4.4 HISTORIC RESOURCES

This section of the Focused Tiered Draft EIR presents potential historical resources impacts of the Creative Arts and Holloway Mixed-Use Project (Project). The preparation of this Focused Tiered Draft EIR was preceded by the Tiered Initial Study, which determined that an EIR would be prepared to consider the potential for the Project to result in new significant impacts on historic resources or substantially more severe impacts compared to those identified in the Campus Master Plan (CMP) EIR. Section 4.4 of the 2007 CMP Draft EIR (SF State 2006) and Section 3.8 of the Final 2007 CMP EIR (SF State 2007a) address the historical resources effects of campus growth under the 2007 CMP (SF State 2007b).

This section presents the environmental setting, impacts of the Project on the environment, and proposed measures to mitigate any identified significant impacts. Information is incorporated by reference from the 2007 CMP EIR, from which this EIR is tiered, as described in Chapter 2 of this EIR. Additionally, a Historical Resources Technical Report was prepared for the Project by Page & Turnbull (2009) to document and evaluate changed conditions on and adjacent to the Project site, since the certification of the 2007 CMP EIR, related to the eligibility of the Parkmerced area as a historic district. This report is incorporated into this section of the EIR as relevant and contained in its entirety in Appendix D.

Public and agency comments related to historical resources were received during the public scoping period in response to the Notice of Preparation, and are summarized below:

- The EIR should describe the properties evaluated for historic significance on the campus for the 2007 CMP EIR. It should be clear whether Parkmerced was previously evaluated during the CMP EIR. Sufficient information should be provided about the setting and a determination provided about whether updated analysis is required for this EIR.
- Identify the criteria used to determine whether a building may be considered a potential historic resource for purposes of environmental review.
- The EIR analysis should clearly explain the specific impacts associated with buildout of the 2007 CMP and whether impacts are to individually-eligible resources or to a district.
- It should be clear how updated information will be used to supplement the CMP EIR, which is incorporated by reference.
- The EIR should provide for robust documentation of the sites' history, which should be informed by the research conducted for the Parkmerced project. San Francisco State University (SF State) should coordinate with City and County of San Francisco’s Planning Department historic preservation specialists on the scope of work related to the Historic American Buildings Survey.
• The EIR should review and reference the importance of the landscaped courtyards and the need to document the loss of designed courtyards done by a master-class landscape architect. Documentation should include a 360 degree video, aerial plans, interior and exterior detailing, and courtyard photos showing prior views and design elements.

• See also Chapter 6, Alternatives, for additional scoping comments related to historic resource impacts and alternatives.

To the extent that issues identified in public comments involve potentially significant effects on the environment according to CEQA, and/or were raised by responsible and trustee agencies, they are identified and addressed in this EIR. For a complete list of public comments received during the public scoping period refer to Appendix B.

4.4.1 Environmental Setting

Section 4.4 of the 2007 CMP EIR addresses the existing environmental setting for historical resources (SF State 2006). The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Environmental Setting’ subsection of Section 4.4 of the 2007 CMP EIR, updated with current information as necessary. In particular, the Historical Resources Technical Report (Appendix D) for the Project provides most of the updated information presented below.

Study Area

The Project site is located along the southern edge of the campus in an area that was formerly part of the Parkmerced area to the south. Since the certification of the 2007 CMP EIR, the Parkmerced area has been determined to be an eligible historic district, as further described below. Given that, the study area for historical resources includes the Project site; the southern portion of the campus that contains original Parkmerced blocks along Holloway Avenue, Tapia Drive, and Font Boulevard; and the remainder of the Parkmerced area to the south of the campus that falls within the eligible historic district (see Figure 4.4-1). The full extent of the original Parkmerced development, now divided amongst several owners, was 192 acres.

The Parkmerced blocks owned by SF State include building Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, 42, the former Parkmerced recreation area (now the site of SF State’s Mashouf Wellness Center), and the medians and traffic circles on a stretch of Font Boulevard between Lake Merced Boulevard and Serrano Drive. The original Parkmerced block numbers listed above are used to discuss the buildings in this section, as that is the identification used in previous historic documentation, and SF State also uses these terms. However, the Parkmerced block numbers correspond to the Assessor’s Parcel Number and other SF State names shown in Table 4.4-1 (see Figure 4.4-2 for locations).
### Table 4.4-1
Original Parkmerced Blocks on SF State Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parkmerced Block Number</th>
<th>Assessor’s Parcel Number</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1 (Tapia Triangle)</td>
<td>7306-001</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>7312-001</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 5</td>
<td>7313-001</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 6</td>
<td>7314-001</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 41</td>
<td>7304-001</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 42</td>
<td>7307-001</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SF State CMP EIR Historic Context

The following historic architectural context was excerpted from the Draft CMP EIR (SF State 2006):

San Francisco State Normal School, a two-year teacher-training college, was founded in 1899. It became a 4-year school in 1930, and received university status in 1972 through the California State University system. The original college was housed in a plain stone structure on Powell Street near Clay, which was destroyed in the 1906 earthquake and fire. While the school reopened at another location on upper Market, it was not until 1939 that 54 acres of land was acquired at the existing campus location. This followed the introduction of the “M” streetcar line along 19th Avenue and the construction of Lake Merced Boulevard. The campus’s earliest temporary buildings and athletic fields replaced farmland. The campus remained largely in this form during the first decade.

