

3.11 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section describes existing cultural resources at the project site and describes whether implementation of the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic or archaeological resource (as defined in Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* and Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines), directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Preparation of this section used data from the *Historic Property Survey Report* and *Archaeological Survey Report* completed by William Self Associates for the project in September 2005 (Appendix G).

The 2003 WTA PEIR for the expansion of ferry service in the Bay Area evaluated environmental impacts related to cultural resources. As this is a project-level analysis that tiers from and incorporates the 2003 WTA PEIR, this section evaluates the site-specific environmental impacts related to cultural resources.

No comment letters related to cultural resources were received in response to the December 17, 2004, Notice of Preparation (NOP) circulated for the project. The NOP and a summary of issues raised during the Public Scoping process are included in Appendix A of this EIR/EA.

3.11.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

■ Historic Background

History of the Project Site

The project site is located on the San Mateo Peninsula, a landform that divides the Pacific Ocean from the southern San Francisco Bay, and connects the City of San Francisco with the Santa Clara Valley. The project site is located within reclaimed marshland on Oyster Point in the City of South San Francisco (City). The first documented use of the project site (i.e., as a dump site) did not occur until 1956, although the surrounding area was a hub of industrial activity and a catalyst for population expansion in the City. Therefore, the following historic context provides information on land uses within the project site and the surrounding environs, including Point San Bruno and beyond.

The colonizing efforts of the Spanish government first reached the San Francisco Peninsula when an expedition led by Gaspar de Portolá was attempting to explore Monterey Bay. The party reached what is now the San Francisco Bay in October 1769, and though they knew they had overshot their target when they spotted the Farallons and Point Reyes, they briefly explored the region before returning south. After traveling along the San Mateo coastline, the party turned east and traveled inland to camp along San Andreas Creek near the present city of Millbrae. Sergeant Jose Francisco Ortega first saw the San Francisco Bay when he climbed the hills northeast of San Pedro Valley (along present-day Sweeney Ridge).

Captain Fernando Rivera, a member of the Portolá expedition, returned with Fray Francisco Palou in 1774 to explore the region and scout prospective sites for Spanish settlement. The party camped in the San Andreas Valley. Just two years later, in the spring of 1776, Juan Bautista de Anza, Pedro Font, and others would return to explore the area once again. The Rivera and de Anza parties traveled north up the Peninsula along the route that would become known as both El Camino Real and the San Jose Road. Once the missions at San Francisco and Santa Clara were established (in 1776 and 1777) at the northern and southern ends of the Peninsula, the trail would become a well-traveled wagon road between the two centers of activity. In addition, the road would be a determining factor in the settlement patterns of newcomers and the growth of future cities and towns within this area.

The current project site is located within the historic boundaries of Rancho Buri Buri, which was first established as grazing land for Mission Dolores and the Presidio of San Francisco. Although ranchos on the Peninsula were generally smaller than those established elsewhere in the Bay Area, the 15,000 acres that made up Buri Buri extended from the San Bruno hills south into modern-day Burlingame, and from the San Andreas Valley east to the shore of San Francisco Bay. By 1810, a successful cattle operation was being run within its boundaries. In October 1827, Sublieutenant José Antonio Sánchez, who was stationed at the Presidio, was granted permission by Mexican governor José María de Echeandía to occupy the rancho for “grazing and agricultural purposes”. With the help of his 10 children and local Indian laborers, Sánchez worked the land from the time it was granted to him until his death in 1843. Upon his death, the rancho lands were divided between his children.

In the decade after Sánchez’s death, settlement patterns throughout California changed dramatically. With the discovery of gold in 1849, the once isolated California frontier was soon awash in immigrants from all corners of the world. California’s 1848 population of less than 14,000 (exclusive of Native Californians) increased to 224,000 in four years. By 1850, California had gained statehood and became inextricably linked to the markets and economic forces of the rest of the United States. In the transition, Rancho Buri Buri had become extremely valuable land, not only because it afforded access to a growing transportation network, but because of its proximity to the City of San Francisco the center of regional commerce and cultural activity. In 1872, the heirs to Rancho Buri Buri were forced to sell their land to pay for the high cost of property taxes, legal fees, and loans. The new owners of Rancho Buri Buri included prominent men such as D. O. Mills, Ansel Easton and Charles Lux. The project site is located within reclaimed tidal marshland adjacent to the 1,700 acres of Rancho Buri Buri purchased by Charles Lux and a business partner, Alfred Edmondson, in 1853 (Lux bought out Edmondson’s interest in 1856). With his newly acquired property Lux founded the town of Baden (northwest of modern-day South San Francisco).

