

4.4 Cultural Resources

This section includes a general discussion of the potential cultural and paleontological resources in the Inner Harbor Specific Plan Area. Discussed are the physical and regulatory setting, the baseline for determining environmental impacts, the significance criteria used for determining environmental impacts, and potential impacts associated with construction, operation, and maintenance in the Plan Area. Cultural resources include architectural resources, prehistoric and historic-era archaeological resources, and human remains. This section also addresses paleontological resources.

4.4.1 Setting

Paleontological Setting

Paleontological Assessment Guidelines

The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) established guidelines for the identification, assessment, and mitigation of adverse impacts on nonrenewable paleontological resources (SVP, 1995). Most practicing paleontologists in the United States adhere closely to the SVP's assessment, mitigation, and monitoring requirements as outlined in these guidelines, which were approved through a consensus of professional paleontologists. Many federal, state, county, and city agencies have either formally or informally adopted the SVP's standard guidelines for the mitigation of adverse construction-related impacts on paleontological resources. The SVP has helped define the value of paleontological resources and, in particular, indicates that geologic units of *high* paleontological potential are those from which vertebrate or significant invertebrate or plant fossils have been recovered in the past (i.e., are represented in institutional collections). Only invertebrate fossils that provide new information on existing flora or fauna or on the age of a rock unit would be considered significant. Geologic units of *low* paleontological potential are those that are not known to have produced a substantial body of significant paleontological material. As such, the sensitivity of an area with respect to paleontological resources hinges on its geologic setting and whether significant fossils have been discovered in the area or in similar geologic units.

Paleontological Resources Potential

On a regional scale, fossilized plants, animals and microorganisms are prevalent throughout the Bay Area. For example, many of the hills in the Bay Area are made up of sedimentary bedrock that is known to contain a wide range of fossils, including radiolarians, mollusks, diatoms, foraminifers and non-marine vertebrates. In addition, even geologically young fluvial deposits have been known to contain fresh water mollusks and extinct late Pleistocene vertebrate fossils. However, the Plan Area overlies young Holocene-age geologic units. Beneath a cap of artificial fill lies deposits of mud and silt associated with the present-day bay estuary (Bay Mud). These types of geologic deposits are too young (i.e., less than 10,000 years old) to have fossilized the remains of organisms, or to have preserved vertebrate fossils. While the Bay Mud may contain a variety of marine invertebrate remains and organic matter (mollusks, clams, fomanifera, microorganisms, etc.), such remains are not fossilized, are likely to exist in other Bay Mud

deposits all around the Bay Area, and would not be considered significant or unique. For these reasons, in accordance with SVP standards, the paleontological potential of the Plan Area is low.

Cultural Setting

Natural Environment

The Plan Area is located on the west shore of the San Francisco Bay. The surrounding hills are the source of many perennial creeks and streams that run to the San Francisco Bay. Redwood Creek, a major perennial creek to the San Francisco Bay, flows out of the west along a course that passes adjacent to the Plan Area boundary. The Plan Area is within the flood plains of these waterways and the area is prone to flooding in its natural state.

San Mateo County exhibits a Mediterranean climate, with year-round moderate temperatures, mild weather, and approximately 20 inches of rainfall per year. This type of climate is subject to recurring and sometimes long-lasting droughts. The Bay Area and the surrounding region contain an abundance of natural resources, which would have been taken advantage of by its prehistoric population. The Bay Area hosts a wide variety of natural communities, including salt marsh, scrub brush, grassland, and foothill woodlands. Deer, elk, and waterfowl were plentiful, as were marine and bay resources such as seals, otters, abalone, mussels, oysters, clams and numerous fish species. Franciscan chert was an easily obtainable local raw material for stone tools. Obsidian could be obtained from the Anadel and Napa Glass Mountain quarries north of the Bay Area (Moratto, 1984).

Geologic Context

The San Francisco Bay Area has undergone dramatic landscape changes since humans began to inhabit the region more than 10,000 years ago. Rising sea levels and increased sedimentation into streams and rivers are among some of the changes (Helley et al., 1979). In many places, the interfaces between older land surfaces and alluvial fans are marked by a well-developed buried soil profile, or a paleosol. A paleosol is formed from weathering at or near the ground surface during a period of comparative landform stability. This surface would also have been available for human occupation and use prior to subsequent sediment deposition. Paleosols preserve the composition and character of the Earth's surface prior to subsequent sediment deposition; thus, paleosols have the potential to preserve archaeological resources if the area was occupied or settled by humans (Meyer and Rosenthal, 2007). Because human populations have increased since the arrival of the area's first inhabitants, younger paleosols (late Holocene, or from approximately 4,000 years before present [B.P.]) are more likely to yield archaeological resources than older paleosols (early Holocene or Pleistocene, or after approximately 14,000 B.P.). Numerous archaeological sites in the Bay Area have been found in this context.

The Plan Area is mapped as artificial fill over San Francisco Bay Mud (Witter et al., 2006). This depositional landform has the potential to contain deeply buried soil surfaces with associated archaeological deposits, as evidenced by archaeological sites found throughout the region either submerged by rising sea levels and/or buried by estuarine deposits. This includes one site in San Mateo County, the "Coyote Point Marina skeleton" (CA-SMA-273), identified several miles

north of the Plan Area at over 3.5 meters beneath the Bay. Since the fill areas were created during the historic or modern period as a result of urban development (less than 150 years), archaeological sites of any age may have been destroyed, re-deposited, or completely buried by artificial fill deposits. The identification of sites buried beneath artificial fill and/or estuarine mud is problematic because these areas consists of altered landscapes that may not currently represent historical landforms and shorelines (Meyer and Rosenthal, 2007).