It was not until 1949 when construction began on the first permanent structures, a stadium and a physical education building. Construction exploded on and around campus after that time. SFSU saw the construction of the campus core, while Villas Parkmerced and Stonestown were fully completed by the end of the 1950s (see further discussion below). New buildings continued to replace the older temporary structures on the campus, as the 1960s and 1970s saw the campus receive its first dormitories, a student center, two library expansions, and a pair of towering new science buildings. Even the valley, a remnant of the former stream canyon, had accumulated several structures. The last 15 years on campus have seen development across all building types, including an expansion in student housing, new academic and student support facilities, and an ongoing program of seismic upgrading of the University’s building stock.
The University Park North (UPN) was recently acquired by SFSU and was previously called the Stonestown apartments. The Western Neighborhoods Project provides a description of the history and architecture of Stonestown, which is summarized as follows (Western Neighborhoods Project 2006). The Stonestown shopping center and the adjacent apartment towers and buildings were built in 1952. “Stonestown” as it was called, was the fourth largest apartment complex/shopping center in the United States at the time. By the early 1980s, the mall still retained a classic 1950s look, but a major renovation took place that added a story of stores, a glass ceiling, and marble floors, creating the “Stonestown Galleria.” The apartments and towers were purchased by SFSU in 2005 and remain much as they were in 1952.

The three blocks of University Park South (UPS) and the Tapia Triangle are part of the larger Villas Parkmerced neighborhood that lies to the south of the campus.

While additional detail about Parkmerced was included in the CMP EIR, this information did not reflect the more recent information that the area is eligible as a historic district.

**Parkmerced Historic Context**

The following historic context for the Parkmerced area, including the portion that is located on the SF State campus, is based on the Historical Resources Technical Report (see Appendix D) prepared for this Project.

*Early Site History*

The area around Lake Merced was originally inhabited by the Ramaytush Ohlone tribe of Native Americans, who used the area to fish, hunt, and gather other resources. During the early years of Spanish settlement in San Francisco, the shores of Lake Merced were used as common land for grazing cattle. It was not until 1835 that the land was privatized and granted to a rancher named Jose Antonio Galindo. The current site of Parkmerced formed part of the Rancho Laguna de la Merced.

The Spring Valley Water Company purchased Lake Merced and the surrounding land in 1868 as part of a move to establish a monopoly over San Francisco’s water supply. The company began to sell off some of its land holdings by the 1890s. The future site of Parkmerced became the Ingleside Public Golf Course, one of the many golf courses built on the shores of Lake Merced around the turn-of-the-century.

During the early decades of the twentieth century, the first signs of significant development began moving out across the dunes of the Sunset district and down into the Parkside district towards Lake Merced. As late as 1920, however, the Lake Merced District was still
The area around Lake Merced represented one of the largest tracts of undeveloped private land in San Francisco, which enticed the rapidly-expanding San Francisco State College (later renamed San Francisco State University) to purchase land for a new campus from the Spring Valley Water Company in 1937. However, construction for the new campus did not begin until after World War II, and the campus was not occupied until 1953—2 years after the completion of Parkmerced.

Development of Parkmerced: Phase I (1941–1945)

The Parkmerced rental complex was constructed on 192 acres of land previously occupied by the Ingleside Golf Course between 1941 and 1951 as San Francisco’s first all-rental housing community. The community was planned as a self-contained development by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife) as part of a government-supported effort that encouraged direct investment in middle-income housing by insurance companies in the 1940s and 1950s. MetLife’s 1941 proposal was to build 2,500 apartments, which would house approximately 8,000–10,000 residents.

Parkmerced was designed by Leonard Schultz & Associates, who was also the architect of two related housing projects commissioned by MetLife during this period, Parkfairfax in Virginia (1941–1943) and Parklabrea in Los Angeles (1941–1950). Frederick H. Meyer, a prominent San Francisco architect, served as the local architect, while Thomas Church (and other landscape architects from his office) served as the landscape architect for the garden courtyards and public open spaces. Rental units were originally planned to be constructed of high quality, modern materials for the time period, such as reinforced concrete, but wartime shortages of materials dramatically limited the application of these materials. The original plans also included amenities such as modern appliances, parking, landscaped courtyards, playgrounds, and open spaces for recreation. The builders of the project were the New York City firm Starrett Brothers & Eken, who constructed the Empire State Building and several other MetLife housing projects, including Parkchester and Peter Cooper Village.

Schultze’s early plans for the buildings, layout, and grounds of the Parkmerced project showed a complex of two-story apartments and open spaces that were formal and axial. An early site plan and image of the original model for Parkmerced from 1944 showed the overall layout of the site and location of garden apartment blocks and open spaces. The difference between the original model and final site plan upon which construction was carried out was a more finished, urban western edge to the site plan and less open space towards Lake Merced. The early site plan appears to be loosely organized by Beaux Arts and Garden City principles. Evidence of these principles is seen in the overall form of the Parkmerced plan, with a series of landscaped streets radiating from a central common according to a hierarchical circulation system that divides the property into pie-shaped blocks. In addition to the garden apartment blocks, this
early site plan included a small recreational area (tennis courts), a small commercial area with parking, and the Meadow.

Construction of the first phase of clustered garden apartments at Parkmerced began in 1941 and was completed in 1945. The initial phase of construction included all site planning by Schultze, including the layout of open spaces and the pie-shaped block grid, as well as the construction of six blocks (Blocks 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36) of unfinished concrete garden apartments, which were completed by 1944. Original plans called for the construction of all buildings with reinforced concrete, but wartime restrictions on building materials made reinforced concrete unavailable for private enterprise during this time. Although construction was allowed to continue through the war years, the original number of apartments was reduced from 2,500 to 1,700 to accommodate for materials shortages. The remaining garden apartments planned for the first phase of construction were completed in 1945 and constructed of wood frame and stucco (Blocks 2-13, 20-25, 29-31, 38, and 42-45). These include the most of the subject blocks currently owned by SF State.

Landscaping of the Meadow, Common, and drives was completed by 1945, as well as the installation of playgrounds and an elementary school. At the conclusion of the initial construction phase in 1945, the site included 1,687 garden apartment units and associated landscaping within a contained area of low-rise blocks, bounded by Arballo Drive to the west, Holloway Avenue to the north, Cambon Drive to the east, and Brotherhood Way to the south. Two additional small blocks of housing extended beyond Arballo Drive on the west side of the development. The adjacent parcels at the edges of the property were left undeveloped, including the land east of Cambon Drive.