Just two years after Charles Lux consolidated the Rancho Buri Buri property, he formed a permanent partnership with fellow San Francisco butcher and entrepreneur Henry Miller. The two worked together to build one of the most powerful cattle businesses in nineteenth-century California. The prime grazing land of Rancho Buri Buri was ideal for holding cattle prior to slaughter, and Miller and Lux not only purchased more land within the former grant, but leased additional land on the Peninsula for grazing purposes. Miller and Lux quickly acquired other rancho properties, and by the end of the 1860s they owned over 300,000

acres of grazing land spread throughout the fertile San Joaquin Valley and the ranchos just east of Monterey Bay. They would use their vast holdings to supply beef to the growing San Francisco market. The San Jose Road served as their cattle trail during the 1860s and the San Francisco and San Jose Railroad (completed in 1866) followed the same route. Although their holdings were vast, Rancho Buri Buri was particularly important because of its proximity to the population center of San Francisco.

When Charles Lux died, his wife Miranda sold his property in South San Francisco to Gustavus Swift, who represented the American Cattle Trust of Chicago. In the early 1890s the American Cattle Trust was the nation's most powerful business conglomerate (Igler 2001:160). The Cattle Trust formed the South San Francisco Land & Improvement Company in 1891 and created the Western Meat Company, a meatpacking firm. The South San Francisco Land & Improvement Co. began promoting the town of South San Francisco and the Western Meat Company was the first of many industrial concerns to be located at Point San Bruno. The Western Meat Company was quickly able to underbid the merchants of San Francisco's Butchertown, and a struggle for control of San Francisco's profitable meatpacking and processing industry escalated in the following years. The standoff was finally resolved when the 1906 earthquake almost completely destroyed the Butchertown facilities, which had been built on piers over San Francisco's water lots (Igler 2001:166–167). In addition to increasing the power of South San Francisco's meatpacking facilities, the earthquake encouraged settlement south of San Francisco, as refugees fled the damage left by the powerful earthquake and fire.

Propelled by the South San Francisco Land & Improvement Co., and with a population of just 1,989 people, South San Francisco incorporated in 1908. The 1910 Sanborn map reveals that Point San Bruno was home to a host of industries by that time, including several steel companies. The South San Francisco Belt Railroad had been built to service the industries in the easternmost portion of town and connected their goods and services to the Southern Pacific's main line. By the time of the 1925 Sanborn mapping, those industries had grown to include other steel, smelting, refining, packing, and milling companies as well as a U.S. Naval Radio Station.

The industries located in South San Francisco focused on wartime production during both world wars. The Shaw Batcher Co. shipyards (located at what would become 1050 Oyster Point Blvd.) built ships at the Oyster Point Channel between 1914 and 1918 to help fulfill World War I naval requirements. Shaw Batcher was purchased by Western Pipe and Steel, and between 1940 and 1945 they built 45 ships in 48 months for the Maritime Commission during World War II. The expansion of the ship building industry was part of a widespread boom in the Bay Area that brought an influx of residents. The 1950s saw the construction of large housing developments to accommodate the growing community; and the wartime shipbuilding activities contributed to the infrastructure that allowed South San Francisco to become an important twentieth-century port.

In addition to increased housing, the 1950s also ushered in an era of land reclamation. Unused marshland, such as the current project site, was made available for industrial development. The project site is located within the Oyster Point Marina Park (Marina), which is within a portion of the 57-acre Oyster Point Landfill. Before reclamation, the eastern portion of the landfill was characterized by Bay mud, while the

upland western portion consisted of soil overlying bedrock. The landfill was in operation from 1956 to 1970 and was operated by the South San Francisco Scavenger Company, who leased the site from the City of South San Francisco. The landfill was used primarily for the disposal of solid wastes. The landfill began to receive liquid industrial waste in 1961. Liquid waste was placed into sumps constructed within the fill. In addition, Bay Mud berms were constructed in 1961, 1962, and 1964 to help contain waste. Waste disposal resulted in the extension of the shoreline approximately 3,000 feet east of the original shoreline. With the landfill still in operation, the Marina was constructed in 1962. In 1963, plans for a 600-acre industrial park adjacent to the Marina were announced. With comprehensive planning and modern facilities, the industrial park attracted light industry to the area.

