4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section discusses known and unknown historical, paleontological, and archaeological resources that may be present within or near the plan area. Applicable legislation relating to cultural resources and archaeological sites is also summarized. The section identifies potential impacts of the New General Plan to known and unknown resources. Where impacts would occur, appropriate mitigation measures are provided. This section is based on the Redwood City General Plan Historic Resources Background Report, October 2008.

4.5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Pre–Historical Background

Pre-European Settlement

Prior to European explorers settling the plan area, the indigenous people known as the Ohlone (depicted in Figure 4.5-1), known throughout California as Coastanoans, or “coastal people”, lived in the region for thousands of years. The Ohlone lived along the bay shores, foothills, and hills of the Peninsula, subsisting off of plentiful food resources, particularly those available from the bay. An estimated 7,000 indigenous people were living in this community when Spanish explorers first arrived in the last half of the 18th century. As a semi-nomadic people, their culture is evidenced by shell mounds left in areas of temporary occupancy. One such mound was located at Main Street near Woodside Road and another near the Union Cemetery. These two shell mounds have since been leveled and built upon.

Historic Period Background

European Exploration and Settlement

Spanish exploration in the mid-18th century led to the eventual establishment of permanent settlements along the coast, mostly in the form of missions. No buildings or structures directly related to the Spanish explorers remain in the plan area. In 1777, Mission Santa Clara was founded approximately 20 miles south of the plan area. Spanish colonization, through the Mission system, eventually decimated the Ohlone population through introduced diseases and forced labor.

In 1835, a 69,120 acre land grant from Mexico established Rancho de Las Pulgas, an area that included all of modern day Redwood City (City), excepting the marsh land area adjacent to the bay. The area was owned and managed by the Arguello family. The ranch raised livestock, and produced hides, tallow, and redwood products. These goods were shipped to San Francisco via the bay on rafts, as the area’s proximity to tidal action allowed for this transportation method. The area where shipments embarked became known as “El Embarcadero,” and was located in the vicinity of Broadway and parallel to Main Street.
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The Gold Rush Era

During the Gold Rush era (in the years following 1848), there was a large population influx of immigrants and gold seekers to California. The plan area developed into an important shipping point during this time. Lumbermen and merchants realized that the “Redwood Embarcadero,” as it was then known, would be a good shipping point for their goods. Earlier lumbermen and merchants also constructed wood frame warehouses, shops, stores, saloons, and a hotel, which were the earliest construction along the thoroughfares that became Main Street and Broadway.

Mezesville

Following the gold rush boom, immigrant populations found other means of livelihood, and many settled on the extensive holdings of the Rancho de las Pulgas ranch. The Arguello family was forced to defend its ownership of these lands. They were assisted by Legal Agent Simon M. Mezes, in successfully establishing clear title for the rancho. In exchange, Mezes was granted title to a portion of the Rancho de las Pulgas land, which included the area that would become the central area of the City. He surveyed, planned, and established Mezesville on a portion of these lands, located in the vicinity of the Embarcadero and northeast of El Camino Real. The new Mezesville streets were arranged in a regular grid of blocks and lots, with El Camino Real as the southern and western boundary. The southern and eastern portions of the plan rotated to meet the streets that had developed east and northwest of the Embarcadero. This double grid intersected at California Square, one of the three blocks donated by Mezes for public purposes (Mezes Park, Courthouse Block, and California Square). The portion of Mezesville west of California Square was at about a 45 degree angle to the streets paralleling the wharf, as shown in Figure 4.5-1. In 1852, soon after Mezesville was surveyed, the County of San Mateo was created. The City became the seat of the County’s government in 1856.

Figure 4.5-2 shows Redwood City in 1899. As shown, the town grew slowly in its early years. The Eastern Addition was the first subdivision to follow the Mezesville subdivision. Even the San Francisco and San Jose railroad corridor, which was developed through the plan area in 1863, offering passenger and freight train service, did not drive the growth of the area. Instead, local residents interested in roadway, pedestrian, and waterborne improvements drove the development and incorporation of the City, which became official in 1868.

Early Industries and Development of Redwood City: 1850 - 1905

The City was relatively self-sustaining after its incorporation. The blocks in the vicinity of Main Street and Broadway continued to serve as a business center for the town, where lumber, shipping, tannery, warehouse, and retail uses continued to thrive. Commercial and residential development during the 1850s and 1860s reflected popular Victorian Era designs and construction types. The oldest remaining commercial structure from this time period is a general store, the Quong Lee Laundry building located at 726 Main Street, which was built in 1859 (Figure 4.5-2).
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The John Offerman House (shown in Figure 4.5-3) at 1018 Main Street, dates to the 1850s. It was expanded in size in about 1889. The expanded building included Greek Revival architectural details which were likely absent on the original four-room building.