Prehistoric Background

Categorizing the prehistoric period into cultural stages allows researchers to describe a broad range of archaeological resources with similar cultural patterns and components during a given timeframe, thereby creating a regional chronology. Milliken et al. (2007) provide a framework for the interpretation of the San Francisco Bay Area who have divided human history in the San Francisco Bay Area into four periods: the *Paleoindian Period* (11,500 to 8000 B.C.), the *Early Period* (8000 to 500 B.C.), the *Middle Period* (500 B.C. to A.D. 1050), and the *Late Period* (A.D. 1050 to 1550). Economic patterns, stylistic aspects, and regional phases further subdivide cultural patterns into shorter phases. This scheme uses economic and technological types, socio-politics, trade networks, population density, and variations of artifact types to differentiate between cultural periods.

The *Paleoindian Period* (11,500 to 8000 B.C.) was characterized by big-game hunters occupying broad geographic areas. Evidence of human habitation during *Paleoindian Period* has not yet been discovered in the San Francisco Bay Area. During the *Early Holocene (Lower Archaic; 8000 to 3500 B.C.)*, geographic mobility continued from the *Paleoindian Period* and is characterized by the millingslab and handstone as well as large wide-stemmed and leaf-shaped projectile points. The first cut shell beads and the mortar and pestle are first documented in burials during the *Early Period (Middle Archaic; 3500 to 500 B.C.)*, indicating the beginning of a shift to sedentism. During the *Middle Period*, which includes the *Lower Middle Period (Initial Upper Archaic; 500 B.C. to A.D. 430)*, and *Upper Middle Period (Late Upper Archaic; A.D. 430 to 1050)*, geographic mobility may have continued, although groups began to establish longer-term base camps in localities from which a more diverse range of resources could be exploited. The first rich black middens are recorded from this period. The addition of milling tools, obsidian and chert concave-base projectile points, and the occurrence of sites in a wider range of environments suggest that the economic base was more diverse. By the *Upper Middle Period*, mobility was being replaced by the development of numerous small villages. Around A.D. 430 a “dramatic cultural disruption” occurred evidenced by the sudden collapse of the *Olivella* saucer bead trade network. During the *Initial Late Period (Lower Emergent; A.D. 1050 to 1550)*, social complexity developed with large, central villages with resident political leaders and specialized activity sites. Artifacts associated with the period include the bow and arrow, small corner-notched projectile points, and a diversity of beads and ornaments.

Ethnographic Context

Based on a compilation of ethnographic, historic, and archaeological data, Milliken (1995) describes a group known as the Ohlone, who once occupied the general vicinity of the Plan Area. While traditional anthropological literature portrayed the Ohlone peoples as having a static

culture, today it is better understood that many variations of culture and ideology existed within and between villages. While these “static” descriptions of separations between native cultures of California make it an easier task for ethnographers to describe past behaviors, this masks Native adaptability and self-identity. California’s Native Americans never saw themselves as members of larger “cultural groups,” as described by anthropologists. Instead, they saw themselves as members of specific villages, perhaps related to others by marriage or kinship ties, but viewing the village as the primary identifier of their origins.

Levy (1978) describes the language group spoken by the Ohlone, known as “Costanoan.” This term is originally derived from a Spanish word designating the coastal peoples of Central California. Today Costanoan is used as a linguistic term that references to a larger language family spoken by distinct sociopolitical groups that spoke at least eight languages (as different as Spanish is from French) of the same Penutian language group. The Ohlone once occupied a large territory from San Francisco Bay in the north to the Big Sur and Salinas Rivers in the south. The Plan Area is in the greater *Ssalson* tribal area who lived in at least three main villages along San Mateo Creek (Milliken et al., 2009).

Economically, Ohlone engaged in hunting and gathering. Their territory encompassed both coastal and open valley environments that contained a wide variety of resources, including grass seeds, acorns, bulbs and tubers, bear, deer, elk, antelope, a variety of bird species, and rabbit and other small mammals. The Ohlone acknowledged private ownership of goods and songs, and village ownership of rights to land and/or natural resources; they appear to have aggressively protected their village territories, requiring monetary payment for access rights in the form of clamshell beads, and even shooting trespassers if caught. After European contact, Ohlone society was severely disrupted by missionization, disease, and displacement. Today, the Ohlone still have a strong presence in the San Francisco Bay Area, and are highly interested in their historic and prehistoric past.

Historic Context

The Portola expedition made the initial historic contact with the native Ohlone in the San Francisco Bay Area while in search of Monterey Bay in 1769. Eight years later Mission Santa Clara de Asís was established south of the Plan Area along Guadalupe Creek. In 1795 José Darío Argüello, the *comandante* of the Presidio de San Francisco, moved his cattle without church permission onto the lands now known as Redwood City. Originally referred to as *rancho de rey* (“Ranch of the King”), the lands soon became known as Rancho de las Pulgas (“Ranch of the Fleas”). Following the Mexican Revolution in 1821, Governor Pablo Vicente Sola reaffirmed the 35,240-acre grant to José Darío’s son Luis Antonio (Hoover et al., 2002).

After California ceded in 1848, the United States Congress passed “An Act to Ascertain and Settle Private Land Claims in the State of California.” The Act required all holders of Spanish and Mexican land grants to present their titles for confirmation before the Board of California Land Commissioners. In 1857, President Buchanan issued Luis Antonio’s widow a patent to Rancho de las Pulgas. Since the 1850s the vast grant was divided into many portions and consists

of the cities of San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, Redwood City, Atherton, and Menlo Park (Hoover et al., 2002).

