and artifacts associated with the early history of CCSF or earlier structures on the site. Construction activities on the campus could result in the discovery and potential disturbance of remnants from those historic structures. Depending on the nature of the resource, disturbance of unknown deposits could be a significant impact.

⁹ CHRIS/NWIC, October 14, 2003.

Near-Term Development

The impacts of development of the proposed near-term projects (Community Health & Wellness Center, Student Health Center & Classroom Building [Health Center], Child Development, practice field, and reservoir berm removal/wall construction) are addressed in the discussion of the impacts of the Master Plan above. Construction of the near-term projects would not result in the disturbance of any known or suspected archaeological resources, but unknown deposits could be discovered during earthmoving activities. This potential impact could be significant.

Reservoir Configuration

If the MOU between CCSF and SFPUC were not approved and the Balboa Reservoir was not reconfigured, Master Plan development would occur within the southern reservoir only. Potential impacts related to discovery of unknown archaeological deposits would be the same as described for development on the reconfigured reservoir.

Mitigation

The following measures are based on mitigation measures developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.

Cultural-1: Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged cultural resources. CCSF shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology. The archaeological consultant shall undertake an archaeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archaeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of CCSF. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to CCSF for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by CCSF. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of CCSF, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (a)(c).

Archaeological Testing Program. The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to CCSF for review and approval an archaeological testing plan (ATP). The archaeological

testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to CCSF. If based on the archaeological testing program the archaeological consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present, CCSF in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and/or an archaeological data recovery program. If CCSF determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of CCSF either:

- A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or
- B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless CCSF determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

Archaeological Monitoring Program. If CCSF in consultation with the archaeological consultant determines that an archaeological monitoring program shall be implemented the archaeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archaeological consultant, project team representative and CCSF shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. CCSF in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archaeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archaeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence

of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource;

- The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and CCSF until CCSF has, in consultation with the project archaeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits;
- The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archaeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with CCSF. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify CCSF of the encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to CCSF.

Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to CCSF.

Archaeological Data Recovery Program. The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, project team representative, and CCSF shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to CCSF. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed

project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- Discard and Deaccession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program.
- Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, CCSF project representative, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Final Archaeological Resources Report. The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to CCSF that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological

and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Once approved by CCSF, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and CCSF shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The City and County of San Francisco, Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive one copy of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, CCSF may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

Cultural -2 Disturbance to Historic Architectural Resources

Impact

Master Plan Buildout

The Main Campus Master Plan would result in the demolition or removal of a number of buildings on the campus. The buildings proposed for removal fall into two main categories: (1) temporary buildings, in many cases trailers (called bungalows) that have been located on campus to fulfill a short-term need for space, and (2) larger buildings or groups of buildings that are considered to have significant structural or systems deficiencies. The following buildings are likely to be demolished or removed during the time frame of the Master Plan:

- South Gym
- North Gym
- Bungalows 201-208
- Bungalows 209-213
- Bungalows 214-223
- Bungalows 301-305
- Bungalows 306-311
- Bungalows 311-317

- Bungalows 401-404
- Bungalows 500
- Bungalows 601-623D
- Child Care
- PE Field Storage
- California Bookstore

As described earlier in this section, the South Gymnasium, North Gymnasium, Child Care Center, and California Bookstore are currently over 45 years of age. However, none of these buildings is considered a significant historic resource. Therefore, demolition or removal of these buildings would not have a significant impact on historic resources. By the 2015 horizon of the Master Plan, none of the other buildings to be demolished will be more than 50 years old (that is, none were built in 1965 or earlier).

The Master Plan would also result in the renovation of several buildings on campus. During the time horizon of the Master Plan, the building for which major renovations are proposed is the Creative and Visual Arts Complex (as part of the Pan American Studies Center project).¹⁰ In general, renovations would include upgrades or modifications to the telecommunications, electrical, lighting, HVAC, and fire alarm systems; upgrades to elevators and restrooms to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act; and replacement of floor coverings, painting, ceiling repair and window replacement. The Master Plan proposes that the Creative Arts Complex be renovated into the Center for Pan American Unity; as part of the renovation, the Diego Rivera Pan American Unity Mural would be repositioned from its current location in the theatre to a gallery location. The Creative and Visual Arts Complex buildings are currently less than 45 years old, and do not appear to have the “exceptional significance” necessary to be eligible at less than 50 years of age. Therefore, they are not currently considered “historic resources” under CEQA, and it is not possible to determine whether they will be considered historic resources once they reach 50 years of age. By the time the renovations are undertaken, the buildings could be considered historic resources. Given that the particulars of proposed renovations are not known at this time, there is a potential for the renovations to result in a significant impact.

