

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

| <u>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</u> | <i>Potentially Significant Impact</i> | <i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i> | <i>Less Than Significant Impact</i> | <i>No Impact</i> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| CULTURAL RESOURCES—Would the proposed project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SETTING

Many of the original surveys of archaeological sites in the San Francisco Bay region were conducted between 1906 and 1908 by N.C. Nelson, which yielded the initial documentation of nearly 425 “earth mounds and shell heaps” along the littoral zone of the Bay (Nelson, 1907). From these beginnings, the most notable sites in the Bay region were scientifically excavated, including the Emeryville shellmound (Ala-309), the Ellis Landing Site (Cco-295) in Richmond, and the Fernandez Site (CC0-259) in Rodeo Valley (Morrato, 1984). These dense midden sites, such as Ala-309, have been carbon 14 dated to be 2310 ± 220 years old, although other evidence from around the Bay suggests that human occupation in the region is of greater antiquity, ±5000 B.C. (Davis & Treganza, 1959). Many of the earliest sites suggested less emphasis on shellfish than the later middens, but were rather focused on hunting and vegetal food processing. The natural marshland biotic communities along the edges of bays and channels were the principal source for subsistence and other activities during the prehistory of the San Francisco Bay region.

Prehistorically, the Islais Creek flowed east from Twin Peaks, which maintained a 3,000-acre marsh that was tidally influenced through Islais Creek Cove. Potrero Point was located at the northern waters of Islais Creek Cove. The rich natural resources of the area would have been an attractive locale for food procurement to prehistoric cultures.

Having undergone significant landscape change from the prehistoric and protohistoric periods, this area has served as the center for many of the earliest manufacturing development in the Southern Waterfront area, which included a gun powder plant and the San Francisco Cordage Manufactory. By 1867, the Islais Creek Cove and marshlands were bridged by a trestle that spanned from Potrero Point to the Third Street shoreline near Innes Avenue (Hupman and

Chavez, 2001). The trestle was used to convey the Potrero and Bay View Railroad. With the extension of the railroad to the southern portion of San Francisco, in 1871, the City passed an ordinance to move the slaughterhouses from the populated areas of the city to the southeastern part of town, to the east side of the Third Street trestle between present-day Cargo Way and Burke Avenue (Hupman and Chavez, 2001). The area remained on the marginalized fringes of the city, essentially a dumping ground for the butchers, who allowed their waste to fall into the mud flats below to be washed into the Bay.

By the turn of the 20th Century, growing sentiment within the San Francisco business establishment to redevelop the Islais Creek marshlands into a channelized, navigable port for commerce led to the creation of the Islais Creek Reclamation District in 1925, which included 280 acres west of Third Street and 8 acres for the Islais Creek Channel (Dow, 1979 as cited in Hupman and Chavez, 1995). A 2,000-foot-long rock seawall was erected in the Islais Creek Cove, west of Third Street, creating the Islais Creek Channel. The mud removed during dredging of Islais Creek, along with local aggregate and rock, was used to fill the Islais Creek Cove and marshlands (Hupman and Chavez, 2001). The reclamation was tentatively completed in 1936, although many areas still remained unimproved.

With the establishment of the Islais Creek Channel, numerous wharves and piers were built to the north and south of the Channel. Additional piers and industrial plants were added along the Channel as the reclamation of the marshlands improved. In addition, the Interstate 280 overpass, which crosses the Islais Creek Channel, was completed in 1967 (Hupman and Chavez, 2001).

REGULATORY CONTEXT

Based on CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and Appendix G, a project would have significant adverse impacts to cultural resources if the project would:

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

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 provides that, in general, a resource not listed on state or local registers of historical resources shall be considered by the lead agency to be historically significant if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. This section also provides standards for determining what constitutes a “substantial adverse change” that must be considered a significant impact on archaeological or historic resources.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3), generally a resource shall be considered “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 4852). When a project will impact an archeological site, it needs to be determined whether the site is a historical resource, which is defined as any site which:

- (a) Is historically or archeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and
- (b) Meets any 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.

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

CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will impact “unique archaeological resources.” Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 (g), states that “unique archaeological resource” means 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.”

IMPACTS DISCUSSION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

METHODOLOGY AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

To determine the level of significance of the impacts anticipated from the proposed project, the proposed project’s effects were evaluated as provided under the CEQA Guidelines. These

significance criteria, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, are summarized in the checklist provided at the beginning of this section.