Redwood City and Creek were named for the nearby Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) forest and lumbering industry. The Redwood Creek Channel was first used for commercial shipping in the 1850s to transport timber from redwood forests on the peninsula to San Francisco. Ship building activities and other industries also located along the shoreline of Redwood Creek Channel. By the late 1800s, the channel was lined with wharves and associated business establishments. Particularly important was the shipment of wood products like shingles, as well as grain and livestock from surrounding agricultural areas.

The tanbark that was left behind by lumber shipping operations was utilized by local tanneries for the tanning of hides for processed leather goods. These tanneries included the Krieg Tannery (later the Beeger Tannery), the California Oak Leather Company, and the S.H. Frank Tanning Company. The S.H. Frank Tanning Company, located on the southeast side of Redwood Creek partially within the Plan Area, was owned and operated by the Frank family from 1880 to 1959 and employed up to 450 men. The tannery buildings were nearly all wood frame, utilitarian structures, from one to three stories in height depending upon their function, and had large brick chimneys. Most were wood construction throughout, including siding and roofing, although some buildings had metal siding. The historic buildings and structures associated with the tannery burned down in 1968 (City of Redwood City, 2010 [1]).

Currently the Plan Area encompasses a mix of recreational and watercraft uses, marinas and businesses, industrial uses, and waterways. A marina area, known as Docktown, is comprised of approximately 100 watercraft including residentially occupied liveaboard watercraft located on Redwood Creek, along the eastern border of the Plan Area.

Findings

Paleontological Findings

Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains of plants and animals, including vertebrates (animals with backbones), invertebrates (e.g., starfish, clams, ammonites, and marine coral), and fossils of microscopic plants and animals (microfossils). The age and abundance of fossils depend on the location, topographic setting, and particular geologic formation in which they are found. Fossil discoveries not only provide a historical record of past plant and animal life, but can assist geologists in dating rock formations. Fossil discoveries can expand our understanding of the time periods and the geographic range of existing and extinct flora or fauna.

Geologic mapping of surficial deposits indicates that the Plan Area consists of artificial fill over San Francisco bay mud. Geotechnical investigations have determined that the bay mud ranges in thickness between 5 and 15 feet below ground surface (bgs), and is underlain by a layer of medium stiff to stiff clay, also known as older bay mud at approximately 12 to 18 feet bgs. Sandy clay, silty sand, and sand with gravel (i.e. alluvial deposits) underlies the bay mud to the maximum depths explored (up to 55 feet below ground surface; ENGEO, 2012; Treadwell and Rollo, 2008). A nearby geotechnical investigation notes that Franciscan bedrock occurs at a depth

of approximately 250 feet bgs (Tejima and Associates, 1989 cited in TRA, 2010). Therefore, even the deepest soil disturbances (i.e., up to 50 feet) associated with pile driving for pier-type foundations or other excavations would be confined to modern or Holocene-age deposits. Recent and modern deposits are generally considered not old enough (i.e., less than 10,000 years old) to have fossilized the remains of organisms, or to have preserved vertebrate fossils. While the bay mud may contain a variety of marine invertebrate remains and organic matter (mollusks, clams, fomanifera, microorganisms, etc.), such remains are not fossilized, are likely to exist in other bay mud deposits all around the Bay Area, and would not be considered significant or unique. For these reasons, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995) standards, the paleontological potential of the Plan Area is low.

Prehistoric and Archaeological Findings

ESA completed a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System on September 23, 2013 (File No. 13-0476). The purpose of the records search was to (1) determine whether known cultural resources have been recorded within or adjacent to the Plan Area; (2) assess the likelihood for unrecorded cultural resources to be present based on historical references and the distribution of nearby sites; and (3) develop a context for the identification and preliminary evaluation of cultural resources.

Ten cultural resources investigations have been completed in the records search radius, including two studies in the Plan Area. One study notes the presence of historic-era subsurface materials (“leather and hair”) in the general location of the Sherriff’s Work Program/County Jail/homeless shelter buildings on Maple Street and the southwestern end of the Docktown Marina parking lot. These materials were likely related to Frank’s Tannery (Cartier, 1977). Two studies on the south side of Highway 101 also noted materials and foundations related to Frank’s Tannery. Following a subsurface investigation, archaeologists concluded that the materials were highly disturbed, likely as a result of the tannery fire and subsequent grading of the building remains, and did not constitute a significant historic-era archaeological deposit (Dietz, 1978). Based on these previous investigations, historic-era archaeological sensitivity is considered low.

No recorded prehistoric archaeological sites are located in or adjacent to the Plan Area. The nearest prehistoric sites are over 1 mile to the east and south. During the recent historic-era the Plan Area would have been marshland, subject to periodic flooding. Late Period prehistoric occupation was established along more stable landforms to the south and east as indicated by known prehistoric sites in the vicinity. Earlier prehistoric sites may be buried by estuarine deposits and/or artificial fill; however as noted above, archaeological sites buried by recent depositional landforms may be destroyed or re-deposited. Additionally the dynamic bay environment would have been more likely to destroy archaeological sites than nearby stable landforms covered by alluvial deposits. For these reasons, prehistoric archaeological potential of the Plan Area is considered low.