Records from the 1870s and 1880s show a concentration of businesses along Main Street and Broadway. The first County buildings were constructed from stone masonry in the Classical Revival style between 1858 and 1906. Major businesses on the main thoroughfares included the Grand Hotel, the Redwood City Hotel, the Eureka Brewery, and the Redwood City Flour Mill. Buildings were generally wood frame with flat parapet roofs for commercial buildings, and gable roofs with wood shingle roofing on residential buildings. The town also included some brick or masonry construction in a few industrial, commercial, residential, and public examples.

The Embarcadero area consisted of a series of wood plank and pile wharves that were essential to the City’s economy and the local lumber and tanning industries. Figure 4.5-3 shows the Embarcadero during the early 1900s. Hanson-Ackerson Lumber Company, the Peninsula’s biggest lumber manufacturer during this time, operated a large facility in the City beginning in the 1860s. Despite a slowdown in timber production after 1870, the City lumber yards and planing mills remained active, still serving the Bay Area markets. In addition to lumber, tanners dominated the wharf in the City. Frank’s Tannery, founded in 1874 in a location north of what is now Veterans Boulevard, was one of the City’s most important industries until its closure in 1959 due to a decline in the demand for leather products. The tannery buildings were nearly all wood frame, utilitarian structures, from one to three stories in height depending upon their function. Most were wood construction throughout, including siding and roofing, although some buildings had metal siding. The historic structures associated with this business burned down in 1968 and only a portion of the wharves and creek pilings remain.

**Economic Development of Redwood City: Early Twentieth Century**

Industries in the plan area had long been located near the tide land areas on either side of Redwood Creek. In 1904, the Alaska Codfish Company established itself on Greco Island, located south of the mouth of Redwood Creek on the Bay, and became an important local employer. The company had thirty buildings on the island, as well as a wharf, and a fleet of five sailing vessels. Morgan Oyster Company, with headquarters on Steinberger Slough, operated oyster beds in the bay for about fifty years starting in the late 1870s.

Various sea salt harvesting companies became important in the early 1900s followed in the 1910s by manufacturers of aniline dyes, magnesia (insulation), and cement and aggregate production. The plan area experienced an economic resurgence in the 1920s fueled by the success of the salt industry. One of the most successful operations was Leslie Salt Company, which built a 460-foot loading dock and two loading towers at the Port of Redwood in 1951, and was later purchased and operated by Cargill, Inc.

Driven by the success of the marsh side industries, which made wharf access increasingly important, the City sought to deepen and widen its port. The City initiated several U.S. Army Corp of Engineers dredging projects over the years, with little success due to the continual silting of the area, while development to the west continued to encroach on the
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marsh industries. Rail connections were extended farther north and east alongside the deep water channel to serve the port industries, including the salt company, a cement plant, and various fishing companies. A modern deep water port was ultimately created in 1937, after a voter-approved bond issue helped create the Port of Redwood City.

Commercial architecture during this period reflected new styles and materials. Various revival styles dominated, especially Spanish Colonial and Mission influences, as well as more understated Classical revival styles. Wood frame and brick construction types were also joined by hollow clay tile and concrete block construction that became popular in the 1920s and 1930s and continued after World War II. A new center of economic activity developed in the new residential areas west of El Camino Real, as well as to the south along the Bayshore Highway (in the 1940s and 1950s), and later the Bayshore Freeway (now U.S. 101).

In the latter half of the 20th century, the Peninsula became home to a thriving technological sector. AMPLEX Corporation was founded during this time and moved to the plan area in 1951. The company became a leading innovator in tape recording equipment and developed the first practical video tape recorder. Corporate offices for the successful corporation were constructed at 401 Broadway in 1959, as shown in Figure 4.5-4. The company was the largest plan area employer through the 1980s. AMPLEX continues to conduct business today; however it filed for bankruptcy in 2008.

**Residential Development**

Following incorporation in 1868, the City’s population grew at a gradual pace. Despite residential development in subdivisions during the late 19th century, the area immediately surrounding the City remained largely agricultural and sparsely developed.

Historically, residential development of the City occurred in two district sections. The first was the Mezesville area, located northeast of El Camino Real and between the creek and Whipple Avenue. This area consists of one- and two-story wood frame buildings in a variety of styles, ranging from Greek Revival to Queen Anne and dating from the 19th century. Later homes include Spanish Eclectic and various Craftsman bungalow examples. The Mezesville Historic District is located in this neighborhood.

The other early residential section is located east of the historic Main Street. This area includes the Stambaugh-Heller Historic District in the Eastern Addition subdivision.

As of 1990, this area contained the largest concentration of pre-1900 buildings in the plan area. Post-1900 homes in this area also include Queen Anne, Spanish Eclectic, Folk Style, Farmhouse, and Craftsman Bungalow style dwellings.