The potential for encountering subsurface archaeological resources in the project area was established by literature review of previously conducted reports and previously recorded archaeological sites. In order to augment the archival research conducted by Essex Environmental (2003), a records search of all pertinent survey and site data was conducted at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, California (File # 03-1052). The records were accessed by utilizing the San Francisco South, North, and Hunters Point USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle maps, Township 2S, Range 5W. The review followed the proposed project route along with a quarter-mile buffer. Previous surveys and studies and archaeological site records were accessed as they pertained to the project area. Records were also accessed and reviewed in the Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for San Francisco County for information on sites of recognized historical significance within the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), the California Inventory of Historic Resources (1976), the California Historical Landmarks (1996), and the California Points of Historical Interest (1992).

Native American Consultation

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted on June 15, 2004 in order to request a database search for sacred lands or other cultural properties of significance to local Native Americans. The sacred lands survey failed to indicate the presence of cultural resources in the project area. The NAHC provided a list of Native American contacts who may have further knowledge of the project area with respect to cultural resources and potential impacts to those resources that could occur as a result of the proposed project. Each person or organization listed on the NAHC list was contacted by letter requesting information about locations of importance to Native Americans. No response has been received as of the writing of this document.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

During the prehistoric period, the majority of the project area was submerged beneath the Islais and Precita Creek marshlands and the Islais Creek Cove. As a consequence, very few archaeological sites have been recorded in this area. The only prehistoric site recorded within a quarter-mile of the proposed project route is **CA-SFr-15**, a Nelson shellmound site recorded in 1909, located to the southwest. At the time of its recordation, the site was disintegrated and subsequent work in the area has revealed that the site may be located on Ingalls Street, rather than on the edge of the former Islais Creek marshlands near Jerrold Avenue as it is currently mapped at the Information Center (Olmsted et al, 1982).

Cultural / Archaeological Resources

No direct impacts to known cultural resources would occur during construction of the proposed project. Cultural resources, however, particularly archaeological resources, have unknown subsurface dimensions. Given the proximity of the proposed project to the mouth of a fresh water

**TABLE 2.5-1
RELEVANT RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES IN PROJECT AREA**

| Designation | Location | Description | Comments | Reference |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------|
| P-38-4313 | 2325 3rd St. | American Can Company | Found eligible for NRHP, Criterion A | Stock 2003 |
| P-38-4276 | 1000 Evans Ave. | Hunters Point Power Station | Found ineligible for NRHP | Kelly 2002 |
| CA-SFr-15 | | Nelson Site No. 389a | Early recordation of shell heap; exact location is uncertain | Nelson 1910 |

SOURCE: On File at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.

source, Islais Creek, and the known prehistoric shell midden, **CA-SFr-15**, there exists the potential for buried prehistoric cultural resources. In addition, portions of the trenching would pass through historical fill that is likely to be greater than 50 years of age, qualifying the contents of the fill as potential cultural resources. Underground trenching could damage or destroy unknown cultural resources if encountered, resulting in a potentially significant impact. The mitigation measures listed below would reduce potentially significant cultural resources impacts to a less than significant level.

Impact CR-1: Project construction could result in the disturbance of unknown buried prehistoric cultural resources and/or potential historic contents in artificial fill material along the project route. This would be a less than significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b.

Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (f), “provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction” shall be instituted. Therefore, in the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and PG&E shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives of PG&E and the qualified archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate course of action. All significant cultural resource materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards.

Mitigation Measure CR-1b: PG&E shall notify a qualified paleontologist of any unanticipated discoveries made by either the cultural resources monitor or construction personnel and subsequently document the discovery as needed. In the

event of an unanticipated discovery of a breas, or seeps of natural petroleum that trapped extinct animals and preserved and fossilized their remains, and/or trace fossil during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find.

Human Remains

No human burials have been discovered within one mile of the proposed project route and no discoveries of human remains are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. However, if unanticipated human remains are uncovered during construction, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CR-2** would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.

Impact CR-2: Project construction could result in the discovery and disturbance of unknown human remains. This would be a less than significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2.

Mitigation Measure CR-2: In the event of the discovery of human remains, the following measures shall be followed, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (e)(1):

- (1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:**
 - (A) The City of San Francisco Coroner shall be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and**
 - (B) If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American:**
 - 1. The Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.**
 - 2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.**
 - 3. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.**

Historic Resources

The proposed project route intersects the Hunters Point Power Plant (P-38-004276) at approximately milepost (MP) 2.5. The site was determined ineligible for listing on the CRHR (Kelley, 2002), and does not qualify as a cultural resource under CEQA. In addition, the power plant structure would not be affected during project construction.

