

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.5.1 Environmental Setting

This section provides an overview of the history of the City and of resources of historical significance that may be affected by the proposed project.

History of the City of Daly City

The City is located in the northwest portion of San Mateo County and shares a border with the City and County of San Francisco to the north, Pacifica to the south, and South San Francisco, Colma, and Brisbane to the east. West of Daly City is the Pacific Ocean. In general, the City is highly urbanized with residential, commercial, and institutional land uses. Most of the open space in the City is located along the coastline. Studies indicate that San Mateo County may have been inhabited between 3,500 and 2,500 B.C. Recent history shows that the area has been inhabited by the Ohlone Indian Tribe, the Spanish peoples, and Mexican peoples.

Native American Period

The Ohlone Tribe primarily occupied the coastline in the San Francisco Bay Area, stretching from San Francisco to Monterey Bay. The Ohlone concentrated near inland villages located on the Colma and San Bruno creeks, as well as a seasonal village on the coast at Mussel Rock. The Ohlone were known to hunt deer, rabbits, fish, wild geese, and ducks in addition to gathering food such as nuts, roots, berries, and shellfish such as mussels and clams. Most of the fishing was done on the inland bay areas, while the coast provided sea otters and seals.

Spanish Period

Considered the first Europeans to reach the San Francisco Bay Area, Spanish explorers led by Juan Bautista de Anza established the Mission of San Francisco de Asis (Mission Dolores) in 1776. The primary route between Mission Dolores and other missions was El Camino Real (now called Mission Street), which runs through the City.

Mexican Period

Between 1822 and 1848, under the Mexican rule of California, land was issued to individuals, including cattle ranchers and hide and tallow traders. The City was part of three land grants, including "Rancho Buri," which was one of the largest grants within the Peninsula.

American Period

In 1868, John Daly purchased approximately 250 acres in the City and was the owner and operator of the San Mateo Dairy. As such, he would eventually become a prominent figure in the area, eventually having the City named after him in 1911 when the City became incorporated.

As a result of the 1906 earthquake, population surged in the areas surrounding Daly's ranch as he opened his land for emergency use by victims and people seeking refuge from the earthquake and fires. Eventually, a small community formed near Daly's ranch, and he ended up subdividing his land in 1907, leading to the City's first residential subdivision, known today as the Crocker neighborhood.

The largest surge in population occurred after World War II. Henry Doelger purchased 600 acres of sand dunes and cabbage patches along the western edges of the City, which was annexed in 1948 and subsequently developed into what is known today as the Westlake community. Doelger would continue to develop the area with thousands of homes and several shopping centers.

Historical Resources

There are no sites in the City listed on the National Register of Historic Places and/or the California Register of Historic Resources; however, there are approximately 46 other properties identified as having potential historic value at the local level within the City.

Archaeological Resources

According to the General Plan EIR, 58 cultural resource studies have been conducted in and around the City consisting of a mixture of architectural and archaeological studies generally concentrated around the I-280 corridor, the coastal margin, and the periphery of San Bruno Mountain (City of Daly City 2012). As a result of the studies, several areas have uncovered archaeological resources attributed to Native American history, located generally in the northern part of San Mateo County and in close proximity to sources of water, wetlands, coastal terraces, and sheltered valleys (City of Daly City 2012).

Furthermore, a brief review of a recorded resources map database and a general landform analysis of existing waterways and known archaeological resources indicate that the project area is not sensitive for archaeological resources.

4.5.2 Previous Environmental Analysis

City of Daly City General Plan EIR Summary

Chapter 3.4 of the General Plan EIR discusses potential impacts on prehistoric and historic resources. According to the General Plan EIR, new development has the potential to disrupt undiscovered archeological resources and unrecorded historic resources during proposed project construction. However, compliance with existing federal, state, and local laws as well as policies contained in the General Plan would reduce impacts on archeological and historic resources to less than significant levels.

The following General Plan policies are applicable to the proposed project:

Policy RME-19: Undertake measure to protect and preserve historic and archaeological resources.