Although early attempts to develop the Wellesley Crescent neighborhood in 1889 offered small estate lots for sale near the Finger Tract Area south of Cordilleras Creek, the region of the plan area south and west of El Camino Real experienced little residential development prior to 1900, largely because it was held in large private estates. In the 1870s, the Hawes Estate extended from the north end of town to Five Points -- the intersection of El Camino Real, Woodside Road, Spruce Street, Mound (Main) Street, and Redwood Avenue. It was eventually divided and sold. Residential development south and
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west of El Camino Real began in the early 1900s and 1910s, around the time that the 1906 earthquake displaced thousands of Bay Area residents, causing them to relocate to Redwood City among other locations on the Peninsula.

In the aftermath of the 1906 earthquake, the Bohemian Club of San Francisco subdivided land between Arlington and Edgewood Roads known as Wellesley Park, or Edgewood Park. The area featured curvilinear streets and a small circular park and attracted scores of new residents in the first decade of the twentieth century. As in the Mount Carmel area (near Fulton Street and Katherine Avenue), houses in the area displayed a variety of architectural styles, including Craftsman Bungalow, American Colonial Revival, Monterey Revival, and the stucco half timbered Tudor Revival styles of the twenties and thirties. Emerald Hills, southwest of Alameda de las Pulgas, was established around 1910. Prior to World War II, Emerald Hills construction consisted of summer homes built around Emerald Lake. However, after the war, residences were more commonly designed for year-round use. Emerald Hills grew slowly and continues to retain a flavor of its earlier rural character.

Other sections of the plan area southwest of El Camino Real that developed in the early twentieth century included several working-class central subdivisions like the Oakwood neighborhood. Most houses were one-story buildings, with a stairway leading up to a porch and main entry in front on the second story. Sheathing materials and design elements included clapboard siding, slanted bays, and hipped roofs. Later homes tended to have stucco siding and flat roofs.

By 1910, the City had around 2,700 residents, many of whom commuted to jobs outside of the City. The old estates of the Victorian Era continued to be subdivided, and for the first time, most of the town’s population lived west of El Camino Real. These commuter neighborhoods grew slowly and this gradual development gave rise to varied architectural styles. The buildings were still generally wood frame, but included other construction materials like brick facing and stucco siding used in English Tudor and Georgian styles, as well as Spanish revival designs. Other housing types included California Bungalows, Mediterranean, Monterey, French and half timber-styled houses, and eventually ranch style homes. By 1920 there were around 5,500 residents and the increase in population required several new schools, including Lincoln, Washington, and John Gill. In 1923-24, the City built a new high school, Sequoia, which is now listed on the National Register, closing down the building located at the corner of Broadway and Middlefield Road which was then used by the Red Cross during WWII.

By 1930, Redwood City had 9,000 residents and residential development continued in spite of the Great Depression. Throughout the decade, the population increased by 4,500 residents and industrial and commercial development continued. The City began to expand at a much more rapid pace during and after World War II, growing from about 12,500 as the war began, to more than 46,000 in 1960. The City annexed adjacent areas until it shared boundaries with Menlo Park, Atherton, and San Carlos. The City also expanded into previously unincorporated San Mateo County along stretches of El Camino Real. Neighborhoods such as East Central and West Central date to the pre-World War II growth of the plan area. The booming post-war era brought large subdivision type
residential development that reached farther south and westward into the hillsides with residential tracts like Woodside Terrace and Farm Hills. This rapid post-War growth is shown in Figures 4.5-4 and 4.5-5, which show the change in density in the Farm Hill subdivision from 1955 to 1958. Many of these new residents worked in the bayside industrial complexes, such as AMPEX.

In the mid-1960s, the City annexed 25 square miles of tide lands and salt ponds and more than doubled the land area of the City. A large part of the new annexation was developed into the planned community project known as Redwood Shores, shown in Figure 4.5-5. Single family homes, condominiums, parks, docks, offices, and commercial buildings were constructed in the 1960s and 1970s, including the first site of the Marine World amusement park. Development stalled temporarily in the late 1970s; Mobil Oil then purchased the development area, and the Redwood Shores area resumed growth in the early 1980s. The Oracle Corporation moved into the former Marine World property in 1989 and eventually purchased it, removed the theme park, and constructed its corporate headquarters on the site, where it remains at the present day.

