

4.4 Cultural Resources4.4-1
 4.4.1 Environmental Setting4.4-1
 4.4.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures4.4-8
 4.4.3 References.....4.4-20

TABLES

Table 4.4-1 Campus Buildings and Construction Dates

Cultural Resources

This section presents an evaluation of the potential for development under the proposed Campus Master Plan to affect cultural resources present on the SF State campus. It also includes measures to be implemented in conjunction with future development to ensure the appropriate identification and protection and/or treatment of cultural resources identified during the course of future development.

Cultural resources under CEQA include historic and prehistoric archaeological sites and features, historic structures and buildings, paleontological resources (fossils and fossil localities), and “unique geologic resources.” Sites and features that hold traditional cultural significance to Native Americans or other cultural groups are also considered to be cultural resources. Additionally, CEQA considers impacts to human remains, including Native American burials found in the context of an archaeological site, under the category of cultural resources.

Public and agency comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation are summarized below:

- Commenters expressed concerns about the impact of the proposed project on the historic values of the Villas Parkmerced neighborhood to the south of the existing campus boundaries.
- A commenter requested that the EIR provide a full discussion of the site history and people who have historically lived in the project area.

To the extent that these issues involve a significant effect on the environment under the CEQA standards of significance, the issues are addressed in the analysis below.

4.4.1 Environmental Setting

4.4.1.1 Study Area

The study area for the evaluation of impacts of campus development under the proposed Campus Master Plan on cultural resources is the SF State campus. The term “campus” refers to the 134-acre main campus and an additional 10 acres of adjacent property owned primarily by the SF State Foundation (see Figure 3-1, *Campus Master Plan Boundary*). See Chapter 3, *Project Description*, for further description of the 144-acre project area. The 144-acre planning area is generally bounded by Lake Merced Boulevard on the west; 19th Avenue on the east; the Stonestown Galleria shopping center, Lowell High School, and Lakeshore Alternative Elementary School to the north; and the Villas Parkmerced residential development to the south.

Currently, the entire study area is largely developed, with the greatest portion covered by campus buildings, other improvements, and landscaping.

4.4.1.2 Prehistoric Context

Human settlement of the San Francisco Bay region probably began sometime during the early Holocene period (about 10,000 years ago). During this period, the mean sea level elevation was considerably lower than today and the area now encompassed by the San Francisco Bay was over 30 miles inland from the coastline. Sea levels rose and, by 8,000 years ago, marine waters began to inundate San Francisco Bay. Except for brief periods, the mean sea level has been at or above its present level for some 6,000 years (Moratto, 1984).

The oldest evidence of human occupation in the region is documented to the south of the project area in northern Santa Clara County, where radiocarbon assaying has yielded dates of circa 8000 B.C. Evidence for later occupations, however, is more common. Radiocarbon dates from several sites within the areas surrounding and between the San Francisco and Monterey Bays range between circa 5000 and 2000 B.C. Data from these sites indicate that extensive but sparse populations of hunter-gatherers occupied these areas before 2000 B.C. Sites from this period are located within the interior hills and valleys and on the bay and ocean shores. These sites are characterized by earth and/or sand midden deposits. Faunal materials indicate that shellfish were an important, but not dominant, source of food during this time. Hunting and vegetal food processing were of greater importance, as indicated by the presence of millingstones and large projectile points.

The entire project area is situated within lands occupied by speakers of Ramaytush or San Francisco Costanoan. Ramaytush is one of eight Costanoan Indian languages spoken in California. Costanoan is derived from the Spanish term *costanos* for "coast people"; however, it does not represent a cohesive ethnic group. Instead, Costanoan is a linguistic division, grouping eight languages together due to their similarities. Together with the Miwokan languages, Costanoan comprises the Utian Family of languages. In turn, the Utian Family is part of the larger Penutian Linguistic Stock (Kroeber 1976, Levy 1978, Moratto 1984, and Shipley, 1978).

Sometime between 2500 and 2000 B.C., Utian-speaking peoples initially occupied what is now eastern Contra Costa County and then expanded westward to the San Francisco Bay. Between the years 2000 and 1000 B.C., bayshore - and marsh-adapted peoples began to settle in the Bay Area. By circa 1500 B.C., Utian people had settled the area around the south end of San Francisco Bay, from which they expanded to the north, west, and south. By circa 500 B.C., Costanoan peoples occupied essentially the same territory that they would until Euro-American contact (Moratto, 1984).