The American Can Company (P-38-004313), a complex of buildings located between 20th, 22nd, Third, and Illinois Streets, is directly adjacent to the proposed project routes. Built around 1919, this complex represents the burgeoning canning industry and labor movements of the early 20th century in California. Therefore, Stock (2003) recorded the complex as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. However, the proposed project would be constructed underground in established roadways; therefore, the American Can Company buildings would not be materially altered.

Numerous additional historical buildings and structures have been recorded within the Southern Waterfront Area of San Francisco, many of which have been found eligible as either Districts (e.g. Dogpatch Historic District) or individually for the National Register or in local historical listings. The proposed project consists of underground cable installation in established roads—no alteration of the setting or directly to extant buildings would be required; consequently, no substantial adverse change to an historical resource is expected to occur.

Archaeological test auguring was conducted on Third Street near 2Third Street by Wirth and Associates (1979). The testing found that the location is graded approximately 13 feet above city datum, composed of sandy fill below the concrete. Therefore, it is unlikely any impacts to cultural resource would occur at this location at a depth of 0 to 12 feet below surface. This does not preclude the possible existence of subsurface historical artifacts in the area.

CHECKLIST IMPACT CONCLUSIONS

- a) No listed National or State Historic Register properties were found during the course of the archival search for the proposed routes. A number of archaeological and architectural surveys have been conducted in the project area that has not identified significant prehistoric cultural resources in the area (Hupman and Chavez, 1993). The proposed project route would not impact any known cultural resource sites; however, it is possible that unrecorded sites and/or isolated artifacts exist within the project area. The potential for encountering and disturbing known or unknown cultural resources would be minimized to a less than significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CR-1a**.
- b) See item a), above.
- c) A records search of available paleontological site information was requested by Essex Environmental (2003) covering the project area from the Museum of Paleontology, University of California at Berkeley. The proposed project transects an area that is primarily underlain by artificial fill materials. Undifferentiated pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock occur beneath the Potrero and Hunters Point switchyards and small areas in the western section of the project area (Geomatrix, 2003). The records search at the University of California, Museum of Paleontology did not identify any known fossil localities in the project area or its vicinity (Holroyd, 2003 as cited in Essex, 2003).

Significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas designated as having low potential, and may result from project excavation and construction activities. This impact would be

reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CR-1b**.

- d). The presence of human remains have not been recorded in the project vicinity; however, the subsurface excavation required for construction of the proposed project could potentially disturb or destroy human remains from both prehistoric and historic time periods, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. This is considered a potentially significant impact that would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CR-2**.

REFERENCES – Cultural Resources

- Davis, J. T. & A. E. Treganza, 1959. The Patterson Mound: A Comparative Analysis of the Archaeology of Site Ala-328. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 47: 1-92.
- Hupman, J.M., and D. Chavez, 2003. Archaeological Resources Investigations for the Bayview-Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, San Francisco, CA. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University. [25045]
- Hupman, J.M., and D. Chavez, 2001. Archaeological Resources Review and Management Plan for the Muni Third Street Light Rail Project. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA. [File 25044].
- Hupman, J.M., and D. Chavez, 1995. Archaeological Resources Investigations for the Waterfront Plan EIR, San Francisco, CA. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University. [16882]
- Hupman, J.M., and D. Chavez, 1993. Cultural Resources Investigation for the Bayside Phase II Discharge Alternatives EIR, San Francisco, CA. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.
- Geomatrix, 2003. Quaternary Geology and Site Location, Potrero to Hunters Point 115 kV Underground Cable Project, San Francisco, California.
- Moratto, M.J., 1984. California Archaeology. Smithsonian Press: San Diego, CA.
- Nelson, N.C., 1907. San Francisco Bay Mounds. University of California Archaeological Survey Manuscripts: 349.
- Olmsted, R.R., N.Olmsted, D. Fredrickson and V. Bente, 1982. San Francisco Bayside, Historical Cultural Resources Survey. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA. [File 6157].
- Stock, J. R., 2003. DPR Primary Record, P-38-004313. On File at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.
- Wirth Associates, Inc., 1979. Potrero 7 Phase II: Archaeological Test Excavations. Prepared for Pacific Gas & Electric. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University.