Cultural Resources in the Plan Area

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources consist of the fossilized remains of plants and animals, including vertebrates (animals with backbones) and invertebrates (e.g., starfish, clams, ammonites, and marine coral). The age and abundance of fossils depends on the topography and geological formations of the region of interest. In general, most fossils in the Peninsula and San Francisco Regions are found along the immediate Pacific Ocean coastline, and in locations within the outcropping marine units in the Santa Cruz Mountains. The plan area does not include any Pacific Ocean coastline and does not extend into the Santa Cruz Mountains. Geologic units underlying the plan area are primarily composed of Holocene period alluvial fan deposits and Holocene period San Francisco Bay Muds. The Holocene Period dates from approximately 10,000 to 12,000 years prior to the present and is the era in which human civilization is generally considered to have begun.

To identify any known paleontological resources in the vicinity of the study area, a record search was conducted on June 11, 2009, of the online database maintained by the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP). According to the UCMP online locality search tool, no records of known fossil localities exist in the plan area. The closest recorded paleontological sites are located approximately 2 miles south of the plan area, within the City of Atherton.

1 University of California Museum of Paleontology, Locality Search (June 11, 2009). Available at http://ucmpdb.berkeley.edu/loc.shtml.
2 The sites have the following code numbers: V101319, V 68129, and V 72213
3 Additional background information for this discussion was obtained from a Draft EIR associated with the Bay Division Pipeline Replacement project associated with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s Water Supply Improvement Program (WSIP).
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Archaeological Resources

In order to determine the potential presence of archeological resources in the plan area (including both prehistoric and historic period archaeological resources), a records search was conducted by reviewing pertinent Northwest Information Center (NWIC) data maps, historic-period maps, and recorded literature for San Mateo County.

Review of this information indicates that the plan area contains one historic-period archeological site\(^4\) that includes the remains of the historic downtown area. In addition, there are eight reported, but not officially recorded, cultural resource sites in the plan area\(^5\), three of which are understood to be associated with Native Americans.

The plan area also contains 12 known prehistoric archaeological sites,\(^6\) ranging from tool processing sites to habitation sites with burials. An additional site is considered to have multiple components.\(^7\)

Generally, Native American related archaeological resources in this portion of San Mateo County have been found in areas near the San Francisco Bay, on inland ridges, midslope benches, and in valleys near intermittent and perennial watercourses. The plan area contains each of these environmental settings and features. As such, there is a high likelihood that unrecorded Native American cultural resources exist in the plan area.

Historic Resources

The plan area contains thousands of buildings that are over 50 years of age and numerous properties that are considered to be historically significant. Figure 4.5-6 depicts the general residential building periods within the City. According to the City’s historic inventory database, there are currently about 200 buildings and structures in the City that are documented and rated as historic resources. These resources are either eligible for, have been determined eligible for, or are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and/or the Redwood City Inventory of Historical Resources.\(^8\) These properties are considered historical resources for the purposes the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These resources are listed in Appendix F.

\(^4\) Site P-41-000506
\(^5\) Sites C-156, C-351, C-360, C-370, C-391, C-392, C-441, and C-442
\(^6\) Sites P-41-000008, P-41-000085, P-41-000086, P-41-000092, P-41-000238, P-41-000262, P-41-000298, P-41-000299, P-41-000300, P-41-000303, P-41-000446
\(^7\) P-41-000506
\(^8\) Eligible resources are resources that have been nominated for inclusion by a resident, landowner, or local government. The State Historical Resources Commission reviews each request and makes a determination of whether to include the resource in the Historic Register. Nominations either remain eligible (those that have not been determined to be included) or determined eligible (those that have been included in the Register).
City Boundary

Building Periods:
- Before 1906 (before earthquake)
- 1906-1929 (earthquake to depression)
- 1930-1945 (WW2 period)
- 1946-1960 (after WW2 period)
- 1961-1975 (green house infill)
- 1976-1990 (modern era)
- 1991-2004 (21st century rebuild/infill)
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Examples of historic properties include:

- Sequoia High School is a historic property recognized by the City Council in 1989 and listed in the National Register and California Register in 1995. (Refer to Figure 4.5-7)

- The old San Mateo County Court House building is a single resource recognized by the City Council in 1981 and listed in the National Register and California Register in 1994. (Refer to Figure 4.5-7)

- The Union Cemetery is not only listed in the National Register and California Register (1992) and recognized by the City in 1989, but is also California Landmark No. 816. (Refer to Figure 4.5-7)

The HRAC, Planning Commission, and the City Council have identified five historic districts in the plan area, as shown in Table 4.5-1 and Figure 4.5-8. In addition, the HRAC as advisory to the Planning Commission is currently considering the possibility of creating a new NRHP-eligible district around the City’s Courthouse Square and expanding the original Main Street Historic District towards the south which would include historic resources located around the intersection of Middlefield Road and Main and Maple Streets. HRAC met with the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) in April 2008 as part of the CRHP listing process.