4.4.1.3 Historical Context

Initial European exploration of the project vicinity was initiated in 1769 and lasted until 1810. Between 1769 and 1776, seven Spanish expeditions penetrated the territory occupied by the Costanoan peoples. Favorable reports led to the founding of seven missions in the region between 1770 and 1797. In the spring of 1776, San Francisco was chosen by Juan Batista Anza for the establishment of a mission and military post. Later that same year, the Mission San Francisco de Asís and Presidio de San Francisco were officially dedicated and Jose Joaquin Moraga (Anza's lieutenant) took formal possession in the name of King Carlos III (Hoover et al., 1990).

The Spanish annexation and colonization of Alta California (or Upper California, also called California Nueva, or New California) produced profound changes in the cultures of the indigenous population. The missions resettled and concentrated the aboriginal hunter-gatherer population into agricultural communities. The last Costanoan tribelets living an aboriginal existence had disappeared by 1810. The Mission tribes were christianized and converted to a form of peasantry which was in rapid decline in Europe. As a consequence of the concentration of population, coupled with the indigenous people's lack of immunity to European diseases, the mission tribes were decimated by common diseases that were generally not fatal to Europeans. It has been estimated that the Costanoan population declined from 10,000 or more in 1770 to less than 2,000 in 1832 (Levy, 1978).

Jurisdiction over Alta California was established by Mexico in April 1822. Control over this remote area by the central and local Mexican authorities was never strong. In 1833, the mission lands were secularized, expropriated, and given out as private ranches during the next decade in the form of land grants (Donley et al., 1979). Secularization of the missions by the Mexican authorities produced additional cataclysmic change within the indigenous cultures. The majority of the Native Americans gradually left the missions to work as manual laborers on the ranches that were established in the surrounding areas. For some Costanoan, there was a partial return to aboriginal religious customs and subsistence practices (Levy, 1978). By the early 1970s, the total number of persons of Costanoan descent was no greater than 200 individuals (Levy, 1978). In 1971, descendants of the Costanoan, incorporated as the Ohlone Indian Tribe and received title to the Ohlone Indian Cemetery.

A major factor leading to the disintegration of Mexican control of California was pressure from the United States. Initial contacts made by private citizens, brought the news of California back to the United States, helping trigger the immigration of U.S. citizens into California. The Mexican government became increasingly agitated by the continued influx of U.S. citizens into California. The semi-official 1844 and 1845 expeditions into California by John Charles Fremont further distressed the Mexican government (Beck and Haase, 1974). The continued friction between Mexico and the United States ultimately led to the Mexican War of 1846-1847. California became part of the United States as a consequence of the U.S. victory over Mexico in the war. The territory was formally ceded in the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, and was admitted as a state in 1850 (Beck and Haase 1974, and Bethel, 1969).

Prior to the discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill on January 24, 1848, development in the area consisted of the Spanish/Mexican facilities (i.e., the Presidio and Mission) and a small settlement known as Yerba Buena situated on the shores of the cove by the same name. The inhabitants of Yerba Buena were predominantly non-Spanish, English-speaking immigrants (e.g., U.S. or British citizens). Sometime before the gold rush, the inhabitants of Yerba Buena officially changed the name of their settlement to San Francisco. Following the discovery of gold, San Francisco transformed rather quickly from an isolated hamlet into a bustling center of commerce (Hoover et al. 1990, and Kemble, 1957). According to historic accounts cited by Hupman and Chavez (1995), after the discovery of gold, the population of San Francisco grew from 375 people in 1847 to 2,000 by February 1849, and by the end of 1849, there may have been as many as 20,000 people living in the city.

4.4.1.4 Historic Architectural Context

SF State Campus

San Francisco State Normal School, a two-year teacher-training college, was founded in 1899. It became a 4-year school in 1930, and received university status in 1972 through the California State University system. The original college was housed in a plain stone structure on Powell Street near Clay, which was destroyed in the 1906 earthquake and fire. While the school reopened at another location on upper Market, it was not until 1939 that 54 acres of land was acquired at the existing campus location. This followed the introduction of the “M” streetcar line along 19th Avenue and the construction of Lake Merced Boulevard. The campus’s earliest temporary buildings and athletic fields replaced farmland. The campus remained largely in this form during the first decade.

It was not until 1949 when construction began on the first permanent structures, a stadium and a physical education building. Construction exploded on and around campus after that time. SF State saw the construction of the campus core, while Villas Parkmerced and Stonestown were fully completed by the end of the 1950s (see further discussion below). New buildings continued to replace the older temporary structures on the campus, as the 1960s and 1970s saw the campus receive its first dormitories, a student center, two library expansions, and a pair of towering new science buildings. Even the valley, a remnant of the former stream canyon, had accumulated several structures. The last 15 years on campus have seen development across all building types, including an expansion in student housing, new academic and student support facilities, and an ongoing program of seismic upgrading of the University’s building stock. Section 4.4.1.5 below further identifies campus buildings that are or will be at least 50 years old by 2020, which is the planning horizon for the proposed Campus Master Plan.