Since 1977, the Marina has been managed by the San Mateo County Harbor District. The Marina was expanded in 1978, the year after major landfill activities ceased. Site closure activities included compaction of the fill and placement of a 2-foot layer of low permeability soil on top of the fill. Today the Marina is a recreation destination within South San Francisco with boat launching facilities, a fishing pier, and a large park with hiking trails and picnic facilities.

■ Archaeology

Prehistoric and Ethnographic Context

At the time of initial contact between European explorers and the Native Californians, the area that is now San Francisco was inhabited by a people who were of Penutian linguistic stock and who spoke the Ramaytush language. These people, referred to as Costanoan, reaped the benefit of living in a bountiful, temperate environment. Abundant marine and terrestrial resources made both agriculture and animal husbandry unnecessary.

Evidence of the success of their hunter/gatherer subsistence strategy may be seen in the number of flourishing village sites known to have existed at the time of contact with the Spanish. The detritus of these sites was found in numerous locations around the shoreline of San Francisco Bay in the form of shellmounds—large accumulations of shell, ash, human artifacts, and occasionally human remains. With the influx of European settlers in the mid-nineteenth century, most of these sites were destroyed or covered by buildings and roads at numerous locations around the bay shoreline, including the project site. Additionally, the project site is located along the southwestern shoreline of the San Francisco Bay. Gold rush-era silt accumulation and historic settlement (e.g., landfills) effectively filled in hundreds acres of the original bay shoreline. The project site is located on such fill, and as a result the original shoreline would have been located approximately 2,000 feet west and 3,000 feet south of the project site. Estuary and marsh locales along the former bay shoreline would have offered abundant food resources to prehistoric human population.

The term Costanoan is derived from the Spanish word *Costaños*, or "coast people," but its application as a means of identifying this population is based in linguistics. Costanoan actually designates a family of eight languages. Of these, Ramaytush was the language spoken by the estimated 1,400 people who occupied the

area now designated as San Francisco and San Mateo counties. Tribal groups occupying the area from the Pacific Coast to the Diablo Range and from San Francisco to Point Sur spoke the other seven languages of the Costanoan family. Modern descendants of the Costanoan prefer to be known as Ohlone and formed a corporate entity in 1971, the Ohlone Indian Tribe. They are named after the Oljón tribal group, which occupied the San Gregorio watershed in San Mateo County.

On the basis of linguistic evidence, it has been suggested that the ancestors of the Ohlone arrived in the San Francisco Bay area about 500 A.D. from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region. Extended families lived in domed structures thatched with tule, grass, wild alfalfa, ferns or carrizo. Semi-subterranean sweathouses were built into pits excavated in stream banks and covered with a structure against the bank. The tule raft, propelled by double-bladed paddles were used to navigate across San Francisco Bay. The Ramaytush usually cremated a corpse immediately upon death but, if there were no relatives to gather wood for the funeral pyre, interment occurred. Mortuary goods were all or most of the personal belongings of the deceased. Mussels were an important staple in the Costanoan diet as were acorns of the coast live oak, valley oak, tanbark oak and California black oak. Seeds and berries, roots, grasses, and the meat of deer, elk, grizzly, sea lion, rabbit, and squirrel also contributed to the Costanoan diet. Careful management of the land through controlled burning served to insure a plentiful and reliable source of all these foods.

The arrival of the Spanish in the San Francisco Bay Area in 1775 led to the rapid demise of native California populations. Diseases, declining birth rates, and the effects of the mission system served to eradicate the aboriginal life ways (which are currently experiencing resurgence among Ohlone descendants). Brought into the missions, the surviving Costanoan along with former neighboring groups of Esselen, Yokuts, and Miwok were transformed from hunters and gatherers into agricultural laborers. With abandonment of the mission system and Mexican takeover in the 1840s, numerous ranchos were established. Generally, the few native Californians who remained were then forced, by necessity, to work on the ranchos.