**TABLE 4.4-1
CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDIES WITHIN ½-MILE OF THE PLAN AREA**

Study No.	Title	Author	Year	Location	Findings
S-3013	Archeological Reconnaissance for the Proposed Addition to the San Mateo County Work Furlough Facility Parcel APN 52-532-020 off Maple Street, San Mateo County.	Cartier	1977	Within Plan Area	Negative for prehistoric resources; Historic-era materials related to tannery
S-3042	An Archaeological Survey of a Proposed Interchange Modification	Caltrans	1977	West of Plan Area	Negative
S-3053	Letter Report for Terranomics Corporation	Dietz	1978	Adjacent to (south) of Plan Area	Negative for prehistoric resources; Noted potential for historic-era materials and foundations related to tannery (recommended subsurface testing as S-8657, see below)
S-3154	Archaeological Report for Leslie Salt Wash Pond, Redwood City, California	Ecumene Associates	1981	Adjacent to (north) of Plan Area	Negative
S-8657	Letter Report for Terranomics Corporation	Dietz	1978	Adjacent to (south) of Plan Area	Subsurface trenching for historic-era materials and foundations related to tannery; Extensive disturbance, no further investigation required
S-23534	Bair Island Unit Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Cultural Resources Review for Restoration and Management Planning	Cultural Resources Team, USFWS	2000	Northwest of Plan Area	Low potential for prehistoric resources; Potential for historic-era sites including early fishing industry, transportation, levees and water control structures
S-25081	Archaeological Survey for 101/Seaport, 8211.30	Holson	2002	Adjacent to (east) of Plan Area	Negative
S-38063	Smart Corridors Geoarchaeological Sensitivity Research	LSA	2009	South of Plan Area	General sensitivity assessment; negative near Plan Area
S-38844	Summary of Findings of an Archaeological Study of the Marina Shores Village Project Area, Redwood City, San Mateo County, California	Holman and Ambro	2002	Adjacent to (west) of Plan Area	Negative
S-39501	Archaeological Survey for the 48-inch Force Main Reliability Improvement Project, Cities of San Carlos and Redwood City, San Mateo, California	Psota	2012	Within Plan Area	Plan Area determined an "Area of Interest" due to presence of historic-era materials related to tannery; Archaeological monitoring recommended

On behalf of Redwood City, ESA contacted Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a search of the Sacred Lands Inventory. The response of the NAHC was negative for the presence of sacred sites. Per Senate Bill 18 requirements, the City sent letters dated March 27, 2015, requesting additional information from locally knowledgeable Native Americans. No response has been received as of this writing.

Architectural Findings

There are no recorded historic-era architectural resources within the Plan Area. One resource, the Inner Bair Island Levee (NWIC designation P-41-002295), is located approximately ¼ mile northwest of the Plan Area. The levee was evaluated part of the early salt production activities at Bair Island and found to be ineligible for listing to the National Register of Historic Places (Psota, 2012).

ESA completed a reconnaissance level architectural survey of the Plan Area on August 15, 2013. Based on the reconnaissance survey and a review of historic aerial photography, the vast majority of the buildings in the Plan Area are industrial, institutional, and marina structures that were constructed within the past 50 years, and as such, they would not meet the minimum age threshold for potential listing in the national, state, or local registers of historical resources. Highway 101 was constructed through the southwestern portion of the Plan Area in the late 1950s, and by the late 1960s, the area began to take on the character of mixed uses which it has today. As described above, the former Frank's Tannery burned down in 1968.

The oldest remaining structure in the Plan Area is a modified former water tank supported by redwood timbers, currently used by the Peninsula Yacht Club (PYC) as a clubhouse, bar, and restaurant. Although it is unknown exactly when the riveted steel tank was first built, the earliest available aerial photography from 1917 and 1931 shows this tank, as well as the adjacent former Frank's Tannery. As such, the original construction of the tank is given a date of circa 1900, as it may date to the area's former use for shipping redwood lumber along Redwood Creek Channel. The PYC was formed in 1960, and by the mid-1960s, the tank structure had been heavily modified, first for use as a harbor office and a real estate office, and later, for use by the PYC which rented the building. As such, the modified structure is given a construction date of circa 1965. The base of the tank was enclosed, and the club made subsequent changes to the structure as membership increased, including various additions to the base, including an enclosed deck, dancefloor, and back bar. These most recent changes occurred within the last 15 years.

The former water tank was evaluated by ESA against the eligibility criteria provided in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and the Redwood City Historic Preservation Ordinance. The structure was recorded by ESA on a California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Form 523 A and B (ESA, 2015). The findings from the DPR form have been excerpted, below. (See Appendix E in this EIR.)

NRHP/CRHR/Local Register Criterion 1/A/1 (Association with Historic Events).

Although it is the oldest remaining structure in the area, and the original portions of the former water tank may have once been associated with Redwood City's redwood lumber

shipping industry along the Redwood Creek Channel, the PYC would not be eligible for listing in the national, state, or local registers of historical resources due to the numerous modifications completed in the 1960s (and later) to convert it for use as a club house, bar, and restaurant. Although the tank itself remains partially visible above the base, the modifications in the 1960s and later have reduced the integrity of the original structure to a point where it no longer conveys historical associations with the city's earlier redwood shipping industry. For these reasons, the PYC is not recommended eligible for listing in the National Register of Historical Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, and the Redwood City Register of Historical Resources.

NRHP/CRHR/Local Register Criterion 2/B/2 (Association with Important Persons).

Research revealed no associations of the former water tank with persons significant in national, state, or local, state history. For these reasons, the PYC is not recommended eligible for listing in the National Register of Historical Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the Redwood City Register (NRHP/CRHR/Local Register Criterion 2/B/2).

NRHP/CRHR/Local Register Criterion 3/C/3 (Architecture/Work of a Master).

Constructed of a redwood timber base supporting a riveted steel tank, including numerous modifications beginning in the 1960s, the former water tank does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a particular style, type, period or method of construction, nor is it a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship. Although the structure's redwood timbers are an indigenous material, the modifications in the 1960s and later have reduced the integrity of the original structure to a point where it no longer conveys architectural associations with the city's earlier redwood shipping industry. Research revealed no associations with the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect. For these reasons, the ESA recommends the PYC ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historical Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the Redwood City Register (NRHP/CRHR/Local Register Criterion 3/C/3) (ESA, 2015).