Recent Acquisitions

The University Park North (UPN) was recently acquired by SF State and was previously called the Stonestown apartments. The Western Neighborhoods Project provides a description of the history and architecture of Stonestown, which is summarized as follows (Western Neighborhoods Project, 2006). The Stonestown shopping center and the adjacent apartment towers and buildings were built in 1952. “Stonestown” as it was called, was the fourth largest apartment complex/shopping center in the United States at the time. By the early 1980s, the mall still retained a classic 1950s look, but a major renovation took place that added a story of stores, a glass ceiling, and marble floors, creating the “Stonestown Galleria.” The apartments and towers were purchased by SF State in 2005 and remain much as they were in 1952.

The three blocks of University Park South (UPS) and the Tapia Triangle, owned by the San Francisco State University Foundation, are part of the larger Villas Parkmerced neighborhood that lies to the south of the campus. The buildings in the UPS property and development further south, including approximately 200 acres of land, constitute the Villas Parkmerced neighborhood. Villas Parkmerced consists of 2-story and tower apartment buildings. The Western Neighborhoods Project also provides a description of the history and architecture of Parkmerced neighborhood, which is summarized as follows (Western Neighborhoods Project, 2006). Villas Parkmerced was the idea of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (Met Life) of New York. The company had fought through the Depression with traditional investment ideas and decided rental housing might provide a more stable cash flow over time.

In 1941, the company purchased over 200 acres of land and named their new project after Lake Merced. In the Bronx they launched “Parkchester” and in Los Angeles “Park LaBrea.”

Met Life hired the architectural firm of Leonard Schultze and Associates, who brought in the now-famous landscape architect Thomas Dolliver Church. Schultze and Church designed the pie-shaped blocks with apartments grouped around patios and public spaces. The geometrical plan came from the Beaux Arts tradition. Avenues radiated from Juan Bautista Circle, a center oval, and larger street octagons surrounded it. Continuing the developer’s decade-long fascination with California’s Spanish period, the avenues were named after members of the Anza expedition that colonized the Bay Area in 1775-76.

Despite the difficulties in obtaining building materials during World War II, the first occupants moved into their garden apartments on Font Boulevard in early 1944. By the early 1950s, after the post-WWII housing boom, eleven 13-story apartment towers, San Francisco’s tallest structures west of Twin Peaks, had been constructed in Villas Parkmerced. Streamline and modern in design, the towers dotted the landscape in a seemingly random pattern. The 2-story and tower apartments remain mostly unchanged today.

4.4.1.5 Known Cultural Resource Sites and Prior Surveys

A records search for the SF State campus as well as a 1/2-mile radius around it was conducted March 7, 2006 at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), NWIC File No. 05-770. The search area includes the neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the campus (e.g., the Villas Parkmerced neighborhood). The record search, which looked for previously recorded archaeological sites and historic built environment features, and for previous archaeological surveys, revealed that there have been previous cultural resource surveys within the SF State campus. The NWIC reports one archeological site and one building as previously recorded within the boundaries of the campus. The archaeological site (P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25) is described as a possible sand midden with some shell and no charcoal. A stone pestle was also reportedly taken from the site. The other site (P-38-004381) is Mary Ward Hall, a 6-story concrete building on the SF State campus constructed in 1960. The site was listed as 6Y2, which means that it was not determined to be eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) at the time it was evaluated. There are no other sites listed on the California Office of Historic Preservation Property Directory, or California Inventory of Historical Resources within the search area. In addition, the City of San Francisco List of Designated Landmarks was reviewed to determine whether any of the buildings on the campus, the Stonestown Apartments, or the Villas Parkmerced are designated as landmarks by the City. None of these buildings are on the City’s Designated Landmarks List.

There are a number of campus buildings and buildings owned by the San Francisco State University Foundation that will be 50 years or older by 2020, which is the planning horizon of the proposed Campus Master Plan. These buildings could be considered historic resources as defined in CEQA. Table 4.4-1 provides an inventory of all campus buildings and the year in which the construction was completed.