■ Results of Records Search and Field Survey

Results of Records Search

William Self Associates conducted a record search and literature review at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historic Resource Information System (CHRIS) prior to the field survey to identify previously recorded archaeological sites and historic properties within or adjacent (within a quarter-mile radius) to the project site. Materials examined consisted of site records, primary records, historic maps and manuscripts, the National Register of Historic Places Index (NRHP), California Register of Historic Resources, California Historic Landmarks (CHL), California Points of Historic Interest (CPHI), and state and local inventories.

The record and literature search did not identify any previously recorded archaeological sites or historic properties at the project site or within a quarter-mile radius of the project site. The record and literature search did not identify any previous Cultural Resource studies at the project site or within a quarter-mile radius of the project site. No resources were listed on the NRHP, CHL, or CPHI.

An examination of the California Shipwreck Database maintained by the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) revealed one historic shipwreck within the vicinity of the project site. The database entry was based on a reference in *California Shipwrecks: Footsteps in the Sea*, which has subsequently been found to be notoriously inaccurate. The entry in the CSLC Shipwreck Inventory lists the Echo, a sloop that reportedly foundered and sank in San Mateo County on January 15, 1879, in San Francisco Bay “between Redwood City and San Francisco.” Because the source of this information is known to contain numerous factual errors, additional research was conducted to learn more about the potential shipwreck.

In the List of Merchant Vessels of the United States for the years 1874, 1876, and 1877 (1878 not available), the Echo (vessel #8002) is listed consistently as a 27.59-ton sloop home ported in San Francisco. The sloop is not listed in Merchant Vessels in subsequent years, which lends some credibility to the date of loss provided in *California Shipwrecks: Footsteps in the Sea* (and the CSLC database). The Echo does not appear in the Lloyd’s Register of British and Foreign Shipping, American Lloyd’s Universal, or the Record of American and Foreign Shipping during that time period. A search of the Index to Early California Periodicals and Newspapers, part of the California Information File housed at the San Francisco Public Library, revealed no references to the Echo. The San Francisco Alta, the San Francisco Call, and the Chronicle are all included in the Index, although only the Alta was indexed during the time period in question. All references to the Echo found in the State Library Index for Vessels, part of the California State Library Newspaper Index (which begins in the mid-1890s), were to a later vessel that eventually burned in Richardson’s Bay near Sausalito. No other data or references to the loss of the Echo were identified.

Field Survey

A William Self Associates senior archaeologist conducted a pedestrian survey of the project site on March 2 and April 11, 2005. Visible ground surface was examined for the presence of historic or prehistoric site indicators, such as charcoal, obsidian or chert flakes, grinding bowls, shell fragments, bone, and pockets of dark, friable soils (for prehistoric sites), and glass, metal, ceramics, brick, wood and similar debris (for historic sites).

The survey was conducted under clear, sunny skies. Since the survey area is entirely landscaped land, very little ground surface was visible (less than 10 percent). Most of the area is covered by asphalt, concrete, gravel, grass, and riprap along the sloped shoreline. Therefore, the survey concentrated on areas of visible ground surface. No prehistoric or historic cultural resources were observed in the survey area.

■ Paleontological Resources

Surface examination often cannot reveal whether paleontological resources are present at a specific project location. Because the project site is underlain with bay fill and landfill components, it is highly unlikely that unique paleontological resources exist at the project site. Paleontological resources typically occur within rock formations and not reused fill material, but may occur in subsurface sediments of water bodies. However, in this particular area, the past dredging and filling activities associated with the creation and operation of the Marina would likely have destroyed or compromised the integrity of such resource if they

were to exist. No previously identified paleontological resources were found to be located at the project site.

■ Native American Consultation

William Self Associates contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on February 28, 2005, by letter with a description of the project. The letter included a request for a listing of local, interested Native American representatives and information on traditional or sacred lands within the project site and vicinity. NAHC staff member Ms. Debbie Pilas-Treadway wrote in response to the letter that a “search of the sacred lands file has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.” Included with the NAHC response was a contact list of interested Native Americans (see Appendix G). No individual or tribal members have been notified as part of this project; WTA may wish to use this list to solicit comments on the project’s environmental documentation.

3.11.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The criteria for eligibility for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) are very similar to those that qualify a property for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), which is the significance assessment tool used under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The project is evaluated under both sets of criteria because it is being proposed as a joint state and federal project by the WTA and the FTA, respectively. A property that is eligible for the NRHP is also eligible to be listed on the CRHR. All potential impacts to “significant” resources under a federal agency must be assessed and addressed under the procedures of Section 106 of the NHPA, set forth at 36 CFR 800.