As the former water tank would not meet any of the federal, state, or local register criteria because the modifications to it have reduced the integrity of the original structure to a point where it would no longer conveys strong historical or architectural/structural associations with Redwood City's earlier redwood shipping industry, this structure would not be considered a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5 (see page 4-4.10). As the Plan Area contains no recorded architectural resources or those meeting the criteria for listing in the national, state, or local registers, there are no historical resources for CEQA purposes.

4.4.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal Regulations

Archaeological resources are protected through the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470f), and its implementing regulations. Prior to implementing an "undertaking" (e.g., federal funding or issuing a federal permit), Section 106 of the NHPA requires

federal agencies to consider the effects of the undertaking on historic properties [(i.e. properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register)] and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment on any undertaking that would adversely affect historic properties. Under the NHPA, a property is considered significant if it meets the National Register listing criteria at 36 CFR 60.4, as stated below:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and

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

Federal review of projects is normally referred to as the Section 106 process. This process is the responsibility of the federal lead agency. The Section 106 review normally involves a four-step procedure, which is described in detail in the implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800):

- Identify historic properties in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and interested parties;
- Assess the effects of the undertaking on historic properties;
- Consult with the SHPO, other agencies, and interested parties to develop an agreement that addresses the treatment of historic properties and notify the ACHP; and finally,
- Proceed with the project according to the conditions of the agreement.

California State Regulations

The State of California implements the NHPA of 1966, as amended, through its statewide comprehensive cultural resource surveys and preservation programs. The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), as an office of the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), implements the policies of the NHPA on a statewide level. The OHP also maintains the California Historical Resources Inventory. The SHPO is an appointed official who implements historic preservation programs within the state's jurisdictions.

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA, as codified in Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21000 et seq., is the principal statute governing the environmental review of projects in the state. CEQA requires lead agencies to

determine if a proposed project would have a significant effect on historical resources, including archaeological resources. The CEQA *Guidelines* define a historical resource as: (1) a resource in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) a resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); or (3) any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.

If a lead agency determines that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5 would apply. If an archaeological site does not meet the CEQA *Guidelines* criteria for a historical resource, then the site may meet the threshold of PRC Section 21083 regarding unique archaeological resources. A unique archaeological resource is "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 any of the following criteria:

- 1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- 2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- 3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person" (PRC Section 21083.2 [g]).

The CEQA *Guidelines* note that if a resource is neither a unique archaeological resource nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on that resource shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064[c][4]).

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register is "an authoritative listing and guide to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the state and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change" (PRC Section 5024.1[a]). The criteria for eligibility to the California Register are based on National Register criteria (PRC Section 5024.1[b]). Certain resources are determined by the statute to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for or listed in the National Register.

To be eligible for the California Register a historical resource must be significant at the local, state, and/or federal level under one or more of the following criteria:

- 1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- 2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

- 3) 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,
- 4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (PRC Section 5024.1[c]).

For a resource to be eligible for the California Register, it must also retain enough integrity to be recognizable as a historical resource and to convey its significance.

California Public Resources Code

In addition to the definition of “unique archaeological resources” in PRC Section 21083.2, sections of the PRC that are applicable include:

- PRC Section 5097.5 – any unauthorized removal or destruction of archaeological, paleontological resources on sites located on public lands¹ is a misdemeanor.
- PRC Section 5097.99 – prohibits obtaining or possessing Native American artifacts or human remains taken from a grave or cairn; sets penalties.

California Health and Safety Code

The Plan is also subject to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code with respect to the discovery of human remains. Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that “Every person who knowingly mutilates or disinters, wantonly disturbs, or willfully removes any human remains in or from any location other than a dedicated cemetery without authority of law is guilty of a misdemeanor, except as provided in Section 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code.”

The measures outlined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and PRC Section 5097.98 are considered standard mitigation measures implemented in the event of an inadvertent discovery of human remains during excavation activities.

Senate Bill 18

Senate Bill 18 requires cities and counties to notify and consult with California Native American Tribes about proposed local land use planning decisions for the purpose of protecting tribal cultural resources. Senate Bill 18 requires cities and counties to 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 (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.

Assembly Bill 52

In September of 2014, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which added provisions to the Public Resources Code concerning the evaluation of impacts on tribal cultural

¹ As used in this section, “public lands” means lands owned by, or under the jurisdiction of, the State, or any city, county, district, authority or public corporation, or any agency thereof.

resources under CEQA, and consultation requirements with California Native American tribes. In particular, AB 52 now requires lead agencies to analyze a project's impacts on "tribal cultural resources," separately from archaeological resources (PRC Section 21074; 21083.09). The Bill defines "tribal cultural resources" in a new section of the PRC, Section 21074. AB 52 also requires lead agencies to engage in additional consultation procedures with respect to California Native American tribes (PRC Sections 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3). Finally, AB 52 requires the Office of Planning and Research to update Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines* by July 1, 2016 to provide sample questions regarding impacts to tribal cultural resources (PRC Section 21083.09). AB 52's provisions only apply to projects that have a notice of preparation filed on or after July 1, 2015.

Redwood City General Plan

The following policies relevant to the Specific Plan and/or the Harbor View project, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, are identified in the *Built Environment Element* of the Redwood City General Plan. Policies listed below that are also considered land use policies are addressed in Section 4.9, *Land Use and Planning*, of this Draft EIR.