**Table 4.4-1
Campus Buildings and Construction Dates**

Facility Name	Category	Date of Construction
Buildings at Least 50 Years Old by 2020		
University Park South Buildings ¹	Residential	1944 - early 1950s
Gymnasium	Physical Education	1951
Stadium Toilet Building	Support	1951
Press Box	Support	1952
University Park North Building ²	Residential	1952
Business Building	Business Administration	1953
Science Building	Science	1953
Fine Arts Building	Industrial Arts	1953
J.P. Leonard Library	Library	1953
Field House No. 2	Storage	1953
Burk Education Building	Education	1954
Warehouse No. 1	Warehouse	1954
Creative Arts Building	Art	1956
Greenhouse	Science	1958
Humanities/Social Science Building	Humanities	1959
Residence Dining Center	Cafeteria	1960
Woman's Field Equipment Building	Warehouse	1960
Mary Ward Hall	Residence Hall	1960
Mary Park Hall	Residence Hall	1960
Franciscan Building	Administration	1961
Parking Garage	Parking Structure	1962
Psychology Building	Psychology	1964
Newer Campus Buildings		
Hensill Hall	Science	1971
Thornton Hall	Science	1972
Student Union	College/University Union	1975
Student Health Center	Health Clinic	1977
Temporary A	Classroom - General	1988
Temporary G	Undefined	1988
Temporary M	Undefined	1988
Administration Building	Administration	1989
Student Apartments	Residence Hall	1991
Guest Center	Non-state	1991
Humanities Building	Classroom - General	1994
Restrooms	Undefined	1995
Children's Center	Undefined	1997
Corporation Yard	Corporation Yard	1998
Central Plant	Corporation Yard	1998
Waste Management	Corporation Yard	1998
Student Services Building	Support	2001

**Table 4.4-1
Campus Buildings and Construction Dates**

Facility Name	Category	Date of Construction
Temp Building H	Science	2001
Temp Building J	Science	2001
Temp Building K	Undefined	2001
Temp Building S	Other	2001
Lakeview Center	Administration	2002
Temp Building N	Engineering	2002
Temp Building O	Undefined	2002
Temp Building P	Undefined	2002
Temp Building Q	Undefined	2002
Temp Building R	Undefined	2002

Notes:

1. Formerly part of Villas Parkmerced
2. Formally known as Stonestown Apartments

4.4.1.6 Native American Coordination

URS contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on June 15, 2006, to request a review of its Sacred Lands File and to receive a list of the individuals and groups that the NAHC believes should be contacted regarding information or concerns related to the project area. The NAHC responded on June 22, 2006 with negative results for its search of the Sacred Lands File. On June 26, 2006, URS transmitted an informational letter to the six potentially interested parties identified by the NAHC. To date, one response to the informational letter has been received. The individual who responded had no specific concerns.

4.4.1.7 Paleontological and Geological Context

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources are the mineralized (fossilized) remains of prehistoric plant and animal organisms, as well as the mineralized impressions (trace fossils) left as indirect evidence of the form and activity of such organisms. These resources are considered non-renewable resources, significant to our culture, and are protected under various state and federal laws.

Paleontological resources, with a few, rare exceptions, are found only in sedimentary deposits formations or deposits. Significant paleontological resources are those that are known to have yielded vertebrate fossils within the project area or region (see further discussion in Section 4.4.2.3, below). Although fossils have never been identified during the construction of existing buildings on campus, the Colma Formation that lies below the campus has been identified as having the potential to contain significant fossils (California Public Utilities Commission, 2002). Further, three individuals of Columbian Mammoth and one individual of Giant Bison were recovered from the Colma Formation exposed in an excavation at the intersection of Pacific Avenue and Kearney Street located near the southeast base of Telegraph Hill in San Francisco (Rodda et al, 1993). This was the most abundant collection of late

Pleistocene terrestrial vertebrates reported from San Francisco, and only the fourth record from excavations in the city proper (Rodda et al, 1993).

Unique Geological Features

Section 4.5, *Geology, Soils, and Seismicity* describes the geological setting of the SF State Campus. Based on this information, the campus does not contain any unique geological features, such as caves, rock outcroppings, scarps, etc.

4.4.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.4.2.1 Significant Cultural Resources Under CEQA

Cultural resources considered under CEQA may be either historical resources, or unique archaeological, paleontological or geologic resources. Human remains are also treated as cultural resources. The Public Resources Code (PRC) and the CEQA Guidelines provide criteria for the assessment of the significance of cultural resources in order to determine whether they are historical resources or unique archaeological, paleontological, or geologic resources. Resources that do not meet the significance criteria are not given further consideration under CEQA. A definitive assessment of resource significance may require archaeological testing or detailed historical research, which has not been conducted for all resources identified as potentially meeting the criteria set forth in CEQA. In these circumstances, identified resources in most cases are assumed to be significant, and treated as such, until such time as they can be formally assessed.

A property qualifies as an historic resource and should be considered as such if it meets one or more of the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), per the criteria set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5. These criteria indicate that a resource shall be considered “historically significant” if it:

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

With a few exceptions, to qualify as a significant resource, a property must be at least 50 years old. This threshold is not absolute; it was chosen as a reasonable span of time after which a professional evaluation of historical significance can be made. Moreover, this standard is commonly used in determining which buildings should be assessed under CEQA. It should also be noted that properties that are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are automatically eligible for listing on the CRHR.