Critics applauded the unity of the whole, seamlessly combining infrastructure, housing, and recreation areas. Also of note were the pie-shaped blocks featuring convenient and designated laundry, play, and private garden space on the interior of each housing cluster.

During the development of the site plan, some of Church’s associates claim that he influenced the site design, while others claim that he was introduced later in the project after Schultze completed the overall site planning. However, these claims seem inaccurate in the face of the historical record, which shows Schultze’s designs and site plans for Parkmerced, which pre-date Church’s involvement.

While Thomas Church’s influence may not have been seen in the earliest site plan (pre-1941), he did design the landscaping of the garden apartment courtyards and open spaces, thus providing landscape interventions into the Project site. As noted by author Marc Treib, Church’s role in the project was one of refinement, not creation, relative to the site plan and landscaping. Church used modern landscape design concepts to optimize the site conditions,
including a focus on the combination of views and spaces instead of the relationship of the landscape to architectural facades. His influence was seen in the landscape elements found within the garden apartment courts, which relate to his other smaller-scale residential work.

Thomas Church used the assistance of landscape architects, contractors, and designers associated with his firm throughout the duration of construction. These individuals included landscape contractors Floyd Gerow and Alec Cattini; landscape architects H. Leland Vaughn (associated with Church from 1931 to 1945); Robert Royston (associated with Church from c.1938 to 1942); June Meehan (associated with Church from 1940 to 1967); Douglas Baylis (associated with Church from 1941 to 1945); and Lawrence Halprin (associated with Church from c. 1944 to 1949).

Each block of attached garden apartments had a series of interior courtyards featuring private terraces, shared laundry areas, and parking. Within each courtyard Church used low walls and plantings to define private outdoor space associated with each living unit, leaving the central open spaces as a semi-private common for the residents of that building. A large section of open space west of the center of the property and bounded by Arballo Drive, Serrano Drive, and Gonzalez Drive, was called “The Meadow,” and was originally designed to feature a series of recreational nodes. A circular area of open space was set aside for a landscaped Common in the center of the site. Schultze's site plan provided access to the property through four vehicle entrances, thereby limiting through-traffic on the property with the intent of increasing pedestrian safety in the enclosed complex.

Development of Parkmerced: Phase II (1948–1951)

In the late-1940s, as a response to the continued demand for housing after World War II, MetLife developed the remaining parcels at Parkmerced to provide greater residential density and site amenities. This second phase of development at Parkmerced took place between 1948 and 1951, and included the addition of four blocks of garden apartments (Blocks 1, 19, 37, and 41), completed between 1948 and 1949, as well as the construction of the Cambon Drive shopping center (specified in the original site plan), an Administration Building (also specified in the original site plan), three underground garages, a Maintenance Building, and eleven mid-rise towers, which were all completed by 1951. All of the buildings constructed between 1948 and 1951 were made of poured-in-place molded concrete with horizontal scoring. The massing, height, and materials of these buildings serve as a clear visual marker of this last phase of construction.

Thomas Church joined Leonard Schultze again on the second phase of design. Church designed the landscaping around the eleven towers and re-designed the Meadow and associated green spaces to accommodate the larger-scale buildings on the project site. An additional 1,769 units
were added to the Parkmerced complex upon the completion of the second phase of construction in 1951, thereby doubling the existing number of rentable units to a total of 3,456.

MetLife owned Parkmerced until 1970, when the property was sold to the Parkmerced Corporation. Property ownership changed again in 1995 and 1999. An 8.2-acre portion of the original Parkmerced property along Brotherhood Way was sold in 1999 and the Cambon Drive shopping center was sold in 2004. The SF State Foundation purchased Blocks 1, 2, 5, and 6 between 2000 and 2005 and subsequently sold them to SF State/CSU. SF State purchased Blocks 41 and 42 directly. Parkmerced Investors purchased the remainder of Parkmerced in 2005.

Current Historic Status of Parkmerced

This section describes the current historic status of the Parkmerced area, including the Project site and other blocks owned by SF State.

National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the nation’s most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. National Register criteria are defined in depth in National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. There are four basic criteria under which a structure, site, building, district, or object can be considered eligible for listing in the National Register. These criteria are as follows:

- **Criterion A (Event):** Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- **Criterion B (Person):** Properties associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- **Criterion C (Design/Construction):** Properties that 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 distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction; and
- **Criterion D (Information Potential):** Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The University Park South blocks are not listed in the National Register of Historic Places. However, a Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment for Parkmerced prepared in 2009 by Page & Turnbull determined that the entire Parkmerced development, including the property owned by SF State, was found to be significant as a historic district for its...
association with community planning and for its mid-century design, with a period of significance from 1941 to 1951. The property was constructed by Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife), and the majority of the features at Parkmerced retain integrity to MetLife’s period of ownership. Together the buildings, landscapes, and associated features of Parkmerced form a historic district and cultural landscape that reflects the original design and functionality of this planned residential community. The apartment blocks are not considered significant individually. This conclusion was reached through comprehensive research of the property’s history, associated historic contexts, an existing conditions survey, and cultural landscape evaluation.

Parkmerced was determined eligible for the National Register under the following criteria:

- Parkmerced is significant under Criterion A (Events) as a resource that is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of local history. Specifically, Parkmerced is significant for its association with MetLife’s nationwide housing effort during and after World War II, and for its association with development and growth of middle-income rental housing in San Francisco.

- Parkmerced is also significant under Criterion C (Design/Construction) as a resource that embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type and period, and as a resource that represents the work of a master. Specifically, Parkmerced is significant as one of the last large-scale residential complexes completed by master architect Leonard Schultze and landscape architect Thomas Church. The property is also significant as a mid-century planned community in San Francisco.