Policy LU-19: Archaeological resources should be preserved where possible.

Plan Bay Area EIR Summary

The following summarizes the potential impacts to cultural resources discussed in Chapter 2.11 of the Plan Bay Area EIR and includes the complete text of mitigation measures previously identified by the Plan Bay Area EIR that are applicable to the proposed project.

Impact 2.11-1: Historical Resources. The Plan Bay Area EIR analyzed the potential impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5, and determined with the implementation of the Plan Bay Area EIR Mitigation Measure 2.11-1, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation (Refer to Impact CUL-1 in Section 4.5.3, Project-Specific Analysis).

***PBA EIR MM 2.11-1:** Implementing agencies and/or project sponsors shall implement measures, where feasible and necessary based on project- and site-specific considerations that include, but are not limited to:*

- *Realign or redesign projects to avoid impacts on known historic resources where possible.*
- *Require a survey and evaluation of structures greater than 45 years in age within the area of potential effect to determine their eligibility for recognition under State, federal, or local historic preservation criteria. The evaluation shall be prepared by an architectural historian, or historical architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, Professional Qualification Standards. The evaluation should comply with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b), and, if federal funding or permits are required, with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (16 U.S.C. § 470 et seq.). Study recommendations shall be implemented.*
- *If avoidance of a significant architectural/built environment resource is not feasible, additional mitigation options include, but are not limited to, specific design plans for historic districts, or plans for alteration or adaptive re-use of a historical resource that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings.*
- *Comply with existing local regulations and policies that exceed or reasonably replace any of the above measures that protect historic resources.*

Impact 2.11-2: Archaeological Resources. The Plan Bay Area EIR analyzed the potential impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 and determined with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.11-2 the impact would be less than significant. However, Mitigation Measure 2.11-2 is not relevant to the proposed project because no known archaeological resources are present in the project area.

Impact 2.11-4: Disturb Human Remains. The Plan Bay Area EIR analyzed the potential impacts related to the disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, and determined impacts would be less than significant as projects are required to comply with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and PRC Section 5097. Compliance with these state regulations provide an opportunity to avoid or minimize the disturbance of human remains, and appropriately treat any remains that are discovered. Therefore, impacts to human remains would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures were identified.

4.5.3 Project-Specific Analysis

Impact CUL-1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Impact Analysis

A desktop review of buildings over the age of 45 was conducted by an architectural historian, and no historic resources (likely eligible under state, federal, or local historic preservation criteria) were identified. Thus, the proposed project is not anticipated to have an impact on any known or potential historical resources.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

No Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

No Impact.

Impact CUL-2 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Impact Analysis

Based on a database review of recorded archaeological resources, no known archaeological resources are present in the project area. Further, the area and project site have been heavily developed, and it is very unlikely that buried archaeological resources are present. Although very unlikely, if archaeological resources are encountered during construction, adherence to the aforementioned requirements would be required to ensure that potentially significant archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5 are treated appropriately. As such, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (PBA EIR MM 2.11-1) would be required and would ensure that impacts associated with damage to buried archaeological resources would remain less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (PBA EIR MM 2.11-1) is required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.

Impact CUL-3 Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would result in a significant impact if it would disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Although the proposed project would include ground-disturbing activities during construction, the project site is highly disturbed and has had extensive previous ground disturbing activities. If human remains did exist on within the project site, they likely would have been discovered during these previous ground disturbing activities. In the very unlikely event that previously undiscovered human remains are discovered onsite during proposed project construction, the proposed project would be required to comply with California Health and

Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and PRC Section 5097. Sections 7052 and 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code states that the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony, and that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the County coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If discovered remains are found to be Native American, the coroner must contact the California Native Heritage Commission. Additionally, compliance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines would set forth procedures in the event of an unexpected discovery of Native American human remains on non-federal land. Therefore, with adherence to standard state and federal regulations, impacts related to disturbance of human remains would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

This page left intentionally blank.