

## K. CULTURAL RESOURCES

### INTRODUCTION

This section evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project on cultural resources. It consists of two parts. The first part generally discusses archaeological resources in Redwood City's Harbor Neighborhood, and the likelihood of discovering archaeological resources on the project site. The archaeological resources evaluation is based on a records search conducted by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University. The records search included reviewing the State of California Office of Historic Preservation records, base maps, historic maps, and literature for San Mateo County and the Redwood City Strategic General Plan Historic Resources Element (HRE). The second part of this section discusses the architectural significance of the site and existing onsite structures. The architectural and historic resources analysis is based on information from a cultural resources study prepared by the independent architectural firm of Carey & Company.

### SETTING

#### *ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES*

At the time of Euroamerican contact the Native Americans that lived in the area spoke *Ramaytush*, one of the Coastanoan languages. The Costanoan people inhabited the San Francisco Bay area and predated Spanish occupation by up to 4,000 years. The people were semi-nomadic but would generally return to village sites season after season. Seasonal camps and villages have been found next to existing or former water courses draining into the Bay on lands which were elevated above the high tide line directly adjacent to the original marsh system which bordered the Bay.

Almost 100 years of archaeological survey work done on the margins of San Francisco Bay have demonstrated that prehistoric Bay margin sites are found in a number of predictable locations. Native American archaeological sites in this portion of San Mateo County tend to be situated along bayshore margins, alluvial flats, near ecotones, and near sources of water.<sup>1</sup> While no written records appear to have been left, evidence of the lives of Native Americans in the Bay Area were marked by shells and other refuse, in some instances eventually creating raised "shell mounds," several of which have been found in Redwood City. However, none of these locally identified former shell mound locations have been identified on the proposed project site (General Plan, p. 13-A-1).

The California Historical Resources Information System's Northwest Information Center's record search (file no. 02-509) for the proposed project site revealed that because the project area has been heavily disturbed by over 100 years of past development it has a low possibility for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ecotones are transitional zones between two communities containing characteristics or species of each.

occurrence of historic-period archaeological deposits.<sup>2</sup> However, a field inspection conducted for the proposed Marina Shores Village mixed-use development, located on a waterfront site approximately ¼-mile southwest of the project site, indicated that cultural resources could possibly be discovered buried under historic materials and/or alluvium (Holman, 2002).<sup>3</sup>

### ***ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES***

A study of existing and potential historic resources was conducted for the Area of Potential Effect (APE), which consists of the 17.74-acre project site. The project site is located approximately ¾-mile south of the Bayshore Freeway (U.S. 101) at 1 Cardinal Way. It consists of three parcels that contain heavy machinery related to the site's former industrial uses related to salt production, the Marine Science Institute and its dock, and the existing pier used to transport bittern on the site's eastern shoreline. Following is a discussion of salt production in the Bay Area, including a description of the site's historical uses and an evaluation of the site's existing structures and heavy machinery.

#### **Salt Production in the Bay Area**

The use of San Francisco Bay salt predates the Spanish settlement of California. The first records of salt gathering were made by the Spanish missionaries, who were impressed by the natural deposits of salt found on the coast. The credit for beginning the salt industry has been given to John Johnson of Alameda County in 1853. It did not become a profitable industry, however, until the late 1850s, when the discovery of the Comstock Lode dramatically increased the demand for salt. The metallurgy industry remained an important market for Bay area salt producers throughout the nineteenth century.

The increased demand and development of a local food-curing industry spurred producers to increase the quality of their product, which was considered unfit for human consumption in the 1860s. The first attempt to improve Bay salt was made by John Quigley in 1862. Quigley built a salt works south of Alvarado, which was in operation until 1909.

The salt industry was largely confined to Alameda County in the nineteenth century. In 1868, there were 17 salt works in Alameda, primarily family operations that frequently changed hands. Salt production began in San Mateo County around the beginning of the twentieth century. As early as 1889, the Oliver Salt Company, based in Alameda County, expressed interest in the salt marshes of the west bay.

In Redwood City, the salt industry began with Redwood City Salt works, which was incorporated in February of 1901 and began to produce salt in April of the same year. The company also had a salt works in Alameda County, near the Oliver Salt Company. The Liguori family owned the company, and the Redwood City works was managed by G.J. Liguori. The family retired from the salt industry entirely in 1910, and sold their Alameda County property to the Oliver Salt

---

<sup>2</sup> This file is available for review at the City of Redwood City Planning Services Department, City Hall, 1017 Middlefield Road.