If a property is determined eligible for listing in the National Register, it is automatically eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register.

The Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment for Parkmerced prepared in 2009 by Page & Turnbull determined the entire Parkmerced development, including the SF State blocks, to be a California Register-eligible historic district in 2009.
**California Historical Resource Status Code**

Properties listed or under review by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation are assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code (CHRS Code) of “1” to “7” to establish their historical significance in relation to the National Register or California Register. Properties with a Status Code of “1” or “2” are either eligible for listing in the California Register or the National Register, or are already listed in one or both of the registers. Properties assigned Status Codes of “3” or “4” appear to be eligible for listing in either register, but normally require more research to support this rating. Properties assigned a Status Code of “5” have typically been determined to be locally significant or to have contextual importance. Properties with a Status Code of “6” are not eligible for listing in either register. Finally, a Status Code of “7” means that the resource has not been evaluated for the National Register or the California Register, or needs reevaluation.

None of the SF State blocks (or the rest of Parkmerced) appear to have been formally submitted to the California Office of Historic Preservation; they are not listed in the California Historical Resource Information System’s database (most updated version from 2012) with a CHRS Code.

**Approved Parkmerced Master Plan**

Much of the Parkmerced property owned by Parkmerced Investors, located south of the Project site and other SF State blocks, is entitled to be redeveloped over a 20- to 30-year period beginning in 2016. The Parkmerced project was approved by the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors in May 2011. That project would demolish the garden apartment blocks and build new multi-story residential buildings and other amenities on site.¹ The nine towers, meadow, and Common would remain. When implemented, the project would create a significant unavoidable impact on the eligible Parkmerced Historic District, wherein the historic district in its entirety would no longer be eligible for listing due to loss of integrity. This determination was made in the Parkmerced Project EIR (CCSF 2010).

**Parkmerced Remnant Historic District**

**Site Descriptions**

The Project site and SF State’s other blocks in University Park South are located at the south border of the campus at what was originally the northern border of Parkmerced (see Figures 4.4-1 and 4.4-2). Large university buildings, including the Humanities Building (1994), Creative Arts Building (1953), J. Paul Leonard Library (1953; renovation and addition 2012), and Administration Building (1989) are located immediately northeast of Block 1 and across

---

¹ A full description of the project is located on the San Francisco Planning Department’s (http://sf-planning.org/parkmerced-project).
Holloway Avenue from Blocks 2, 5, and 6. The former Parkmerced recreation area is located immediately north of Block 41, and the Mashouf Wellness Center is currently under construction on this site. The parking garage that was located east of Block 41 and was part of the original Parkmerced development was demolished in August 2015 and is now within the construction zone. Across Vidal Drive to the south of Block 41 and across Arballo Drive to the west of Block 42 are Parkmerced towers 39 and 40.

Natural landscape features include a relatively flat topography and vegetation. Designed landscape features include radial vehicular circulation with traffic circles and planting medians; street and carport parking; pedestrian pathway circulation; the public, semi-private, and private open spaces; views and vistas to the SF State buildings, Parkmerced garden apartments, and Parkmerced towers; and small scale features, such as decorative and functional landscape walls, steps, privacy screens, railings, etc.

While the Parkmerced garden apartments owned by Parkmerced Investor would be demolished and new multi-story housing would be constructed with a new street pattern, the towers would remain within the viewshed of the SF State University Park South blocks. Figure 4.4-3 through Figure 4.4-8 provide photographs of the SF State blocks. Full site descriptions for each block are included in Appendix D.

Eligibility of Remnant Parkmerced Properties

Given the pending approved development at Parkmerced, by Parkmerced Investors, the eligibility of the remaining Parkmerced features on the SF State campus was assessed in the Historic Resources Technical Report for the Project (Appendix D), and is summarized below.

For a property to be eligible for national, state or local designation under one of the significance criteria identified above, the essential physical features, known as character-defining features, that enable the property to convey its historic identity must be evident. A property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms such as form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials.

The 2009 Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment provided a list of the Parkmerced Historic District’s character-defining features. In light of the approved project at the greater Parkmerced site that is anticipated to be implemented, the list of character-defining features is assessed below for whether they could still be represented by SF State’s Parkmerced Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42, along with the towers that would remain on Parkmerced Investors property to the south (see Figure 4.4-9).
Those character-defining features that would still be represented on SF State’s blocks and other areas to remain are noted in italicized font below.

**Spatial Organization**

- Overall site plan includes street grid, *placement of buildings in blocks [at the Towers, Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42], the Meadow, and Parkmerced “Common.”*
- *Garden apartment blocks and courtyards (interior, entry, and laundry) [at Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42]*
- *Tower arrangement and courtyards*

**Cluster Arrangement**

- *Garden apartment blocks [at Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42]*
- *Tower clusters*

**Circulation**

- *Landscaped drives*
  - *Font Boulevard*
  - *Crespi Drive [circulation would remain though the landscaping would change]*
  - *Bucareli Drive [circulation would remain though the landscaping would change]*
  - *Grijalva Drive [circulation would remain though the landscaping would change]*
- *Juan Bautista Circle [circulation would remain though the landscaping would change]*
- *Traffic circles [At Font Boulevard]*
- *Aggregate and concrete paths (in courtyards and between buildings)*

**Topography**

- Individual garden apartment courtyard grading

**Buildings and Structures**

- *Garden apartments*
- *Towers*
- *Maintenance building*
- *Administration building*
• Carports
• Laundry buildings
• Storage buildings

Vegetation

• Location and rhythm of street trees and plantings along drives and secondary streets, garden courtyard apartments, and towers
• Placement of specimen trees, lawns, and vegetation in courtyards of garden apartments and towers (actual species of vegetation has been altered in certain cases; this character-defining features should be evaluated on case-by-case basis)
• Parkmerced Common plantings
• Ornamental median plantings in traffic circles and along landscaped drives, where remaining.