The Public Resources Code also provides criteria that define “unique archaeological resource.” Under PRC § 21083.2(g), a unique archaeological resource is a resource for which it can be clearly demonstrated that—without merely adding to the current body of knowledge—there is a high probability that it:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important historic or prehistoric event or person.
- Has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.

While CEQA Guidelines Appendix G refers to unique paleontological and geologic resources, CEQA does not define these terms. For the purposes of this EIR, the relevant provisions of the statute used to define a unique archaeological resource are also used to define unique paleontological and geologic resources. In addition, State law explicitly considers vertebrate paleontological sites and fossil footprints and provides for their recordation (Archaeological, Paleontological and Historic Sites Statute at PRC 5097 *et seq.*).

It may not be possible to ascertain without extensive excavation whether significant fossils are present within a geologic formation at a specific project location. Therefore, paleontological resource significance assessment generally is not conducted in advance of construction. It is assumed that significant fossils may be present on campus in geologic formations or rock units that have yielded significant fossils elsewhere in the region, such as is the case for the Colma Formation.

4.4.2.2 Standards of Significance

The following standards of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the project would have a significant impact with regard to cultural resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §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 §21084.1 provides that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect upon the environment. CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(b) defines a substantial adverse change as “physical demolition, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.” The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

The same section further provides that project impacts due to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of buildings and structures that qualify as historical resources are generally mitigated to a less-than-significant level if the work is conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Weeks and Grimmer, 1995). In some cases, however, documentation will not mitigate the effects of demolishing a historical resource to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(b)(2)).

CEQA Guidelines §21083.2 state that if the lead agency determines that the project may have an effect on unique archaeological resources, the environmental impact report shall address the issue of those resources. The section further states that, if it can be demonstrated that the project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to preserve the resource in place or leave the resource undisturbed, including such measures as avoidance through project design, or capping with soil. Data recovery archaeological excavation is also cited as appropriate mitigation under certain conditions.

PRC §30244 states that where development would adversely impact an archaeological or paleontological resource as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(b) states that public agencies should, whenever feasible, seek to avoid damaging effects on any historical resource of an archaeological nature, and stipulates that preservation in place is the preferred mitigation, through such measures as planned avoidance, incorporation within open space, or covering with soil. The section further states that when data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, this work shall be directed by a data recovery plan that provides for adequate recovery of the scientifically consequential information from and about the historical resource. Results of studies are to be filed with the Californian Historical Resources Information Center (CHRIS). Human remains encountered during excavation shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code.

4.4.2.3 Analytical Method

Potential Impacts to Archaeological Resources

Impacts to archaeological resources and human remains most often occur as the result of excavation or grading within the vertical or horizontal boundaries of a significant archaeological site. Archaeological resources may also suffer impacts as the result of project activity that increases erosion, or increases the accessibility of a surface resource, and thus increases the potential for vandalism or illicit collection. Because archaeological resources often are buried, or cannot be fully defined or assessed on the basis of surface manifestations, substantial ground-disturbing work may have the potential to uncover previously unidentified resources, including archaeological deposits and human remains. Therefore, it must be assumed that any ground-disturbing activities in any area of the campus where development will occur could potentially affect cultural resources. The mitigation measures developed to address impacts to unique archaeological resources and historical resources of an archaeological nature address potential

impacts both to identified archaeological resources, and to archaeological resources that might be discovered during construction.

Potential Impacts to Historical Structures

Buildings identified in Table 4.4-1 that are or would be at least 50 years of age during the planning horizon of the proposed Campus Master Plan are considered to be potentially eligible for listing on the CRHR and are considered historical resources for purposes of the impact analysis that follows. Until definitive study determines that a resource lacks integrity or otherwise does not meet the criteria that define an historical resource, the resources so identified in Table 4.4-1 are assumed to be eligible for listing on the CRHR, and impacts to these resources are considered to be potentially significant.

Significant impacts to historic resource may result from demolition or physical alteration of the buildings. Significant impacts may occur if the setting of a historic resource is altered by the introduction of incompatible elements, in cases where the property retains integrity of setting and the setting of the resource contributes to its significance.

Potential Impacts to Paleontological Resources

Since paleontological resources most commonly are buried in the substrate, surface examination often cannot reveal whether paleontological resources are present at any specific location. Moreover, due to the developed and landscaped condition of the campus, surficial soils and sediments cannot be readily examined. For these reasons, assessment of the potential for paleontological impacts from the proposed Campus Master Plan is based on an assessment of the paleontological sensitivity of the geological formations present under the campus. The assessment of paleontological sensitivity is based on both the presence of known paleontological sites near the project area, as well as extrapolated biostratigraphic information derived from rock units in adjacent areas or the region. To perform this analysis, a review of geological maps of the project area was conducted to determine geologic formation likely to be present, and a review of previously recorded paleontological localities found in these formations. On the basis of records, geological formations present or likely to be present on the project site are assigned high, moderate or low paleontological sensitivity ratings (see below). This analysis assumes that if the rock units in the geologic formations which are to be disturbed have a high or moderate potential to contain fossil materials, these formations are considered likely to incur impacts with implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan in locations where undisturbed sediments could be affected.