<sup>3</sup> Alluvium is sediment that originates from a stream.

Company and the Redwood City property to Stauffer Chemical Corporation. Other companies in the Redwood City area included the West Shore Company, established in 1902; the Greco Salt Company; and the Leslie Salt Refining Company.

The salt industry began to consolidate in the early twentieth century in San Mateo County. Stauffer Chemical Corporation bought the West Shore Company and Redwood City Salt Works around 1907. According to the article *More Than a Grain* by Mitch Postel, the consolidation of the west bay salt industry happened as follows:

On June 23, 1907, a stockholders meeting was called by the leadership of the newly formed Leslie Salt Company at the A. Schilling and Co. Building on Second and Folsom Streets in San Francisco. At this gathering, little more is known than that the Stauffer Chemical Corporation decided to borrow \$1,000,000 from the Central Trust Company of California. Probably as a result of the conference, however, a little over a month later, on July 29, 1907, Vice President of the West Shore Salt Company, John Stauffer, signed the deed to that company over to the Leslie Salt Company at a nominal fee. One day later, on July 30, officers of the Stauffer Chemical Corporation controlled Redwood City Salt Company also transferred ownership, and the day after that, July 31, Arthur S. Whitney signed away his Leslie Salt Refining Company to the Leslie Salt Company.

This merger of west bay salt interests began the “golden era” of the west bay industry. The strong capital backing allowed technological innovation, including the installation of the vacuum refining method in the San Mateo refinery. This process was essential in the production of table salt, and the company set out to change the poor perception of Bay Area salt. Advertising and packaging methods were developed by Leslie Salt Co. to win over consumers, the most recognizable being the cylindrical package. These methods were very successful, and the San Mateo refinery won first prize for salt production at the 1913 California Land Show and Home Industry Exhibition. By 1919, the Company was producing 25,000 tons of salt, over five times the 1904 yield.

The industry continued to consolidate, and in May of 1924 the Leslie Salt Company, California Salt Company, and Continental Salt Company merged to form the Leslie-California Salt Company. In 1936, the Leslie-California Salt Company merged again, with the Arden Salt Company, which was itself the result of a massive consolidation effort. The company was reincorporated as the Leslie Salt Company. The final step in the consolidation process took place in 1940, when Leslie Salt Company took over the Stauffer Chemical Corporation. Included in this purchase was the site of the Redwood City stack site.

Leslie Salt Company moved their headquarters to the east bay in 1931, closed their San Mateo refinery, and proceeded to build a new west bay plant in Redwood City. Construction finished in 1950, and in 1951 the first load of salt was produced. Also in 1951, plans by the Leslie Salt Company were approved allowing them to build a terminal next to the stack site. The Leslie Salt Company was sold to the Cargill Salt Corporation in 1979. The terminal and stack site were used continuously until 2000, when the stack site was included in a land sale to Abbott Laboratories. Cargill Salt Corporation continues to use the pier on the site’s eastern shoreline to ship bittern until 2010, however the salt stack is no longer there.

## Project Site

As discussed in the Project Description (see Chapter III) and shown on Figures IV.G-2 and IV.G-3, several utilitarian structures from the site's production era exist on the project site. The southernmost structure is a two-story quonset hut, rectangular in plan. It is of metal frame construction with corrugated metal cladding and roof. Windows include six-lite, metal combination, fixed and hopper windows, and aluminum sliders. The doors on the west elevation include a pair of wood doors with a nine-lite window in the center. The interior of the structure has been partitioned into two sections: a larger, open storage space and a smaller, one-story shop space. The shop space was created with plywood partitions, and can be accessed through a modern wood door at the west side of the partition or through the pair of wood doors on the west elevation. The space above the shop is accessed via a wood stair along the partition wall. The structure is in poor condition.

Centered along the eastern side of the site, west of the onsite access road, is a small, one-story shed. Square in plan, it appears to be of wood frame construction, with corrugated metal cladding on three sides and the roof, and plywood sheathing on the east side. Windows are wood double-hung, two one-over-one on the south side and one two-over-one lite on the east elevation. The wood door, located on the west elevation, is a wood one panel door with a single lite. The interior of this building was inaccessible. The exterior is in fair condition. The structure is situated adjacent to various pieces of mechanical equipment, located on the north side.