Landscape Features

• Terrace divider walls in courtyards
• Planters (concrete, wood and brick)
• Low concrete and/or brick site walls
• Courtyard stairs (brick and concrete)

Views and Vistas

• Vistas down landscaped drives (see circulation above)
• Vistas to and from garden apartment courtyard breezeways
• Views to and from the Common
• Views from mid-rise towers to garden apartments and landscape

In addition to the character-defining features listed above located on Parkmerced Investors site, which was the subject of the Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment done in 2009 (Page & Turnbull 2009), the former Parkmerced recreation area (now the site of SF State’s Mashouf Wellness Center), and commercial complex under other ownership are also within the boundary of the original Parkmerced development, and thus are contributing features to the Parkmerced Historic District.

When the approved project at Parkmerced is implemented, most of the character-defining features could be represented through the remaining significant landscaped spaces, the towers, and SF
State’s garden apartment blocks. Of the typologies of garden apartments that were constructed at Parkmerced, wood frame and stucco garden apartments and scored poured-in-place concrete garden apartments would be represented, but not smooth poured-in-place buildings.

The overall site plan would change because many streets in the existing grid would be removed, though primary radial streets from the Parkmerced Common would remain. The maintenance building, administration building, and other storage buildings would be demolished. Most vegetation and landscape features would continue to be represented by the SF State garden apartment blocks. While views and vistas would change due to the construction of new buildings on the Parkmerced site, the general concept of views down the streets framing the SF State garden apartments and from Towers 39 and 40 across the street from Blocks 41 and 42 would be retained.

Thus, while the garden apartments at the Parkmerced site would eventually be demolished, sufficient character-defining features exist in the six garden apartment blocks with laundry and carport facilities, the landscape features that remain at the SF State Parkmerced garden apartment blocks, and the adjacent Towers 39 and 40 to constitute a smaller, contiguous Parkmerced Remnant Historic District (see Figure 4.4-9). Integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association would be maintained in this remnant district, though integrity of setting would be compromised to an extent due to new construction surrounding the remaining blocks. Overall, this remnant historic district would continue to represent the significant mid-century middle-income housing concept characterized by Parkmerced and the architectural and landscape designs of Leonard Schultze and Associates and Thomas Church. The Parkmerced Remnant Historic District would represent two of three garden apartment construction typologies: scored concrete and wood-frame construction (poured concrete would no longer be represented). The blocks create a line along Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard west of 19th Avenue such that nearly the full width of the Parkmerced development would be represented.

With the implementation of the approved Parkmerced redevelopment project, the larger identified historic district was found in previous analyses to lose eligibility due to the anticipated change in integrity of the overall Parkmerced site. Intact examples of Metlife and other mid-century housing developments exist elsewhere in the country, including Stuyvesant Town in Manhattan, Parkfairfax in Alexandria, Virginia, and Parkchester in the Bronx. However, in California many of these types of mid-century middle-income developments have been altered or demolished, and a lower threshold of integrity may exist to represent the significant context. In sum, this report finds that Blocks 1, 2, 5, 6, 41, and 42, along with towers 39 and 40 that would remain on the Parkmerced Investors property, constitute as a smaller Parkmerced Remnant Historic District eligible for listing in the California Register that is significant at the state and local levels. Even as a remnant landscape, the remaining components convey enough
information about the to-be-demolished Parkmerced development to the south to be eligible on their own.

The Project site and other SF State blocks are not individually significant, as their significance is rooted in the history and design of the larger development.

4.4.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

2007 CMP EIR Standards of Significance

As indicated in the 2007 CMP EIR, the significance criteria used to evaluate the impacts of the Project related to historical resources are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines; applicable agency plans, policies, and/or guidelines; and agency and professional standards. Based on the above, a significant impact related to historical would occur if the Project would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) defines a “substantial adverse change” to a historical resource as: “physical demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.” The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register or in registers meeting the definitions in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k) or 5024.1(g) (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(b)), as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA. In other words, a significant impact occurs when demolition or significant alteration renders a historical resource no longer eligible for listing in a historic register. A project may cause changes to a historic resource but still not have a significant adverse effect on the environment as defined by CEQA as long as the impact of the change on the historic resource is determined to be less than significant, negligible, neutral or even beneficial.

A building or district may qualify as a historic resource if it falls within at least one of four categories listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). The four categories are:

- A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).
- A resource 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
resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

- The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

In general, a resource that meets any of the four criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) is considered to be a historical resource unless “the preponderance of evidence demonstrates” that the resource is not historically or culturally significant.” Therefore, the smaller Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, which has been found in Appendix D to be eligible for listing in the California Register, would be considered a qualified historic resource under CEQA under the third of the categories listed above.

The above historic resource standard of significance was addressed by CMP Impact CULT-2 and Impact CULT-5. These impacts are further addressed below to incorporate new information available since the CMP EIR was completed. Other cultural resource standards of significance addressing archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, paleontological resources, and human remains are covered in Appendix A and are adequately addressed by the CMP EIR and the Tiered Initial Study. Therefore, these standards of significance are not further discussed in this section.

**Analytical Method**

The Historical Resources Technical Report (Appendix D) prepared for the Project documents and evaluates changed conditions on and adjacent to the Project site, since the certification of the 2007 CMP EIR, related to the eligibility of the Parkmerced area as a historic district. The Historic Resources Technical Report provides building descriptions, an abbreviated historic
context statement, and an examination of the current historic status of the former Parkmerced blocks owned by SF State. The report includes a summary significance statement of the blocks’ eligibility for listing in the National Register and the California Register, as summarized above.