As noted previously, the Pan American Unity Mural, a significant historic resource, would be relocated. Removal of the mural from the Theatre would not be a significant impact because the mural was not designed specifically for the Theatre, and the Theatre was not designed specifically for the mural. The significance of the mural would not be damaged because the mural would be moved to a more prominent

¹⁰ The Draft Master Plan (November 19, 2003, p. 58) mentions the Visual Arts Complex and Statler Wing (which will be 50 years old by 2015) in a list of buildings “most in need of removal and/or major renovation.” For this EIR, it is assumed that changes to the Visual Arts Complex would be limited to renovation. No major changes to the Statler Wing are foreseen within the 2015 Master Plan time frame; the need for any changes to the building would be determined based on the development of a consolidated Student Services complex. Demolition of the buildings is not proposed as part of the Master Plan.

location, and the relocation would be undertaken by qualified professionals. For those reasons, relocation of the mural would not result in a significant impact to historic resources.

Near-Term Development

The impacts of development of the proposed near-term projects (Community Health & Wellness Center, Health Center, Child Development Center, practice field, and reservoir berm removal/wall construction) are addressed in the discussion of the impacts of the Master Plan above. Construction of the near-term projects would require demolition of Bungalows 201 through 213, 301 through 312, and the Child Care Center; as noted above, none of these structures is considered a significant historic resource. Therefore, the impacts of near-term development would be less than significant.

Reservoir Configuration

If the MOU between CCSF and SFPUC were not approved and the Balboa Reservoir was not reconfigured, Master Plan development would occur within the southern reservoir only. Potential impacts to historic resources would be the same as described for development on the reconfigured reservoir. The only structure that might be affected by development in this area is the California Bookstore, which is not considered a significant historic resource.

Mitigation

Cultural-2: If renovation of the Creative Arts building occurs while it is less than 50 years old (prior to 2011), no mitigation is required. If renovation occurs in 2011 or later, CCSF shall have a qualified professional re-evaluate the significance of the building to determine if it is eligible for the NRHP or CRHP and if the building is considered a historic resource under CEQA. If the re-evaluation determines that the Arts Complex is not a historic resource under CEQA, no other mitigation is required.

If the re-evaluation determines that the Arts building is a historic resource under CEQA, all renovations to the building shall be designed to comply with The Secretary of Interior's Standards. The professional hired by CCSF shall prepare a list of character-defining features to be used when considering the extent of renovations. The renovations shall respect the principles of material repair over replacement, or if repair is not feasible, replacement in kind with matching form and materials. Assuming that the renovations would follow these principles and would not result in major changes to the building exterior, compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards would be feasible.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of all of the above mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to historic resources to a less-than-significant level.

Cultural-3 Impacts of Citywide Master Plan Development

Impact

As stated in the Project Description, changes at most of the other CCSF campuses would be minor, such as the remodeling of existing space. These changes would not result in any significant negative cultural resource impacts. The cultural resources impacts associated with the Mission and Chinatown/North Beach campuses have already been analyzed in certified EIRs (see **Section 3.0, Project Description**, for full citations of these documents). That analysis has been incorporated into this EIR by reference.

The 1999 EIR Addendum on the approved Chinatown/North Beach campus concluded that the facility would preserve, restore and rehabilitate the Colombo Building, which is eligible for listing on the NRHP. The planned use of the building was found to be in conformance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards, and the EIR Addendum concluded that the impact to the resource would not be significant. Planned demolition of the Fong Building would not cause the loss of an historically or architecturally significant structure. The 1998 EIR on the project and prior EIRs indicate the presence of significant archaeological resources (cultural resources from the Spanish-Mexican to Gold Rush periods, as well as Native American remains); mitigation measures proposed as part of the project would reduce potential impacts to those resources to less-than-significant levels.

The 1998 Mission Campus EIR and 2003 EIR Addendum noted that there are no known archaeological resources in the immediate project area, but that there is potential for unknown prehistoric artifacts to be discovered. Mitigation measures were proposed and adopted as part of the Mission Campus project. Thus, the EIR Addendum concluded that the project would not result in any significant impacts to historic architectural resources.

The proposed CCSF Main Campus Master Plan could have significant impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. However, those effects could not combine with cultural resource impacts at the other campuses because of the physical separation of the campuses and because mitigation has already been approved or incorporated into the other campus projects to effectively address potential impacts. In addition, potential impacts of the Main Campus Master Plan on historic architectural resources would not combine with effects at the other campuses because the impacts at the other campuses would not be adverse. Therefore, there would be no cumulative cultural resource impacts from Citywide campus development.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant.

Cultural-4 Cumulative Impacts

Impact

Impacts to historic architectural resources tend to be site-specific and are assessed on a site-by-site basis. Most of the historic resources on the campus are significant at the local level as representatives of the creation of the City College of San Francisco and the junior college movement in the Bay Area. This significance is tied to the Main Campus site and would not pertain to other cumulative development.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant.

G. CONCLUSION

Potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources and historic architectural resources would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this section.