Table 4.5-1. Redwood City Historic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Resources</th>
<th>Criteria for Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Historic District; City Council Res. No. 14474 (10/28/2002)</td>
<td>Local District; Status Code 7J (includes Redwood City Historic Commercial Buildings District, below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City Historic Commercial Buildings District, (listed NRHP 1977, #7700033)</td>
<td>NRHP District; Status Code 1D (encompassed within Main Street Historic District, above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stambaugh Heller Historic Residential District; City Council Res. No. 11047 (6/5/1989)</td>
<td>Local and California Register of Historical Resources District; Status Code 2D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezesville Historic District; City Council Res. No. 14723 (7/24/2006)</td>
<td>Local District; Status Code 3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia Union High School Historic District; City Council Res. No. 10967 (1/3/1989); (Listed NRHP 1995, #95000389)</td>
<td>NRHP District; Status Code 1D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.5.2 REGULATORY SETTING

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, (NHPA) sets forth national policy and procedures regarding historic properties (defined below). NHPA provides the legal framework for most state and local preservation laws. NHPA established the NRHP program under the Secretary of the Interior, authorized funding for state programs with provisions for pass-through funding and participation by local governments, created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and established the Section 106 review process for protecting historic properties.

Under NHPA, historic properties are buildings, structures, objects, districts, or sites that are both historically significant and that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Historically significant properties:

- are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Section 106 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, and afford the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment. The historic preservation review process mandated by Section 106 is outlined in regulations issued by ACHP. Revised regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800), became effective January 11, 2001.

The Secretary of the Interior developed its Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR 68) to further guide federal agencies in historic preservation efforts. Application of these standards is required in certain programs that the Secretary administers through the National Park Service. The standards apply to all proposed development grant-in-aid projects assisted through the national Historic Preservation Fund, and are intended to be applied to a wide variety of resource types, including buildings, sites, structures, objects, and districts.

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA, as well as California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1 (which established the CRHR, discussed below), requires that projects take potential impacts on historical resources into account.
CEQA equates a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource with a significant effect on the environment (Section 21084.1 of the Public Resources Code) and defines substantial adverse change as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration that would impair historical significance (Section 5020.1). Section 21084.1 stipulates that any resource listed in, or eligible for listing in, the CRHR (see below for discussion of the CRHR) is presumed to be historically or culturally significant.

Resources listed in a local historic register or deemed significant in a historical resource survey (as provided under Section 5024.1g) are presumed historically or culturally significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates they are not. A resource that is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the CRHR, is not included in a local register of historic resources, or not deemed significant in a historical resource survey may nonetheless be historically significant (Section 21084.1; see Section 21098.1). Even absent a formal eligibility determination by the Commission, however, a lead agency “generally” shall consider a resource to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources.

CEQA mandates that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. While demolition and destruction are fairly obvious significant impacts, it is more difficult to assess when change, alteration, or relocation crosses the threshold of substantial adverse change. The CEQA Guidelines provide that a project that demolishes or alters those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance (i.e., its character-defining features) can be considered to materially impair the resource’s significance. However, a project that conforms to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties can generally be considered a project that will not cause a significant impact.

California Register of Historic Resources

The California OHP administers the CRHR, which was established in 1992 though amendments to the Public Resources Code, to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change.

The CRHR includes resources that have been formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the NRHP, State Historical Landmark Number 770 or higher, Points of Historical Interest recommended for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC) for listing, resources nominated for listing and determined eligible in accordance with criteria and procedures adopted by the SHRC, and resources and districts designated as city or county landmarks when the designation criteria are consistent with CRHR criteria.

PRC Section 5024.1 requires evaluation of historical resources to determine their eligibility for listing on the CRHR. The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP, which is described above.
As defined by Section 15064.5(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, a resource shall be considered historically significant if the resource meets the following criteria:

- It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (Criterion D is usually applied only to archaeological sites, rather than in the evaluation of most historic architectural structures, see below.)

Automatic CRHR listings include NRHP listed and determined eligible historic properties (either by the Keeper of the NRHP or through a consensus determination on a project review); State Historical Landmarks from number 770 onward; Points of Interest nominated from January 1998 onward. Landmarks prior to 770 and Points of Historical Interest may be listed through an action of the SHRC (CAL/OHP ca. 1999b).

**Senate Bill 18**

Signed into law in September 2004, Senate Bill (SB 18) requires cities and counties to notify and consult with Native American Tribes about proposed local land use planning decisions for the purpose of protecting tribal cultural resources. SB 18 stipulates that cities and counties must send any proposals for revisions or amendments to general plans and specific plans to those California Native American Tribes that are on the Native American Heritage Commission’s (NAHC) contact list and have traditional lands located within the city or county’s jurisdiction. Cities and counties must also conduct consultations with these tribes prior to adopting or amending their general plans or specific plans.