Page & Turnbull visited the site in May 2016. All site photographs in Appendix D were taken by Page & Turnbull in May 2016, unless otherwise noted. No primary historic research was conducted for this report, as the blocks have previously been researched and evaluated in the “Parkmerced Historic Resource Evaluation and Cultural Landscape Assessment” (Page & Turnbull 2009) and HABS-HALS Written Report (Page & Turnbull 2016).

A records request was sent to the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System in May 2016. The record search results are summarized in the Current Historic Status section above, along with information from other sources. There was no new information provided by the Northwest Information Center that had not been included in previous documentation about the site or the SF State campus.

**CMP EIR Mitigation Measures Included in Project**

The adopted mitigation measures for historic resources included in the 2007 CMP EIR and applicable to the Project are presented below. These measures are already being implemented as part of the CMP, the adopted CMP EIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and the Project and therefore they are considered to be part of the Project, as described in Chapter 3 of this EIR. Mitigation measures CULT-2A through CULT-2C are being implemented as part of the preparation of this EIR. Additional mitigation measures, if needed, are provided under Impacts and Mitigation Measures, below, to reduce or minimize identified impacts of the Project.

**CMP Mitigation CULT-2A:** The campus shall identify all buildings and structures within the project’s area of potential effect that will be 50 years of age or older at the time of project construction. If potentially historic structures are present, Mitigation CULT-2B shall be implemented.

**CMP Mitigation CULT-2B:** Potential historic structures present within the project’s area of potential effect will be evaluated as follows:

i. Before altering or otherwise affecting a building or structure 50 years old or older, the campus shall retain a qualified architectural historian to record it based on professional standards, and assess its significance under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The evaluation process shall include the development
of appropriate historical background research as context for the assessment of the significance of the structure in the history of the California State University system, the campus, and/or the region. For historic buildings, structures or features that do not meet the CEQA criteria for a historical resource, no further mitigation is required.

ii. For a building or structure that qualifies as a historic resource, the architectural historian and the campus shall consider measures that would enable the project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to the building or structure. These measures could include preserving a building on the margin of the project site, using it “as is,” or other measures that would not alter the building. If the project cannot avoid modifications to a significant building or structure, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-2C.

**CMP Mitigation CULT-2C:** For a structure or building that has been determined by a qualified architectural historian to qualify as a historical resource, and where avoidance is not feasible, documentation and treatment shall be carried out as described below:

i. If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings” (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).

ii. If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record
(HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the SF State Library. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site-specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.

iii. If preservation and reuse at the site are not feasible, the historical building shall be documented as described in item (ii) and, when physically and financially feasible, be moved and preserved or reused.

iv. If, in the opinion of the qualified architectural historian, the nature and significance of the building is such that its demolition or destruction cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the structure to be preserved intact. These could include project redesign, relocation or abandonment.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Tiered Initial Study Results

As described in the Tiered IS (Appendix A), the 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout related to historic resources could be significant and unavoidable if CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C above, requiring documentation of historical resources, would not fully mitigate the effects of demolition of those resources to less than significant. In such cases, CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C would reduce the impact to the extent feasible; however, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Project would involve construction of three buildings on Block 1 and Block 6 in the southern portion of the SF State campus. The existing housing on the two sites, which are former Parkmerced properties, are proposed to be demolished as part of the Project. Since the certification of the CMP EIR in 2007, more is now known about the eligibility of the Parkmerced area as a Historic District, as documented in Section 4.4.1, above. The Parkmerced area is eligible as a Historic District, based on a Historical Resource Evaluation prepared for the
Parkmerced area (Page & Turnbull 2009), which included the former Parkmerced properties located on the SF State campus.

Given the above, the Tiered IS concluded that the EIR will evaluate potential historic resource impacts of the Project on the former Parkmerced properties on the campus to determine whether there may be new or increased impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR. This analysis is provided below and is based on Appendix D.

Project and Cumulative Impacts

For each impact presented below, the CMP EIR impact is presented first in gray text for easy reference to the CMP EIR’s prior impact conclusions. The Project impact is presented second and emphasizes whether new or increased impacts would result with the Project.

**CMP Impact CULT-2:**
Implementation of the Campus Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical building or structure, as a result of alteration, removal or demolition of the building, or alteration of the site associated with project *(Significant and unavoidable impact).*

**Project Impact CULT-2A:**
The Project would demolish Blocks 1 and 6, which are qualified historic resources as contributors to an identified Parkmerced Historic District. The demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 would erode the integrity of the historic district, but would not materially impair its significance *(New less-than-significant impact).*

The CMP EIR did not identify or evaluate the impact of campus growth on the Parkmerced historic district, as shown in Figure 4.4-1, as this district was not identified at the time the CMP EIR was prepared. The CMP EIR identified buildings that are currently 50 years old or will be that age by 2020 and may qualify as historic resources under CEQA criteria. These buildings were assumed to be historic resources for the purposes of the CMP EIR analysis. The 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout related to individual historic resources could be significant and unavoidable if CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C above, requiring documentation of historical resources, would not fully mitigate the effects of demolition of those resources to less than significant. In such cases, CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C would reduce the impact to the extent feasible; however, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable if a historical resource cannot be preserved in place, and if the historic values it represents cannot be fully captured through documentation and data recovery.
Demolition is often considered to be a significant adverse impact, since it could materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historic resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the National Register or California Register. In this case, the Parkmerced Historic District includes all of the original Parkmerced development. The demolition of the garden apartment Blocks 1 and 6 in the larger Parkmerced Historic District, which is extant under current conditions, would erode the integrity of the historic district, but would not materially impair the district’s significance. The historic district would continue to represent the significant mid-century middle-income housing concept characterized by Parkmerced and the architectural and landscape designs of Leonard Schultze and Associates and Thomas Church. The SF State blocks are not considered significant individually, and the majority of the site plan and blocks within the Parkmerced Historic District would remain. The remaining 28 garden apartment blocks, 11 towers, and landscape features on the Parkmerced Investors site, as well as the other four SF State garden apartment blocks that currently exist, would convey the character-defining features and all characteristic building typologies of the development. The larger Parkmerced Historic District would remain eligible under existing conditions with the implementation of the Project. Thus, the Project would create a new less-than-significant Project-specific impact on the larger historic district. Regardless, CMP Mitigations CULT-2A, -2B, and -2C are included in the Project.