The northernmost structure, located just north of the shed, is a one-story office structure, rectangular in plan. It appears to be of wood frame construction with corrugated metal cladding. The gable roof is also clad in corrugated metal. Windows consist of aluminum three-lite combination fixed and sliding windows, and two-lite aluminum sliding windows. The wood doors consist of a single-lite over one panel. A conveyer belt, used to transport salt from the stack to the pier, is routed below the center of the structure. A tunnel, beginning at the west side of the structure and deep enough for a person to walk upright through, surrounds this conveyor, and is constructed of concrete. The tunnel continues below the access road, emerging on the east side. The conveyer belt is connected to a Weightrometer (a type of scale), located inside the office structure. The office structure is in good condition.

Located to the west of the office, shed, and quonset hut is a conveyer system used to carry the salt from the top of the stack down to near-ground level, past the shed to the tunnel below and just to the north of the office. It then passed below the office and access-road, was carried up the gantry on the pier to be loaded onto ships. The salt conveyer structure consists of a steel gantry-like piece of machinery, onto which the salt was pushed from the top of the stack. The conveyer would then take the salt down the structure, where it would continue on the ground-level conveyer, constructed of wood. The belt was propelled along ceramic and steel rollers. This structure continues below the office, connecting with the steel gantry on the east side of the access-road.

The Cargill pier is located on the east edge of the site. The pier is constructed of steel, wood and concrete. It is 569 feet long, with two loading towers, each approximately one third from each end. The centers of the towers are 200 feet apart. The footings are wood, the dock structure wood and/or concrete supported by steel structural members, and the gantry structure is steel. It extends east from the shore, and north and south into Port waters. Wood decking covers the pier on the east and south sections; the north section is concrete. The dock is in fair to poor condition.

Several structures are associated with the pier: at the westernmost edge, on shore, is a small wood shed with a gable roof and two modern, multi-panel doors. This structure appears to be a recent addition, and the interior was not accessible. On the pier are two small corrugated metal sheds, used for storage and to protect equipment. These are in poor condition. The gantry structure extends above the pier. The conveyer rises up the gantry, where the salt was loaded on the ships from above. A third corrugated metal hut is found near the top of the gantry. The gantry is in poor condition.

The Marine Science Institute is located on the northwest edge of the site. It consists of several modern trailer buildings, and a 100-foot wooden dock.

## REGULATORY CONTEXT

### ***CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15064.5***

Under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, archaeological resources that have not otherwise been determined to be historical resources may be considered significant if they are unique. Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 defines a unique archaeological resource 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: contains information needed to answer important scientific questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized, important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Section 15064.5 also assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. These procedures are stated under Public Resources Code Section 5097.

### ***HISTORIC PRESERVATION CRITERIA***

Historic architectural surveys provide information about existing properties that may be of value to a community. Designation or listing on a registry or cultural and/or historical resources may occur if a building is found to be of value; designation or listing can also serve to alert potential developers of the public's interest in such properties through review by public boards and commissions.

### **National Register of Historic Places**

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

Structures, sites, buildings, districts and objects over 50 years of age can be listed on the National Register as significant historic resources. However, properties under 50 years of age that are of exceptional importance or are contributors to a district can also be included on the National Register. According to National Register criteria, historic resources must be significant at the local, state or national level under one or more of the following four criteria:<sup>4</sup>

- A. Criterion A (Event): Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B. Criterion B (Person): Resources that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C. Criterion C (Design/Construction): Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master; and
- D. Criterion D (Information Potential): Resources that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The project site contains no resources formally listed on the National Register.

### **California Register of Historical Resources**

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an authoritative listing of the State's significant historic and archaeological resources. Any resource listed in or formally determined eligible for the National Register is automatically listed in the California Register, pursuant to Section 4851(a) of the Public Resources Code.

The project site contains no resources formally listed on the California Register of Historical Resources.

### **City of Redwood City**

The Historic Preservation Ordinance of the City of Redwood City was adopted in 1980. Its purpose is "to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare by providing for the identification, protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and use of improvements, building, structures, signs, objects, features, sites, places, and areas within the City that reflect special elements of the City's historic, architectural, cultural, aesthetic, and other heritage..." (Section 40.3) The Historic Preservation Ordinance creates an Historic Resources Advisory Committee

---

<sup>4</sup> This use of the word "significant" in the context of historic resources is to be differentiated from its use under CEQA, wherein it denotes an effect that constitutes a substantial adverse change in the environment. "Significant," when used in reference to historic resources, denotes a resource's importance.