**Mills Act**

Enacted in 1972, the Mills Act allows cities to grant property tax relief to owners of qualified historic properties. The Mills Act was conceived as a preservation tool that encourages the preservation and restoration of historic properties. The Mills Act enables cities to enter into historical property agreements with owners of qualifying properties that result in reductions to the owner’s property taxes. The agreements provide a benefit to cities in that they ensure preservation and guarantee authentic rehabilitations and a high level of maintenance of cultural resources important to communities.

In the City, the review criteria for the Mills Act limit eligibility to residential properties designated as local historic landmarks and or contributors to locally designated historic districts.
California Health and Safety Code

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 regulates the procedure in the event of human remains discovery. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, in the event of human remains discovery, no further disturbance is allowed until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings regarding the origin and disposition of the remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner is required to contact the NAHC. The NAHC is responsible for contacting the most likely Native American descendent, who will consult with the local agency regarding how to proceed with the remains. According to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, all human remains are a significant resource.

Redwood City Historic Preservation Ordinance

Modern historic preservation planning in the City began in the 1970s when four commercial buildings in the old Main Street and Broadway area were listed on the NRHP. Many years later, in 2002, these properties were designated by the City Council as the Main Street Historic District #1.

The City adopted the Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 40 of the City Municipal Code) in 1980. The Historic Preservation Ordinance is intended to safeguard the City’s heritage by providing for the protection of historic landmarks, encourage public knowledge of the City’s history, and foster a sense of identity in the community. The Historic Preservation Ordinance is also structured to identify historical resources at the early stages of projects and to resolve conflicts that arise between land uses and the preservation of historical resources. The Historic Preservation Ordinance requires that applications or projects affecting historic resources comply with applicable local, state, and federal laws. Under the Historic Preservation Ordinance, the City also maintains a list of individual historic landmarks, resources, and districts. The list is continually updated as new sites and landmarks are identified.

Historic Resources Advisory Committee and Cultural Resources Management Plan

The City Council established the Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) in 1980. In 1992, the HRAC attained National Park Service Certified Local Government (CLG) status, a program administered by the California OHP. The HRAC actively pursues historic preservation projects in the City, such as overseeing management of the City’s Historic Resources Inventory, which is based on surveys initially conducted in 1976 and updated in 1996. The inventory has been updated since that time on a using the Department of Parks and Recreation forms (DPR 523 form series), and as such, is expected to be certified by OHP by 2010.

The HRAC also developed and oversees implementation of a Cultural Resources Management Plan that outlines the City’s policies for the treatment of historic resources impacted by development projects in the City. The Cultural Resources Management Plan
is applied to all historic sites which have a potential for the on-site discovery, reconnaissance, and identification of a cultural resource.

The CLG program is a preservation partnership, jointly administered by the National Park Service and the OHPs in each state; in this case, the California OHP. The CLG program is focused on promoting historic preservation at the grass roots level. Local communities go through a certification process to become recognized as CLGs. The HRAC is responsible for maintaining the City’s CLG status.

Project Consistency Analysis

Pursuant to the NHPA, CRHR, and CEQA, the plan area has been examined for cultural and historically significant resources; findings of this examination are discussed in Section 4.5.1. The New General Plan includes a spectrum of policies and implementation programs adherence to which would ensure compliance with pertinent federal, state, and local regulations. For example, Policies BE-36.1 through BE-36.3 would develop a strategy to identify, study, and document historic resources, while Policies BE-37.1 through BE-37.8 would protect, preserve, restore, and rehabilitate and/or enhance existing historic resources within the plan area. In regards to the Redwood City Historic Preservation Ordinance, Historic Resources Advisory Committee, and the City’s Cultural Resources Management Plan, Program BE-100 would enforce the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance and Program and require coordination with the Historic Resources Advisory Committee to continue to review and make recommendations regarding historic resources, thereby representing consistency. Program BE-105 also would require the continued application of the Cultural Resources Management Plan, in compliance with the applicable CEQA regulations, for all historic sites. Specifically, in accordance with SB 18, project historians requested a sacred lands search and a list of Native American contacts for the plan area from the NAHC. The sacred lands search completed by the NAHC did not identify any significant Native American cultural resources either within or near the plan area.

Implementation of Policies BE-36.1 through BE-36.3 would ensure consistency with the Mills Act, as historic resources within the plan area would be identified, studied, and documented, which could be used for property tax information.

With regard to the California Health and Safety Code, the plan area may contain hidden and/or unknown archaeological resources, including human remains. Development or infrastructure projects with the potential to affect hidden/unknown archaeological resources usually achieve consistency with archaeological regulations through individual, project specific environmental review processes. Potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources are avoided or minimized through the inclusion of Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a, 4.5-1b, 4.5-2, 4.5-3a, and 4.4-3b, identified in Section 4.5.4 below.