High Potential Rating. Rock units with a High Potential for significant paleontological resources are known to have yielded vertebrate fossils within the project area or region. This does not necessarily imply that vertebrate fossils will always be recovered from a High Potential rated rock unit, but only that there are recorded occurrences within the unit. A dditional factors that are considered in making a determination pertain to inferred depositional environment and lithology.

Moderate Potential Rating. A Moderate Potential rating is applied to rock units that possess some potential for resource preservation or possessing characteristics of lithologically similar rock units in the area that have yielded vertebrate fossils.

Low Potential Rating. A Low Potential rating is applied to rock units containing lithologies that do not commonly preserve significant fossil resources (e.g., coarse boulder conglomerates, or welded [ignimbrite] volcanic ash deposits). Igneous rocks are precluded from preservation of paleontological resources, due to their genesis within a magmatic environment.

Potential Impacts to Unique Geologic Resources

As indicated in Section 4.4.1.7 above, the SF State campus does not contain unique geologic resources. Therefore, this topic will not be further analyzed in this section.

4.4.2.4 Campus Master Plan Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact CULT-1: Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource through damage or destruction that could occur as a result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development.

Significance: Potentially significant

Mitigation CULT-1A: During the planning and environmental review of specific development projects under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the campus shall follow the following protocol:

- If the project site is within 200 feet of archaeological site P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25, the campus shall conduct subsurface testing in order to determine whether buried archaeological materials are present and if so the extent of the deposit relative to the project's area of disturbance. In the event that an archaeological resource is encountered during subsurface testing, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1B. No surveys or subsurface testing is necessary at project sites in the rest of the campus.
- The campus shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract, which requires that in the event that an archaeological resource is discovered during construction (whether or not an archaeologist is present), all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease, and the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1B below.

Mitigation CULT-1B: For an archaeological site that is encountered during the subsurface testing or during construction, the campus shall:

- Retain a qualified archaeologist to determine whether the resource qualifies as a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource.

- If the resource is determined to be a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource, the qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the campus, shall prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the recovery that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant, and implement the data recovery plan prior to or during development of the site. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the appropriate information center, and provide for the permanent curation of recovered materials.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

Any future campus project under the proposed Campus Master Plan that would disturb site soils or surface features has the potential to result in impacts to archaeological resources of the prehistoric or historic period. Significant resources under CEQA are those that meet CRHR eligibility criteria or are defined as unique under CEQA. If the resource is significant under CEQA, impacts would be significant if the project results in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the resource. Substantial adverse changes to archaeological deposits and features may result from ground disturbance or from increased traffic, erosion, vibrations or other activities that could affect the physical integrity of archaeological deposits or features.

As described in Section 4.4.1.4, there is one known archeological site on campus (P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25), which is described as possible sand midden with some shell and no charcoal. While there are no other known archeological sites on campus, there is a potential that subsurface resources may exist on the campus. The mitigation measures described above (Mitigations CULT-1A and 1B) would ensure that any historical or unique archaeological resources within the area of potential effect (APE) of a given campus project would be identified. An archaeological resource that is identified but that does not qualify as a historical or unique archaeological resource need not be further considered in the process. Impacts to such sites would be less than significant. Similarly, where an archaeological site does not extend into the project's area of potential effect, or where it can be preserved through avoidance, use of a preservation easement or other measures, no impact would occur, or the impact would be less than significant. Where avoidance or substantial preservation in place of a resource is not possible, data recovery and other measures described above would ensure the preservation of the significant information represented by the site. With the implementation of these identification, evaluation and protection measures, the impact on archaeological resource sites would be less than significant.

Impact CULT-2: Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical building or structure, as a result of alteration, removal or demolition of the building, or alteration of the site associated with project development.

Significance: Potentially significant

Mitigation CULT-2A: The campus shall identify all buildings and structures within the project's area of potential effect that will be 50 years of age or older at the time of project construction. If potentially historic structures are present, Mitigation CULT-2B shall be implemented.

