
14. CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

This EIR chapter describes possibilities for the existence of prehistoric and archaeological resources on the project site, possible project impacts on these resources, and related mitigation needs. The chapter incorporates the findings of the EIR archaeologist, Holman & Associates, based on (1) a February 2002 cultural resources database review conducted for Holman & Associates by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) located at Sonoma State University; (2) research completed at the Bancroft Library located on the University of California Berkeley campus;¹ and (3) review of the Redwood City Strategic General Plan, *Historic Resources Element*, Appendix A.

14.1 SETTING

14.1.1 Prehistoric Resources

(a) Prehistoric Habitation of the Margins of the San Francisco Bay. An extensive marsh system comprised the original landscape of the Marina Shores Village project area. More permanent settlements demonstrating long periods of habitation (up to 5,000 years at nearby San Bruno Mountain) were located west of the Bay margin on dry lands bordering the fresh water and in close proximity to the hills farther west.²

¹Holman & Associates, *Summary of Findings of an Archaeological Study of the Marina Shores Village Project Area, Redwood City, San Mateo County, California*, February 2002.

²*Ibid.*, p. 3.

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. 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.³ Village sites 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 are on the proposed project site.⁴

(b) Recorded Prehistoric Sites. An inspection of the files at the NWIC (file no. 01-1180) revealed no evidence of recorded historic or prehistoric resources in or immediately around the project site. There have been two archaeological surveys in the immediate project vicinity, one which covered a small portion of the project site.

A 1981 archaeological survey completed for the 150-acre Leslie Salt pond sites east of the project site revealed no cultural resources.⁵ A field inspection of a 5.2-acre portion of the Pete's Harbor portion of the project site, on a parcel previously proposed for residential uses and a marina, revealed no cultural resources,⁶ nor were any found during a literature review for the same project.⁷ The field inspection report also noted, however, that survey conditions were not

³Ibid.

⁴Redwood City, Redwood City Strategic General Plan, *Historic Resources Element*, Appendix A, p. 13-A1.

⁵Ecumene Associates, 1981.

⁶Adam Siro, Anthropological Studies Center, Sonoma State University, 1997.

⁷The literature review included review of the following resources: *National Register of Historic Places*, *California Register of Historic Places*, *California Historic Landmarks*, *California Points of Historic Interest*

good, and that cultural resources could potentially be discovered buried under historic materials and/or alluvium.⁸

14.1.2 Historic Resources

(a) History of the Project Area. A review of the United States Coast Survey manuscript maps show the original condition of the broad coastal marsh where the Bair Island Road area and project site are now located. By 1857, there were no physical structures (e.g., wharves or roads) or indications of elevation rises above the level of mapped tidal maps that may have been utilized for aboriginal habitation sites. By 1910, the Peninsula Marina portion of the project site was within the Redwood City limits and belonged to the Frank Tanning Company, and by 1942, this portion of the site was dry (likely due to a levee system) and had been subject to filling activities. By 1942, the area east of the project site on former salt evaporation areas was occupied by Frank Tanning Company and included several buildings. U.S. Highway 101 was by then in place along the shoreline, and most of the former marsh areas were contained by levees.

and the California Inventory of Historic Resources; and Five Views: an Ethnic Site Survey for California.

⁸Holman, p.3.

By 1960, a road around the periphery of the Bair Island Road area was in place, and a small landing or marina was visible in the Pete's Harbor area; this marina was further enlarged by the late 1960s. Actual development of the Pete's Harbor marina complex seen today probably began in the 1940s and continued through the end of the century, by which time filling of existing dry land and dredging for the harbor complex was complete. By the mid 1990s, the marina facilities in Pete's Harbor had been expanded with two larger T-shaped breakwaters and at least three structures on the ground; the Peninsula Marina was also complete by this time.⁹

14.1.3 Summary: Prehistoric and Historic Resources on the Project Site

Neither the archival research conducted for this EIR nor the field inspection by the EIR archaeologist of the project site and vicinity revealed any definite locations of either prehistoric or historic resources on the project site. Based on anecdotal information, there is a possibility that by the end of the 19th century, a single structure was located at the southernmost edge of the project vicinity just north of Highway 101, between Bair Island Road and Redwood Creek, in an area which is currently open space, but this general area is now occupied by the U.S. 101 Freeway right-of-way. Based on existing map data, the process of past filling and dredging in the project vicinity does not appear to have affected any historical structures (e.g., buildings or wharves), and did not affect any naturally dry elevations which may have been utilized by the Native American population of the area.¹⁰

14.2 PERTINENT PLANS AND POLICIES

The Redwood City Strategic General Plan 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 in the vicinity.

For all identified historic sites or sites that have a potential for on-site discovery, reconnaissance, and identification of cultural resources,¹¹ 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

⁹Holman, pp. 3 to 5.

¹⁰Ibid., p 5.

¹¹Redwood City Planning and Redevelopment Department, *Cultural Resources Management Plan*, revised 2000.

resources at the project site is very low (see subsection 14.1.2, above), a *cultural resources management plan* would not be warranted for the proposed project.

14.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

14.3.1 Significance Criteria

Based on the CEQA Guidelines, the project would be considered to have a *significant* cultural resources impact if it would:¹²

- (1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5;
- (2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5;
- (3) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;
- (4) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; or
- (5) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines further defines criteria for determining the significance of impacts on archaeological and historic resources. Section 15064.5 provides that, in general, a resource not listed on state or local registers of historical resources shall be considered by an agency to be historically significant if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. The section also provides standards for determining what constitutes a "substantial adverse change" that must be considered a significant impact on an historic resource. The section further states that its provisions apply to those archaeological resources that also qualify as historic resources.

14.3.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Disturbance of Historic Resources. As outlined in subsection 14.1.3, no on-site historic resources are known to exist, nor would any known off-site historic resources be affected by the proposed project.

¹²CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, items V(a-d) and IX(b).

Mitigation. No significant historic resources impact has been identified; no mitigation is necessary.

Impact 14-1: Disturbance of Prehistoric Cultural Resources. Implementation of the proposed project grading plan, including subsurface foundations, dredging, roads and infrastructure, could disturb as yet unidentified sensitive, on-site, subsurface, cultural resources. This potential represents a **potentially significant impact** (see criteria 1 through 5 in subsection 12.3.1, "Significance Criteria" above).

Comment: new tab grid for indented text underneath boxes--(just the old one with 1.167 added)

Native American resource sites occur in the immediate region. Although development of the project site is not expected to affect prehistoric or historic cultural resources, concentrations of archaeological material (e.g., Pleistocene archaeological deposits) might be found under on-site alluvium, resulting from a combination of alluvial materials and rising water levels over the past six to eight thousand years. It is possible that foundation construction or deep dredging associated with the proposed project could uncover concentrations of materials associated with early village locations.

Mitigation 14-1. Require that a qualified archaeologist be retained at applicant expense to monitor project-related on-site building foundation, marina, infrastructure, and other excavations. In the event that subsurface cultural resources are encountered during approved ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity must be stopped and the retained archaeologist shall evaluate the finds. The discovery or disturbance of any cultural resources shall also be reported to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources shall be recorded on State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) form 422 (archaeological sites). Mitigation measures prescribed by these groups and required by the City shall be undertaken prior to resumption of construction activities. If disturbance of a project area cultural resource cannot be avoided, a mitigation program, including measures set forth in the City's *Cultural Resources Management Program* and in compliance with sections 15064.4 and 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, shall be implemented. In the event that any human remains are encountered, earthmoving shall be stopped until the County Coroner's office has been contacted. Implementation of these measures will reduce this potential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.