**Project Mitigation CULT-2A:** No additional mitigation required.

**Project Impact CULT-2B:** The Project would demolish Blocks 1 and 6, which are qualified historic resources as contributors to an identified Parkmerced Remnant Historic District. The demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 would erode the integrity of the historic district but would not materially impair its significance (*New less-than-significant impact*).

As indicated above, the CMP EIR did not identify or evaluate the impact of campus growth on the Parkmerced historic district or any remnant district, as no such districts were identified at the time the CMP EIR was prepared. In the event that the approved project at the Parkmerced Investors site is fully implemented, the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District identified in this report and shown in Figure 4.4-9—composed of six garden apartment blocks with laundry and carport facilities, and two adjacent towers—is the historic resource under evaluation in this impact. The apartment blocks in the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District are not considered significant individually. The integrity of the historic district would erode with the demolition of Blocks 1 and 6, one-third of the represented garden apartments that line Holloway Avenue west of 19th Avenue. Block 1 is one of two scored concrete garden apartments with one of five total laundry units, and Block 6 is one of four wood frame and stucco garden apartments with one of four carport complexes. Although the number of these typologies would be
reduced, all typologies of buildings represented in the identified district would remain, and the character-defining features that the six blocks feature would still be represented by the remaining four blocks. Furthermore, Blocks 1 and 6 are both on the edges of the line of former Parkmerced blocks owned by SF State: Block 1 is an outlier on the northeast side of Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard, and Block 6 is the furthest east in the row along Holloway Avenue. Removing these two blocks would not create a discontinuous condition amongst the remaining Parkmerced blocks.

The demolition of the garden apartment Blocks 1 and 6 in the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District would erode the integrity of the remnant historic district, but it but would not materially impair the district's significance. The remnant historic district would continue to represent the significant mid-century middle-income housing concept characterized by Parkmerced and the architectural and landscape designs of Leonard Schultze and Associates and Thomas Church. Therefore, the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District would remain eligible with the implementation of the Project. Thus, the Project would create a new less-than-significant Project-specific impact on the remnant historic district. Regardless, CMP Mitigations CULT-2A, -2B, and -2C are included in the Project.

**Project Mitigation CULT-2B:** No additional mitigation required.

**CMP Impact CULT-5:** Development under the Campus Master Plan could contribute to cumulative damage to and/or loss of... historical resources in the City and County of San Francisco (Potentially significant impact / Less than significant with mitigation).

**Project Impact CULT-5A:** The proposed demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 and removal of existing landscape features on the Project site would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced Historic District, as it would erode its integrity; however, the Project's contribution to this significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable (New less-than-significant impact).

The CMP EIR did not identify or evaluate the cumulative impact of campus growth and other reasonably foreseeable future projects and development on the Parkmerced Historic District, as shown in Figure 4.4-1, as this district was not identified at the time the CMP EIR was prepared. The CMP EIR determined that the campus' contribution to the destruction of the cultural resources in San Francisco would be minimized to the extent feasible with the
implementation of identified mitigation measures. The cumulative impact was determined to be less than significant with the protocols in place for development projects on campus and in San Francisco, and the campus’ contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

The geographical setting for the discussion of cumulative impacts related to Parkmerced historic resources consists of the SF State campus and the Parkmerced area to the south. Reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects that may impact the Parkmerced Historic District include the following:

- The approved Parkmerced project, including demolition of all of the two-story garden apartment buildings and removal of all of the interior landscaping on the Parkmerced Investors property.
- Future redevelopment of Parkmerced’s eastern 2.75-acre commercial shopping center owned by Yousef Realty.
- The current redevelopment project of the former Parkmerced recreation area to construct the Mashouf Wellness Center.
- The probable future build out of University Park South, as contemplated in the future vision included in the 2007 adopted Campus Master Plan, including demolition and redevelopment of all SF State garden apartment blocks in University Park South.²

The EIR for the redevelopment project at the Parkmerced Investors site already determined that the Parkmerced Historic District would not remain eligible for listing in any historic registers if that project proceeds as entitled and the project-level impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable for that project. Additionally, the cumulative study area for that project was the original Parkmerced complex, which included four other property owners of Parkmerced properties, SF State, Yousef Realty, and Olympic Realty. Redevelopment of these former Parkmerced properties is contemplated in some fashion by all of these owners, as described above. The EIR for the Parkmerced project determined that the impact associated with the Parkmerced project and the cumulative redevelopment projects would be significant and unavoidable, as anticipated redevelopment of all of the properties identified above would materially impair the significance of the historic district to the extent that it would no longer be eligible for listing. This impact was identified as being caused primarily by the Parkmerced Investors redevelopment project. For example, out of 34 total garden apartment blocks, the Parkmerced Investors project would demolish 28. The demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 for the

² The adopted 2007 CMP and map do not include future buildout of University Park South during the buildout horizon for the CMP, and there are no approved or adopted plans for such buildout. However, the CMP future vision beyond 2020 and the CMP objectives do consider development in this area and, therefore, such development and the associated demolition is considered reasonably foreseeable and therefore demolition is considered in the cumulative analysis above.
Project would contribute to a significant cumulative impact by eroding the Parkmerced Historic District's integrity. However, when combined with known current, entitled, and future projects, including the large Parkmerced Investors project, the Project’s contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Thus, the new cumulative impact of the Project on the Parkmerced Historic District would be less than significant.