Mitigation CULT-2B: Potential historic structures present within the project's area of potential effect will be evaluated as follows:

- (i) Before altering or otherwise affecting a building or structure 50 years old or older, the campus shall retain a qualified architectural historian to record it based on professional standards, and assess its significance under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The evaluation process shall include the development of appropriate historical background research as context for the assessment of the significance of the structure in the history of the California State University system, the campus, and/or the region. For historic buildings, structures or features that do not meet the CEQA criteria for a historical resource, no further mitigation is required.
- (ii) For a building or structure that qualifies as a historic resource, the architectural historian and the campus shall consider measures that would enable the project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to the building or structure. These measures could include preserving a building on the margin of the project site, using it "as is," or other measures that would not alter the building. If the project cannot avoid modifications to a significant building or structure, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-2C.

Mitigation CULT-2C: For a structure or building that has been determined by a qualified architectural historian to qualify as a historical resource, and where avoidance is not feasible, documentation and treatment shall be carried out as described below:

- (i) If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the "Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings" (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).
- (ii) If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography

and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the SF State Library. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.

- (iii) If preservation and reuse at the site are not feasible, the historical building shall be documented as described in item (ii) and, when physically and financially feasible, be moved and preserved or reused.
- (iv) If, in the opinion of the qualified architectural historian, the nature and significance of the building is such that its demolition or destruction cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the structure to be preserved intact. These could include project redesign, relocation or abandonment.

Residual Significance: Significant and unavoidable

As indicated in Table 4.4-1 above, several campus or foundation buildings will be 50 years or older by 2020, which is the planning horizon for the proposed Campus Master Plan. None of these buildings have been evaluated at this time for their historic significance. Buildings that are currently 50 years old or will be that age by 2020 may qualify as historic resources under CEQA criteria, as identified in Section 4.4.2.1 above.

In compliance with Mitigation CULT-2A, for future specific development projects under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the campus will evaluate the project location during initial planning to determine whether a structure over 50 years of age is present and may be affected by the project. If there is a potential for adverse effects, Mitigation CULT-2B would be implemented to evaluate and determine the significance of the historic structure. In most cases, impacts to historical buildings and structures would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through preservation and avoidance. If a construction project cannot avoid modifications to a significant building or structure, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-2C, which requires documentation and/or data recovery of the resource such that the scientifically and historically consequential information from and about the resource would be preserved. In most cases, implementation of these measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. However, CEQA Guidelines (15126.4(b)(2)) note that in some circumstances, documentation of a historical resource will not mitigate the effects of demolition of that resource to a less-than-significant

level. For instance, a historic building could derive exceptional significance because of its associations with a significant event or person not represented elsewhere, or because of exceptional architectural merit or construction. Some values of this kind are not fully preserved through documentation or data recovery. Although the campus would prefer to preserve such a resource where possible, there may be cases in which avoidance or preservation of such a resource is not feasible. If a highly exceptional historical resource cannot be preserved in place, and if the historic values it represents cannot be fully captured through documentation and data recovery, impacts to the resource cannot be fully mitigated. In such cases, Mitigations CULT-2C and 2D would reduce the impact to the extent feasible; however, the impact nonetheless would be significant and unavoidable.

Structures older than 50 years of age have not been evaluated at this time because while they may not qualify as historic structures at this time, their significance could change between now and the time that they are proposed for removal or alteration. Therefore it is possible that some of the site structures could qualify as historic resources in the future and their alteration or removal could represent a significant adverse impact. This EIR therefore conservatively concludes that implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could result in a significant and unavoidable impact on historic resources.

Impact CULT-3: Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Significance: Potentially significant

Mitigation CULT-3A: The campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1 to minimize the potential for disturbance or destruction of human remains in an archaeological context and to preserve them in place, if feasible.

Mitigation CULT-3B: The campus shall provide a representative of the local Native American community an opportunity to monitor any excavation (including archaeological excavation) within the boundaries of a known Native American archaeological site.

Mitigation CULT-3C: In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity will halt immediately and the area of the find will be protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the campus will notify the County of San Francisco Medical Examiner of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures, the campus will ensure that the remains and vicinity of the find are protected against further disturbance. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the campus will comply with the provisions

of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

Mitigation CULT-3D: If human remains cannot be left in place, the campus shall ensure that the qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided an opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains, and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out prior to reinternment. The campus shall provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community, and shall provide an opportunity of local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting. As stipulated by the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the campus shall ensure that human remains and associated artifacts recovered from campus projects on state lands are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

Although no human remains have been encountered during the construction of buildings and other improvements on the campus, development under the proposed Campus Master Plan that includes excavation and grading has the potential to uncover, displace, and destroy human remains. Avoidance of disturbance of archaeological sites may reduce the potential for such impacts. The implementation of Mitigations CULT-3A through 3D will ensure that human remains in archaeological and isolated contexts will be protected from destruction that might result from development, through identification, Native American consultation, preservation in place or recovery, respectful treatment and study, and reinternment. The implementation of the identified measures would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact CULT-4: Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb and destroy significant paleontological resources, if they are located in undisturbed native sediments below the campus.