■ National Register of Historic Places

In considering impact significance under the Nation Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), there are four evaluation criteria to determine a resource’s eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (or determination of “significance”), in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) outlined in 36 CFR 800, and identified at 36 CFR 60.4. These evaluation criteria, listed below, are used to determine what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment as a result of project-related activities (36 CFR 60.2).

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) Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- (b) Resources that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- (c) Resources 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) Resources that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (36 CFR 60.4).

■ California Register of Historic Resources

In considering impact significance under CEQA, the significance of the resource itself must first be determined. At the state level, consideration of significance as an “important archaeological resource” is measured by cultural resource provisions considered under CEQA Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4, and the draft criteria regarding resource eligibility for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Generally under CEQA, a historical resource is considered significant if it meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR. These criteria are set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5, and defined as any historical resource that:

- (a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
- (b) Is associated with lives of persons important in our past;
- (c) 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
- (d) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Section 15064.5 of CEQA also assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. These procedures are detailed under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98.

Impacts to “unique archaeological resources” and “unique paleontological resources” are also considered under CEQA, as described under PRC Section 21083.2. 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 one of the following criteria:

- (a) The archaeological artifact, object, or site contains information needed to answer important scientific questions, and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; or
- (b) The archaeological artifact, object, or site has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
- (c) The archaeological artifact, object, or site is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

A non-unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the above criteria. Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources and resources that do not qualify for listing on the CRHR receive no further consideration under CEQA.

3.11.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

■ Methodology

Historic Resources

Potentially adverse effects on historic structures or features are evaluated by determining the presence or absence of historic status with respect to the feature in question, and then determining the potential for the project to affect the structure or feature if it possesses historic status.

Archaeological Resources (including human remains)

This analysis is based on the possibility, based on the archaeological survey conducted, that an archaeological resource or human burial would be affected by activities that disturb the ground surface or subsurface, including grading or excavation.

Paleontological Resources

This analysis is based on professional knowledge, that paleontological resources could be affected by activities that disturb the ground surface or subsurface, including grading or excavation. For the purposes of this EIR/EA, impacts on paleontological resources are assessed in terms of significance based upon whether these resources meet the definition of a “unique paleontological resource” found in Section 21083.2(g) of the PRC.

■ Impacts and Mitigation Measures Incorporated from 2003 WTA PEIR

The 2003 WTA PEIR (URS 2003) included many impacts and mitigation measures that are either addressed in this document or are not applicable to this project. A table of impacts and mitigation measures from the PEIR is included as Appendix H of this document and includes a column showing how the PEIR impacts and MMs are applied to this project (i.e. *IR*—Incorporated by Reference, *AD*—Addressed in EIR, and *NA*—Not Applicable). For cultural resources, the following impacts and mitigation measures from the PEIR would apply to the project and are assumed to be incorporated in this project by reference.

- **Impacts:** CUL-2, CUL-4
- **MMs:** CUL-2.1 (CUL-1.1 by reference), CUL-2.2, CUL-4.1 (CUL-1.1 by reference)

■ Environmental Criteria

Under Section 106 of the NHPA and CEQA Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4, the project would have an adverse effect on the environment if it would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of any of the following:

- A historic resource (a cultural resource eligible for the NRHP and/or CRHR)

- An archaeological resource (defined as a unique archaeological resource that meets NRHP and/or CRHR criteria)
- A unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature (where the project would directly or indirectly destroy a site or resources)
- Human remains (where the project would disturb or destroy burials)

■ Impacts and Mitigation

Threshold	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in the NRHP criteria and/or CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?
-----------	---

Impact 3.11-1 Implementation of the project would not result in the demolition of a structure that has been determined potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR.

As discussed under “Environmental Setting,” there were no previously identified historic structures located within the project site or within a quarter mile of the project site. The project site currently comprises non-historic structures used to support functions of the Marina. The project would not require demolition of a structure or structures which are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR.

CEQA Conclusion: This impact on the significance of a historical resource would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Threshold	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 36 CFR 60.4 Criterion (d) and/or CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?
-----------	--

Impact 3.11-2 Implementation of the project could affect the significance of a previously unidentified archaeological resource as defined in 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5, and PRC Section 21083.2.