Thus, the New General Plan would be consistent with regulations and policies related to cultural resources.
4.5.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The City has not established local CEQA significance thresholds as described in Section 15064.7 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, significance determinations utilized in this Section are from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. A significant cultural resource impact could occur if development allowed by the New General Plan would:

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

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

4.5.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Impacts

**Impact 4.5-1: Growth projected to occur with new allowable development under the New General Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources in the plan area due to damage or demolition of historic resources. (Less than Significant)**

The New General Plan would allow for the development of an estimated 9,103 new dwelling units and about 7.3 million square feet of new non-residential development within the plan area by the year 2030 plus a number of infrastructure and transportation improvements. Historic resources in the plan area could be vulnerable to development activities or other public works improvements, which could result in damage to or demolition of these structures.

As previously discussed, there are a number of federal, state, and local regulations currently in place that protect historic resources in the plan area. In addition to these existing regulations, proposed policies and implementation programs of the New General Plan would enact further regulations, programs, and incentives intended to preserve both publicly- and privately-owned historic and cultural resources and reducing significant impacts of development within the plan area related to historic resources. The spectrum of policies and implementation programs within the New General Plan encourages identification, evaluation, and listing of historical resources in local, state, and federal registers, including individual resources and districts. These strategies maintain the City’s CLG status by meeting qualification and reporting requirements for the CLG Program, a preservation partnership between local, state, and national governments.

Specifically, the New General Plan Policies BE-36.1 through BE-36.3, BE-37.1 through BE-37.8, BE-38.1 through BE-38.6, and BE-39.1 through BE-39.4, detailed in Appendix A, include surveying, identifying, and maintaining a record of historic resources within the
plan area; developing adaptive reuse of historic residential, commercial, and industrial buildings; and preserving and rehabilitating historic and landmark sites. These policies involve striving for compatibility between new development and adjacent historic properties and promoting public awareness of and education regarding the historic context of the City through implementation of historic walking programs and developing pedestrian uses within the historic commercial districts and landmarks.

Implementation programs within the New General Plan could further introduce measures to reduce impacts related to historic resources. Programs BE-100 through BE-118, BE-120, and BE-121 could enforce the Historic Preservation Ordinance, incentivize loans for the rehabilitation of landmark district sites, establish a review process for demolition of potentially historic sites, continue the application of the Cultural Resources Management Plan, develop maintenance and repair guidelines for historically designated areas, and establish a non-government landmark preservation Revolving Fund for historic districts land bank programs. Refer to Appendix A for implementation program details.

With adherence to and implementation of the New General Plan policies and implementation programs, which would balance the goal of providing opportunities for infill development with preservation of the integrity of historic resources, impacts to historic resources within the plan area would be less than significant. Individual developments within the plan area will be required to undergo project-specific environmental review. If project-level significant impacts to historical resources are identified, project-site specific mitigation would be applied as part of this separate environmental review to further reduce potentially significant impacts related to historic resources, as required under CEQA.

**Impact 4.5-2: Construction activities, including site preparation and grading, associated with new development allowed under the New General Plan could adversely impact previously undiscovered archaeological resources due to uncovering or unearthing these resources. (Less than Significant after Mitigation)**

As discussed in Section 4.5.1, there is a high likelihood that unrecorded Native American cultural resources exist in portions of the plan area, as several reported cultural resource sites understood to be associated with Native Americans have been found within the plan area and surrounding areas, including near the San Francisco Bay, on inland ridges, midslope benches, and in valleys near waterways. Individual development proposals allowed under the New General Plan would likely entail site preparation, grading, and construction activities, which could adversely impact these previously undiscovered archeological resources. Implementation of the following mitigation measures could reduce potential impacts to undiscovered archeological resources to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a:** As a standard condition of approval on all ground-disturbing activities in the City’s jurisdiction, the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department shall adopt a resolution to require work stoppage in the event sensitive cultural resources are identified. Specifically, if deposits of
prehistoric or historic archeological materials are encountered during project construction activities, all work within an appropriate buffer area around the discovery shall be stopped and a qualified archeologist meeting federal criteria under 36 CFR 61 shall be contacted to assess the deposit(s) and make recommendations.

If deposits of prehistoric or historic archeological materials cannot be avoided by project activities, the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department shall confirm that the project applicant(s) have retained a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the potential historic significance of the resource(s). If the deposits are recommended to be non-significant by a qualified archeologist, avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are determined to be potentially significant by the qualified archeologist, the resources shall be avoided. If avoidance is not feasible, project impacts shall be mitigated in accordance with the recommendations of the qualified archaeologist, in coordination with the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (b)(3)(C), which requires implementation of a data recovery plan. The data recovery plan shall include provisions for adequately recovering all scientifically consequential information from and about any discovered archeological materials and include recommendations for the treatment of these resources. In-place preservation of the archeological resource is the preferred manner of mitigating potential impacts, as it maintains the relationship between the resource and the archeological context. In-place preservation also reduces the potential for conflicts with the religious or cultural values of groups associated with the resource. Other mitigation options include, but are not limited to, the full or partial removal and curation of the resource.