**Project Mitigation CULT-5A:** No additional mitigation required.

**Project Impact CULT-5B:** The proposed demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 and removal of existing landscape features on the Project site would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, as it would erode its integrity; the Project’s contribution to this significant cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable (*New significant and unavoidable impact*).

Following the redevelopment of Blocks 1 and 6, the remaining blocks of Parkmerced garden apartments owned by SF State—blocks 2, 5, 41, and 42—are anticipated to be demolished eventually and redeveloped by SF State, as described in Project Impact CULT-5A, and the landscape design of Font Boulevard is anticipated to be eventually altered. This would likely occur under the future vision included in the 2007 CMP, which contemplated demolition and redevelopment of all SF State garden apartment blocks in University Park South beyond the 2020 horizon year for the CMP. While redevelopment of the entirety of University Park South is not yet approved or adopted, the ultimate demolition of this area is considered reasonably foreseeable and is therefore considered in this analysis.

The future redevelopment of Blocks 1 and 6 as part of the Project, as well as the rest of SF State’s Parkmerced blocks and street landscapes would materially impair the significance of the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, as shown in Figure 4.4-9, to the extent that it would no longer be eligible for listing. The remnant historic district would no longer be able to represent the significant mid-century middle-income housing concept characterized by Parkmerced and the architectural and landscape designs of Leonard Schultze and Associates and Thomas Church. This would constitute a significant cumulative impact, as the remnant district would no longer be eligible for listing. Because the remnant district only includes six garden apartment blocks and two towers, the Project would contribute one-third of the garden apartment demolitions. The Project, therefore, would create a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact when combined with the known and future redevelopment of all former Parkmerced blocks on the SF State campus, as contemplated in the future vision for the campus in the 2007 CMP. Thus, the cumulative impact of the Project on the Remnant Parkmerced Historic District would be significant.
This significant cumulative impact can be reduced through the implementation of CMP Mitigation CULT-2A, -2B, and -2C included above and through the implementation of the Project Mitigation CULT-5B below. However, the impact is significant and unavoidable as the implementation of feasible mitigation measure would not reduce the impact to less than significant. This is a new significant and unavoidable impact not previously identified in the CMP EIR.

**Project Mitigation CULT-5B:**

The following mitigation measures are recommended in advance of the Project, and elaborate on the mitigation measure outlined in the Campus Master Plan EIR’s Mitigation CULT-2C (ii)

**DOCUMENTATION:**

SF State shall facilitate documentation of the affected historic resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II per Campus Master Plan EIR Mitigation CULT-2C(ii), which includes:

i. **Drawings:** Select original Church and Schultze drawings of Blocks 1 and 6, if available from Parkmerced Investors LLC or the San Francisco Planning Department,³ should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar. Measured drawings are not required, as these were completed for each type of building as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced site (completed by Page & Turnbull in 2016).

ii. **Photographs:** Archivally printed digital photographs of exterior and interior views of Blocks 1 and 6. These photographs must adequately document the character-defining features of the buildings and should be produced by a qualified professional who is familiar with the character-defining features of the buildings, as identified in the Historic Resource Evaluation completed by Page & Turnbull in 2009 and information provided in this report. Photographs should include general views that illustrate the setting; the exterior

³ Parkmerced Investors transferred a set of historic Parkmerced drawings to the San Francisco Planning Department to be archived as part of the Parkmerced project’s cultural resource mitigation measures.
façades; the courtyard façades; details including front entrances and/or typical doorways; typical windows; exterior details indicative of the era of construction or of historic or architectural interest; and interior views to capture spatial relationships and any decorative elements. An example of printed digital photographs, site plans, and photo captions can be found in the Parkmerced HABS-HALS photographs produced as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced Investors LLC site. These photograph sets are located at the San Francisco Public Library History Center and the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System. The photograph set for Blocks 1 and 6 should correspond to the previously produced sets.

iii. **Written data:** Not required, as these blocks are covered in the HABS-HALS written report produced as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced Investors LLC site.

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. The HABS Level II documentation shall be completed by professionals who meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for History or Architectural History.

Three copies of the drawings and photographs should be provided to the San Francisco Public Library History Center, the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, and SF State University.

This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. Implementation of this mitigation measure will assist in reducing the project-specific impacts: however, according to Section 15126.4(b)(2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for significant impacts of
demolition of the resource will typically not mitigate the impacts to less-than-significant.

**VIDEO RECORDATION:**

SF State will facilitate the creation of a walk-through video of Blocks 1 and 6 and their Parkmerced setting, including an exterior overview of adjacent streets (with medians and traffic circles), nearby tower apartments, and primary public spaces at Parkmerced such as the central Common and the Meadow. The documentation shall be conducted by a professional videographer, preferably one with experience recording architectural resources. The documentation shall be narrated by a qualified architectural historian. The documentation shall include as much information as possible—using visuals in combination with narration—about the materials, construction methods, current condition, historic use, and historic context of the historical resources. Copies of the video documentation shall be submitted to the San Francisco Public Library History Room, the Northwest Information Center, and SF State University. This mitigation measure will supplement the traditional HABS-HALS documentation.

### 4.4.3 References

California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000–15387. CEQA Guidelines.

California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 3, Chapter 11.5, Section 4850 et seq. California Register of Historical Resources.
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San Francisco State Blocks Associated with Eligible Parkmerced Historic District
San Francisco State Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project EIR
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Photographs of Block 2
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FIGURE 4.4-5
Photographs of Block 5
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FIGURE 4.4-6
Photographs of Block 6
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FIGURE 4.4-7
Photographs of Block 41
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FIGURE 4.4-8
Photographs of Block 42
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