As discussed under “Environmental Setting,” a possible shipwreck may exist offshore of the project site, however, the dredging activities associated with the project would be limited to the existing navigation channel within the Marina. Furthermore, the original shoreline of San Francisco Bay was situated approximately 2000 feet west and 3000 feet south of the project site. Consequently, there is little likelihood that cultural deposits associated with prehistoric occupation or utilization of the project site (such as those associated with a shipwreck) will be encountered in the area to be dredged. In addition, any historic materials that may have been located within the dredge area, such as shipwreck remains or cultural material discarded into the near shore waters, have long since been destroyed, as the navigation channel has been routinely dredged for maintenance purposes for a considerable length of time. However, other previously unidentified archaeological resources eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR may be located within the project site or its immediate vicinity during project construction. Construction of the project could result in

ground disturbance associated with grading, excavating, and trenching, which could damage or destroy previously unidentified, significant archaeological resources that may be present on the project site.

However, to minimize this impact, implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.11-2, shall be required in the event that previously unidentified archaeological resources are encountered:

MM 3.11-2 A qualified archaeologist approved by the WTA shall first determine whether a previously unidentified archaeological resource uncovered during construction is a “unique archaeological resource” under 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5, and/or Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. If the archaeological resource is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource,” the archaeologist shall formulate a mitigation plan that satisfies the requirements of, 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5, and/or Public Resources Code 21083.2. Work in the vicinity of the find may resume at the completion of a mitigation plan or recovery of the resource.

If the archaeologist determines that the archaeological resource is not a unique archaeological resource, work will resume, and the archaeologist may record the site and submit the recordation form to the California Historic Resources Information System Northwest Information Center.

The archaeologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the City and to the California Historic Resources Information System Northwest Information Center.

CEQA Conclusion: The potentially significant impact on previously unidentified archaeological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.11-2.

Threshold	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature pursuant to 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5 and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2?
-----------	---

Impact 3.11-3 Implementation of the project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

As discussed under “Environmental Setting,” no previously identified unique paleontological or unique geologic features are located at the project site. The site and immediate surrounding area are composed of bay fill and landfill materials that typically do not preserve paleontological resources. Routine maintenance dredging of the channels in the Marina results in constant disturbance to surface and subsurface sediments, the latter of which are sometimes known to contain unique paleontological resources. However, because of the fill composition and the continued disturbance from offshore activities, it is unlikely that unique paleontological or geologic resources occur at the project site. Implementation of the project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature at the project site.

CEQA Conclusion: The impact on a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Threshold	Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries pursuant to 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5 and/or Public Resources Code Section 5097.98?
-----------	---

Impact 3.11-4 Implementation of the project could disturb unknown human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries as defined in 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5 and/or PRC Section 5097.98.

As discussed under “Environmental Setting,” the project site is not known to be located within a human burial ground and no known human burial sites were identified within the project site or its immediate vicinity. However, previously unidentified human remains could be encountered during ground disturbing activities with construction of the project. Human burials, in addition to being potential archaeological resources, have specific provisions for treatment in Section 5097 of the PRC. Disturbing human remains could violate the health code, as well as destroy the resource.

However, to minimize this impact, implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.11-4, shall be required if human remains are discovered at the project site, as required by statute, ordinance, or code:

MM 3.11-4 In the event of the discovery of a burial, human bone, or suspected human bone, all excavation or grading in the vicinity of 100 feet of the find shall halt immediately, the area of the find shall be protected, and the WTA immediately shall notify the San Mateo County Coroner of the find and comply with the provisions of PRC Section 5097 with respect to Native American involvement, burial treatment, and re-burial, if necessary. Work may resume once the area is protected or the body is removed.

CEQA Conclusion: This potentially significantly impact on previously unidentified human remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.11-4.

3.11.4 REFERENCES

URS Corporation. 2003. *Final Program Environmental Impact Report—Expansion of Ferry Transit Service in the San Francisco Bay Area*, June.

William Self Associates, Inc. 2005. *Historic Property Survey Report, San Francisco Bay Water Transit Authority, South San Francisco Ferry Terminal Project, Oyster Point Marina and Park, City of South San Francisco, San Mateo County, California*, September.