- Policy BE-37.1: Enhance, restore, preserve, and protect, as appropriate, historic resources throughout the city.
- Policy BE-37.2: Preserve historic landmark structures, landscapes (including trees), trails, and sites that serve additional community needs, such as recreational open space and/or cultural needs.
- Policy BE-37.3: Encourage the retention and/or adaptive reuse of historic residential, commercial, and industrial buildings.
- Policy BE-37.8: Permit removal of non-contributing elements of structures in or adjacent to designated historic resources to allow replacement by compatible, historically appropriate structures.

City of Redwood City Historic Resources Code

Chapter 40 of the *Redwood City Municipal Code* establishes the Redwood City Historic Preservation Ordinance, which is intended to safeguard the city's heritage by providing for the protection of historic landmarks, encouraging public knowledge of the city's history, and fostering a sense of identity in the community (City of Redwood City, 2015). An historic landmark, historic site, or historic district may be designated by the City Council if it meets the following criteria pursuant to Section 40.5 of Chapter 40:

- It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's cultural, aesthetic, or architectural history; or
- It is identified with persons or events significant in local, State, or national history; or
- It 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
- It is representative of the notable work of a builder, designer or architect.

The Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) advises the Redwood City Planning Commission regarding the implementation of the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. The Committee recommends historic designation of local landmarks and districts, performs design review of changes to historic buildings and adjacent affected sites, and is involved in other historic preservation-related activities.

4.4.3 Project Baseline

Baseline conditions reflect the setting in the Specific Plan Area and the Harbor View project site as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Specific Plan was issued on November 6, 2014, as described above in the Environmental Setting.

4.4.4 Significance Criteria

Based on CEQA *Guidelines*, a project would cause adverse impacts to cultural resources if it would:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5;
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5;
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature; or
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

According to the CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a)(3), in general, a resource shall be considered "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register (PRC Section 5024.1). This section also provides standards for determining what constitutes a "substantial adverse change" that must be considered a significant impact on historical resources.

In addition, a resource included on a local register of historical resources, as defined by PRC Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant.

Approach to Analysis

Architectural/Structural Historical Resources

Potential impacts on architectural resources are assessed by identifying any activities such as new construction, demolition, or substantial alteration that could affect resources that have been identified as historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. Individual properties and districts identified as historical resources under CEQA include those that are significant because of their association with important events, people, or architectural styles or master architects, or for their

informational value (National Register and California Register Criteria A/1, B/2, C/3, and D/4) and that retain sufficient historic integrity to convey their significance. Criterion D/4, however, is typically applied to the evaluation of archaeological resources and not to architectural resources, as described below.

Once a resource has been identified as significant, it must be determined whether the impacts of the project would “cause a substantial adverse change in the significance” of the resource (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5[b]). A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of [the] historical resource would be materially impaired” (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5[b][1]). A historical resource is materially impaired through the demolition or alteration of the resource’s physical characteristics that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in (or eligibility for inclusion in) the California Register or a qualified local register (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5[b][2]).

Archaeological Resources

The significance of most prehistoric and historic-period archaeological sites is usually assessed under National Register and California Register Criterion D/4. This criterion stresses the importance of the information potential contained within the site, rather than its significance as a surviving example of a type or its association with an important person or event. Archaeological resources may qualify as historical resources under the definition provided in CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5[a], or they may also be assessed under CEQA as unique archaeological resources, defined as archaeological artifacts, objects, or sites that contain information needed to answer important scientific research questions (PRC Section 21083.2). A substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource is assessed similarly to other historical resources, i.e., by destroying or materially altering in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its significance under the appropriate criteria (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5[b][2]).

Paleontological Resources

The paleontological analysis identifies the potential to encounter paleontological resources (i.e., plant, animal, or invertebrate fossils or microfossils) during excavations associated with the Plan. The paleontological potential of the geologic units to be disturbed is used to evaluate the potential to encounter paleontological resources at the location of each improvement or potential land use. A potentially significant impact on paleontological resources would occur if:

- (1) construction of a Plan component would move or excavate previously undisturbed geologic bedrock (native rock) and/or
- (2) the bedrock to be disturbed has a high paleontological potential.

Human Remains

Human remains, including those buried outside of formal cemeteries, are protected under several state laws, including PRC Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. These laws are identified above in State Regulations. This analysis considers impacts including intentional disturbance, mutilation, or removal of interred human remains.

4.4.5 Program-Level Impacts of the Inner Harbor Specific Plan

Historical Resources

Impact CUL-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources that are listed in or may be eligible for listing in the federal, state, or local registers of historical resources. (No Impact)

The Plan Area contains no recorded architectural resources or those meeting the criteria for listing in the national, state, or local registers. The vast majority of the buildings in the Plan Area are industrial, institutional, and marina structures that were constructed within the past 50 years, and as such, they would not meet the minimum age threshold for potential listing in the national, state, or local registers of historical resources. The oldest remaining structure in the Plan Area, the former water tank, would not meet the criteria for listing in the national, state, or local registers of historical resources due to a lack of integrity resulting from the numerous modifications completed in the 1960s and afterwards. For these reasons, the former water tank would not be considered an historical resource for CEQA purposes, as previously discussed in Section 4.4.2. As there are no historical resources as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5 in the Specific Plan Area, development under the Specific Plan would have no impact on historical resources.

The Specific Plan does recognize the water tank as exhibiting cultural significance and would be retained within the Plan Area as a placemaking landmark.

Mitigation Measure: None Required

Archaeological Resources

Impact CUL-2.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could result in significant impacts to unknown archaeological resources. (Potentially Significant)

No archaeological resources were identified during the background research conducted for this project. Based on the geologic framework, distribution of archaeological sites in the vicinity and the results of previous studies, the Plan Area has a low sensitivity for archaeological resources. Despite the low potential, the discovery of archaeological resources cannot be entirely discounted. Impacts to archaeological resources would be potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2.SP would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level by ensuring appropriate treatment of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2.SP: Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources. If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered, all construction activities within 100 feet shall halt and the City of Redwood City shall be notified. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools,

such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-era materials might include deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. A Secretary of the Interior-qualified archaeologist shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery.