The City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department shall confirm that the project applicant(s) have retained a qualified archeologist for the preparation and implementation of the data recovery plan, which shall be conducted by prior to any additional earth-moving activities in the area of the resource. The recovery plan shall be submitted to the project applicant, the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department, and the NWIC. Once the recovery plan is reviewed and approved by the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department and any appropriate resource recovery completed, project construction activity within the area of the find may resume. A data recovery plan shall not be required for resources that have been deemed by the NWIC as adequately recorded and recovered by studies already completed. Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b: Prior to the issuance of grading permits within the plan area, the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department shall confirm that any development applicant has required all construction crews to undergo adequate training for the identification of federal or state-eligible cultural resources, and that the construction crews are aware of the potential for previously undiscovered archaeological resources within the plan area, of the laws protecting these resources and associated penalties, and of the procedures to follow should they discover cultural resources during project-related work. To the extent that individual
development projects may be found to have the potential to disturb or destroy archaeological resources, subsequent environmental documentation would be required, including mitigation measures to address any identified significant impacts.

**Significance After Mitigation.** Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a and 4.5-1b would reduce the impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.5-3:** Earth moving activities, particularly deep grading, associated with the construction of new development allowed under the New General Plan could have the potential to destroy paleontological resources. *(Less than Significant after Mitigation)*

As previously discussed, the plan area is not known to have unique paleontological resources. However, the potential for destruction of unknown fossils is a potentially significant effect requiring mitigation.

**Mitigation Measure 4.5-2:** As a standard condition of approval on all ground-disturbing activities in the City’s jurisdiction, the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department shall adopt a resolution to require work stoppage in the event sensitive paleontological resources are identified. Specifically, prior to the issuance of grading or demolition permits, the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department, in coordination with a qualified paleontologist, shall assess individual development project proposals within the plan area for the potential to destroy unique paleontological resources. The City Planning, Housing and Economic Development Department shall require development proposals entailing significant earthworks or deep foundations with the potential to penetrate sedimentary rock layers to incorporate a study by a professional paleontologist to assess the potential for damage of paleontological resources. Should the paleontologist determine that the proposal has the potential to damage resources, the paleontologist shall provide detailed provisions for the protection of these resources to the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department. These provisions may include the complete avoidance of the resource, in-place preservation, and/or complete data recovery as discussed in Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a.

**Significance After Mitigation:** Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-2 would reduce the impacts to paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.5-4:** Ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of new development allowed under the New General Plan could impact previously undiscovered human remains. *(Less than Significant after Mitigation)*

Ground-disturbing activities associated with site preparation, grading, and construction activities could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The potential to uncover Native American human remains exists in locations throughout California. Although not anticipated, human remains may be identified during site-preparation and grading activities, resulting in a significant impact to Native American cultural resources. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less than significant level.
Mitigation Measure 4.5-3a: For future development projects permitted by the City under the New General Plan, if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities within specific project sites, the project contractor and/or on-site supervisor shall provide certification to City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department that work within 50 feet of the discovery is stopped. The project contractor shall immediately notify the San Mateo County Coroner (Coroner) upon the discovery of any human remains. At the same time, a qualified archaeologist meeting federal criteria under 36 CFR 61 shall be contacted by the project applicant(s) and project contractor, in coordination with the City Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Department to assess the situation and consult with the appropriate agencies. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours of this identification. The NAHC will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the remains and any associated grave goods. Upon completion of the assessment, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the background to the finds, and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report shall be submitted to the project applicant, the City Planning Department, and the NWIC. Once the report is reviewed and approved by the City Planning Department, and any appropriate treatment completed, project construction activity within the area of the find may resume.

If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours the project applicant(s) shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. If the project applicant(s) does not accept the MLD’s recommendations, the applicant(s) or the MLD may request mediation by the NAHC.

Mitigation Measure 4.5-3b: Prior to the issuance of grading permits within the plan area, the City Planning Department shall confirm that any development applicant has required all construction crews to undergo a training session to inform them of the presence and nature of federal or state-eligible cultural resources and the potential for previously undiscovered archaeological resources and human remains within the project area, of the laws protecting these resources and associated penalties, and of the procedures to follow should they discover cultural resources during project-related work.

Significance After Mitigation: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-3a and 4.5-3b would reduce the impacts to undiscovered human remains to a less than significant level.