(HRAC), and establishes the criteria for inclusion on the local register (Section 40.6). A resource may be designated as an historic site or landmark if it:

- exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City’s cultural, aesthetic or architectural history;
- is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history;
- embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship; or
- is representative of the notable work of a builder, designer or architect.

The project site contains no resources formally listed on the City of Redwood City local register of historic resources. Although the City's current inventory does not list the described structures at this time, the HRAC may determine that some of these features (e.g., the pier) may be eligible for the City's inventory even though they may not qualify for state or national status. The pier is not part of this project and would not be accessible to the public due to its condition.

### ***Strategic General Plan***

The Redwood City Strategic General Plan’s Historic Resources Element (HRE) contains no policies relevant to the proposed project site. All current HRE policies pertain to landmark districts and structures, none of which exist on the project site or vicinity.

For all identified historic sites or sites that have a potential for onsite discovery, reconnaissance, and identification of cultural resources, the Redwood City Planning and Redevelopment Department typically requires developers to prepare a Cultural Resources Management Plan. However, since the likelihood of uncovering buried archaeological resources at the project site is considered to be low, a Cultural Resources Management Plan would not be warranted for the proposed project.

## **SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

According to Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*, a project may be deemed to have a significant impact on the environment if it will:

- cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5;<sup>5</sup>
- cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5;

---

<sup>5</sup> A “substantial adverse change,” according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, is defined as the “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource is impaired.” Material impairment is defined as the alteration, “in an adverse manner, those characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.”

- disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; or,
- directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### *ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES*

#### **Impact K.1: The proposed project could result in inadvertent damage to Native American or other archaeological resources. (Potentially Significant)**

There are no recorded archaeological resources within the project area, and according to the NWIC letter on file for the project, the likelihood of discovering archaeological resources on the project site is considered low because the site is underlain by artificial fill and has been previously disturbed by grading and onsite activities associated with salt production and stockpiling. Nevertheless, it is possible that demolition, excavation, and grading on the approximately 18-acre project site could unearth previously undiscovered archaeological resources. Such resources could include, but would not necessarily be limited to, chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, and pestles; and dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human remains.

While the likelihood of unearthing such resources is considered to be low, the following mitigation measures would ensure that potentially significant impacts of the project on potential archaeological resources would remain less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure K.1a: The applicant shall retain an archeologist, at its own expense, to monitor onsite excavation of any generally “undisturbed” areas on the project site, such as areas along the shoreline band and under existing buildings.**

**Mitigation Measure K.1b: If cultural resources are accidentally uncovered during construction or grading activities for the proposed project, the developer shall notify the City immediately and all excavation work within ten feet of the find shall immediately cease. The applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to evaluate any Native American or other archaeological resource exposed during construction, to make recommendations for recovery, avoidance, or other appropriate protection for the resource, and to determine the necessity for monitoring the remaining excavation. Construction activity shall resume upon consultation with the City of Redwood City and upon implementation of the recommendations of the archaeologist. (Identified by this EIR)**

**Mitigation Measure K.1c: In the event that human remains are encountered during demolition, construction, or grading activities for the proposed project, the City of Redwood City shall require the project sponsor to immediately notify the San Mateo County Coroner. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the California Native Heritage Commission, pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code. (Identified by this EIR)**

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than Significant.

---

### ***ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES***

**Impact K.2: Construction activities associated with each of the proposed three phases of construction could disturb onsite architectural and historic resources. (Potentially Significant)**

Because no study has been conducted to determine whether the property is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historic Places (CRHR), the independent architectural firm of Carey & Company conducted its own analysis and determined that the proposed Abbott Laboratories West Coast Research Center project site would have a NRHP Status Code of 6Z, which indicates that the property does not possess historic significance and is therefore ineligible for listing in the NRHP through a complete (official) evaluation process. Because the property is over 50 years old and is not one of the property types that are generally automatically disqualified from listing on the NRHP, this property has been evaluated under the standard National Register Criteria for evaluation. Because no historic significance has been established, this property's integrity has not been evaluated.

The analysis also determined that the property does not possess historic significance and is therefore not eligible for listing on the CRHR. The project site has not been automatically listed on the CRHR because it is not listed on the NRHP and has not been determined eligible through a complete evaluation process. As a result, the project site has been evaluated under the standard state criteria. Because no historic significance has been established, this property's integrity has not been evaluated.