If it is determined that the project could damage a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined pursuant to the CEQA *Guidelines*), mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2 and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA *Guidelines*, with a preference for preservation in place. If preservation in place is feasible, this may be accomplished through one of the following means: (1) modifying the construction plan to avoid the resource; (2) incorporating the resource within open space; (3) capping and covering the resource before building appropriate facilities on the resource site; or (4) deeding resource site into a permanent conservation easement.

If avoidance or preservation in place is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan to recover the scientifically consequential information from and about the resource, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to any excavation at the resource site. If avoidance is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan in consultation with City of Redwood City and, for prehistoric resources, the appropriate Native American representative. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim to target the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the project. The treatment plan shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved facility, and dissemination of reports to local and state repositories, libraries, and interested professionals.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant

Paleontological Resources

Impact CUL-3.SP Development under the Specific Plan could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. (Potentially Significant)

While the paleontological sensitivity of the units underlying the Plan Area is low, there is a remote possibility that fossils may nevertheless be discovered during excavations. Because the significance of such fossils would be unknown until examined by a qualified paleontologist, such an event represents a potentially significant impact on paleontological resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3.SP would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level by ensuring appropriate treatment of inadvertently discovered paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3.SP: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources. If paleontological resources, such as fossilized bone, teeth, shell, tracks, trails, casts, molds, or impressions are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in

conformance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, and in consultation with the City of Redwood City.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant

Human Remains

Impact CUL-4.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Potentially Significant)

Although unlikely, the inadvertent discovery of human remains during construction within the Plan Area that involves ground disturbance cannot be entirely discounted. Disturbance of human remains would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-4.SP** would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level by ensuring appropriate treatment of inadvertently discovered human remains.

Mitigation Measure CUL-4.SP: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains. In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction activities, such activities within 100 feet of the find shall cease until the San Mateo County Coroner has been contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) will be contacted within 24 hours if it is determined that the remains are Native American. The NAHC will then identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American, who in turn would make recommendations to the City of Redwood City for the appropriate means of treating the human remains and any grave goods.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant

4.4.6 Project-Level Impacts of the Harbor View Project

Historical Resources

Impact CUL-1.HV: The Harbor View project would not result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources that are listed in or may be eligible for listing in the federal, state, or local registers of historical resources. (No Impact)

The proposed Harbor View project development area contains no recorded historical resources or those meeting the criteria for listing in the national, state, or local registers. All of the industrial and commercial buildings on the project site were constructed within the past 50 years, and as such, they would not meet the minimum age threshold for potential listing in the national, state, or local registers of historical resources. As there are no historical resources as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5 on the proposed project site, implementation of the proposed Harbor View project would have no impact on historical resources.

Mitigation Measure: None Required.

Archaeological Resources

Impact CUL-2.HV: The Harbor View project could result in significant impacts to unknown archaeological resources. (Potentially Significant)

The proposed Harbor View project development area contains no recorded archaeological resources, and the sensitivity for the existence of such resources and remains on the project site is low. Although unlikely, the inadvertent discovery of these resources on the project site during ground-disturbing construction cannot be entirely discounted. Disturbance of such resources and remains would be a potentially significant impact. However, as discussed above for the Program-level analysis, the project's potential to encounter previously unrecorded resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the same mitigation measure (re-designated) identified for the Specific Plan.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2.HV: Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-2.SP.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant

Paleontological Resources

Impact CUL-3.HVP: The Harbor View project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. (Potentially Significant)

The proposed Harbor View project development area contains no recorded paleontological resources, and the sensitivity for the existence of such resources and remains on the project site is low. As with the other resources discussed in this section, although unlikely, the inadvertent discovery of these resources on the project site during ground-disturbing construction cannot be entirely discounted. Disturbance of such resources and remains would be a potentially significant impact. However, as discussed above for the program-level analysis, the project's potential to encounter previously unrecorded resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the same mitigation measure (re-designated) identified for the Specific Plan.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3.HV: Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-3.SP.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant

Human Remains

Impact CUL-4.HV: The Harbor View project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Potentially Significant)

Although unlikely, the inadvertent discovery of human remains on the project site during ground-disturbing construction cannot be entirely discounted. Disturbance of such remains would be a potentially significant impact. However, as discussed above for the Program-level analysis, the project's potential to encounter previously human remains would be reduced to a less-than-

significant level with implementation of the same mitigation measure (re-designated) identified for the Specific Plan.

Mitigation Measure CUL-4.HV: Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-4.SP.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant

4.4.7 Cumulative Impacts

Impact CUL-1.CU: Construction activity and development under the Specific Plan and/or the Harbor View project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and in the vicinity of the Plan Area and project site, would contribute to a significant adverse cumulative impact to cultural resources, but the contribution would not be considerable. (Potentially Significant)

The geographic scope for cumulative impacts on cultural resources includes potential cultural resources in the Plan Area and the City of Redwood City. Development under the Specific Plan would contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources, including archaeological and paleontological resources, if the Plan and other projects in the vicinity adversely affect the same cultural resources or would cause impacts on other cultural resources in the project vicinity. Development of the Harbor View project would contribute in the same matter.

Historical Resources

As discussed in Impact CUL-1.SP and CUL-1.HV, the Specific Plan and Harbor View project, respectively, would not affect any historical resources. Thus, neither would contribute to a potential cumulative impact on historical resources; no cumulative impact is identified.

Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains

As discussed in Impacts CUL-2.SP, CUL-3.SP, and CUL-4.SP for the Specific Plan, and Impacts CUL-2.HV, CUL-3.HV, and CUL-4.HV for the Harbor View project, excavation associated with the Plan Area or the project site would have a potentially significant impact related to the potential to encounter previously unrecorded archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and/or human remains interred outside of a formal cemetery. Cumulative projects in the Specific Plan vicinity that would also involve excavation include those in the development forecasts conducted for this EIR based on the countywide transportation model and the US 101/SR84 (Woodside Road) Interchange Improvement Project and other approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects citywide, including the nearby San Mateo County Replacement Jail and several recent, existing, and anticipated projects underway in downtown Redwood City under the Downtown Precise Plan (see Section 4.0.4 *Cumulative Analysis* in this chapter for detail). These projects could also encounter previously unrecorded archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains, which would be a potentially significant cumulative impact, and the Specific Plan's and/or Harbor View's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.

However, as discussed in Impacts CUL-2.SP, CUL-3.SP, and CUL-4.SP for the Specific Plan, and Impacts CUL-2.HV, CUL-3.HV, and CUL-4.HV for the Harbor View project, the potential to encounter previously unrecorded resources and human remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-2.SP and CUL-2.HV (Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources); CUL-3.SP and CUL-3.HV (Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources); and CUL-4.SP and CUL-4.HV (Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains)**. These measures require the City or the project applicant to halt work if any potential resources are discovered during construction. If it is determined that an archaeological or paleontological resource may be present within the Plan Area or the project site, the City or the project applicant is required to retain the services of a qualified archaeological or paleontological consultant to evaluate the find. With regard to the inadvertent discovery of human remains, in particular, the San Mateo County coroner must be notified immediately, and, in the event the coroner determined that the remains were Native American, the NAHC must be notified. Implementation of these measures would effectively avoid damage to or loss of resources, and little to no residual impact would remain after mitigation.

With implementation of these mitigation measures, the Specific Plan's and the Harbor View project's contribution to this cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable and thus less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1.CU: Implement Mitigation Measures CUL-2.SP and CUL-2.HV; CUL-3.SP and CUL-3.HV; and CUL-4.SP and CUL-4.HV.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant

References – Cultural Resources

- Cartier, Robert, *Archeological Reconnaissance for the Proposed Addition to the San Mateo County Work Furlough Facility Parcel APN 52-532-020 off Maple Street, San Mateo County*. Prepared for the County of San Mateo. On file (S-3013), NWIC, July 1977.
- City of Redwood City,
2010 (1), *Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan*, August 2010.
2015 (as amended), *Municipal Code*, Chapter 40 – Historic Preservation, 2015.
- City of Redwood City, 2010. *Redwood City General Plan 2010*, October 11 2010. Accessed March 05, 2015.
http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/generalplan/FinalGP_Docs.html.
- ESA (2015b), Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record Form 523 A and B, *Peninsula Yacht Club*, Prepared by ESA, April 6, 2015.

- Dietz, Stephen, Letter Report for Terranomics Corporation. On file (S-8657), NWIC, May 1978.
- ENGE0, *Geotechnical Exploration San Mateo County Replacement Correctional Facility, Redwood City, California*, November 2012.
- Helley, E.J. and LaJoie, K.R., *Flatland Deposits of the San Francisco Bay Region, California*. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 943, 1979.
- Hoover, Mildred Brooke, Hero Eugene Rensch, Ethel Rensch, and William N. Abeloe, *Historic Spots in California*. Fifth edition, revised by Douglas E. Kyle. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 2002.
- Levy, Richard, Costanoan In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 485–495. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Meyer, Jack, and Jeffrey Rosenthal, *Geoarchaeological Overview of the Nine Bay Area Counties in Caltrans District 4*. Prepared for Caltrans District 4, 2007.
- Milliken, Randall T., *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1769-1810*. Ballena Press, Menlo Park, 1995.
- Milliken, Randall, Richard Fitzgerald, Mark G. Hylkema, Randy Groza, Tom Origer, David G. Bieling, Alan Leventhal, Randy S. Wiberg, Andrew Gottsfield, Donna Gillette, Viviana Bellifemine, Eric Strother, Robert Cartier, and David A. Fredrickson. Punctuated Culture Change in the San Francisco Bay Area. Chapter 8 in *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar. Altamira Press, Lanham, Maryland, 2007.
- Milliken, Randall, Laurence H. Shoup, and Beverley R. Ortiz, *Ohlone/Costanoan Indians of the San Francisco Peninsula and their Neighbors, Yesterday and Today*. Prepared for National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area. June 2009.
- Psota, Sunshine, *Archaeological Survey for the 48-inch Force Main Reliability Improvement Project, Cities of San Carlos and Redwood City, San Mateo, California*. Prepared for David J. Power and Associates, San Jose. On file (S-39501), NWIC, August 2012.
- Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP). *Assessment and mitigation of adverse impacts to nonrenewable paleontologic resources: standard guidelines*, Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin, Vol. 163, p. 22–27. 1995.
- TRA Environmental Sciences, Inc., *San Mateo County Sheriff's Office Maple Street Replacement Facility Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration*, November 2010.
- Treadwell and Rollo, *Geotechnical Investigation Bair Island Road, Redwood City, California*. November 2008.
- Witter, Robert C., Keith L. Knudsen, Janet M. Sowers, Carl M. Wentworth, Richard D. Koehler, and Carolyn E. Randolph. *Maps of Quaternary Deposits and Liquefaction Susceptibility in the Central San Francisco Bay Region, California*. Part 3: Description of Mapping and Liquefaction Interpretation. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. 2006.