Because the project site is not eligible for listing on the CRHR, the historic resources analysis also determined it would not be eligible to be placed on Redwood City's historic register.

Regarding Criterion A, the proposed Abbott Laboratories West Coast Research Center project site is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. The association of the proposed site with the regional salt industry is clear: it has been associated with the production and storage of salt since 1901, when the Redwood City Salt Company owned the property, through the 2000 sale of the site to Abbott Laboratories. However, despite the association with this industry, this particular site does not appear to have played a significant role in the development of the salt industry in the Bay Area. Other, more productive sites in the region, such as Cargill Salt's Newark plant, appear to have had a much larger impact on the development of the industry as a whole. The salt industry began in the East Bay, and does not appear to have played an integral role in the development of the economy of Redwood City. Therefore, this individual site did not contribute significantly to "events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history," and is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the City of Redwood City Register of Historic Resources.

Regarding Criterion B, the proposed Abbott Laboratories West Coast Research Center project site is not associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. The property has had four owners, and while the Leslie Salt Company has had a strong regional presence, this particular site does not appear to have played an integral role in the company or its development.

With respect to Criteria C, the proposed Abbott Laboratories West Coast Research Center project site does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. The structures, including the salt conveyer, underground channels for the conveyance of bittern, pier and existing single-story quonset-style office and storage shed, as well as the smaller shed-like structures, also do not represent the work of a master, possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. They do not appear to be designed in accordance with a particular period or style. Therefore, they do not meet the requirements of Criterion C, and are not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the City of Redwood City Register of Historic Resources.

In regard to Criterion D, the proposed Abbott Laboratories West Coast Research Center project site has not yielded, nor is it likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history. While this criterion is generally applied to archaeological resources, it applies to any building, structure, or object whose physical fabric itself can be considered an artifact. The proposed Abbott Laboratories West Coast Research Center project site contains no visually-observable, above-ground elements whose physical fabric includes unique materials, provides information on special building techniques, or has the potential to provide information about our past.

While the analysis concludes that development of the proposed project would not adversely affect existing historic or architectural resources by deeming them ineligible for the California Register of Historic Places (therefore resulting in a less significant impact under CEQA), the site also does not appear eligible for inclusion in Redwood City's local historic register, because the project does not appear to "exemplify or reflect special elements of the City's cultural, aesthetic or architectural history; identify with persons or events significant in local, state or national history; embody distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship; or represent the notable work of a builder, designer or architect." As stated in the Setting, the site and its artifacts have not been assessed by the City's Historic Preservation Resources Advisory Committee. Although Impact K.2 would be considered less than significant for purposes of this EIR, the project applicant has agreed to include Mitigation Measure K.2 as part of the project.

**Mitigation Measure K.2: The project sponsor shall provide a photographic record of existing structures and equipment on the project site prior to demolition. The photographs shall be submitted to Redwood City's Historic Resources Advisory Committee to be used at the HRAC's discretion. (Proposed as part of the project)**

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than Significant

## REFERENCES – Cultural Resources

*(The references cited below are available at the Redwood City Planning Services Department, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, California, unless specified otherwise below.)*

California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Northwest Information Center, *Records Search Results for 295 Seaport Blvd., Redwood City* (File No. 02-509), January 17, 2003.

City of Redwood City Public Library History Room, Salt Industry Clipping File, *Leslie Bulk Salt Loading Berth*, na, nd.

City of Redwood City, *Marina Shores Village Project*, Draft Environmental Impact Report, February 2003.

City of Redwood City, *Redwood City Strategic General Plan*, 1990.

City of Redwood City, *Historic Resources Element*, an element of the *Redwood City Strategic General Plan*, 1990.

City of Redwood City, *Redwood City Municipal Code*, November 2001.

Holman & Associates, Summary of Findings of an Archaeological Study of the Marina Shores Village Project Area, Redwood City, San Mateo County, California, February 2002, as cited from the Marina Shores Village Project, Draft Environmental Impact Report, February 2003.

Postel, Mitch, *More Than a Grain: The History of the Salt Industry in San Mateo County*, La Peninsula, Vol. XX, No. 3, Summer 1980, San Mateo County Historical Society.

VerPlanck, W.E., *Salt in California*, San Francisco, 1958.