Significance: Potentially significant

Mitigation CULT-4A: Prior to construction, a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted regarding the likelihood of encountering significant fossils on a given construction site. If the paleontologist determines fossils may be present, a paleontologic monitor shall be present at each excavation that penetrates potentially fossiliferous undisturbed native soil of the Colma Formation that has been identified by the paleontologist as moderately to highly sensitive.

Mitigation CULT-4B: If a monitor is not required, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential paleontological resources and must notify the campus if paleontological resources are found.

Mitigation CULT-4C: If paleontological resources are discovered, all soil disturbing work shall cease within 100 feet of the location. The resources shall be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist who will determine the resource's potential scientific significance. If the find is determined to be significant, or potentially significant, a qualified paleontologist shall design and carry out data recovery consistent with the Standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists. Adequate recordation and recovery would include, at a minimum, the following:

- Development of site-specific environment and contextual information regarding the particular resource.
- Archival research and review of other studies in the area.
- Accurate recordation and excavation of the noted resources.
- In the event that a major significant find is uncovered, prior to excavating the significant resource, the campus shall ensure that an appropriate museum or scientific repository is selected for curation of the recovered materials.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

As indicated in the *Environmental Setting*, there is potential that significant paleontological resources could exist in the Colma Formation that underlies the campus. Given that the Colma Formation has yielded significant vertebrate fossils within the project region, undisturbed sediments of the Colma Formation below the campus are considered to have a high potential for the occurrence of significant paleontological resources. As indicated in Section 4.4.2.3 above, this does not necessarily imply that vertebrate fossils will always be recovered from a high potential-rated rock unit, but only that there are recorded occurrences within the unit elsewhere in the region. Therefore, development under the proposed Campus Master Plan that could result in the disturbance of undisturbed sediments of the Colma Formation has the potential to result in a significant impact on paleontological resources that could exist in this formation. Such disturbance would most likely occur in conjunction with the excavation for a new building foundation in undisturbed sediments. Note that Colma Formation underlies almost the entire campus except the valley where fill is present. The implementation of Mitigations CULT-4A through – 4C above would ensure that any such excavation in undisturbed sediments of the Colma Formation is adequately monitored and that any discovery of fossils is appropriately evaluated, documented, and curated. The implementation of these measures will ensure that impacts to paleontological resources are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.4.2.5 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact CULT-5: Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could contribute to cumulative damage to and/or loss of the resource base of unique archaeological resources and historical resources (including archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures), human remains, and paleontological resources in the City and County of San Francisco.

Significance: Potentially significant

Mitigation CULT-5: The campus shall implement Mitigations CULT-1 through CULT-4.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

The geographic area for the analysis of cumulative impacts on cultural resources is the City and County of San Francisco.

Campus development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, and other development in San Francisco over time would be anticipated to result in some impacts to historical resources, unique archaeological resources, human remain, and paleontological resources. These impacts may be significant if a significant resource is disturbed or destroyed. SF State cultural resources protocols, as stipulated in the mitigation measures provided above, will minimize the impact of development under the proposed Campus Master Plan on these resources, because the campus will carry out a continuing program of investigation, which will in most cases enable the campus to avoid or preserve significant resources, and will appropriately recover data from and document resources that cannot be preserved in place.

While data recovery is acknowledged to be destructive of the physical resource, appropriately designed investigations can be successful in preserving at least part of each discovered site, in reducing physical impacts through project modification, and in recovering substantial new archaeological and cultural information. Historic campus buildings that will be affected by development can be appropriately recorded, moved, and/or adaptively reused if feasible and appropriate. Should human remains be archaeologically recovered, they can be studied to provide archaeological and cultural information, and reinterred, with full consultation with Native American representatives. Should paleontological resources be discovered, they can be adequately recorded and excavated. Overall, the cultural resources protocols described in Mitigation Measures CULT-1 through CULT-4 would, except in rare and exceptional cases, reduce the potential for impacts to significant cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the campus' contribution to the destruction of the cultural resources database in San Francisco will be minimized to the extent feasible. Similarly, the protocols in place for development projects in San Francisco, such as are provided in the CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources (City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, 2004) would also be expected to minimize significant impacts to the cultural resource base associated with construction projects elsewhere in the City. Therefore, it is concluded that the cumulative impact would be less than significant with the protocols in place for development projects on campus and in San Francisco, and the campus' contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.4.3 References

- Beck, W. A. and Y. D. Haase. 1974. *Historical Atlas of California*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- Bennyhoff, James A. 1977. *Ethnogeography of the Plains Miwok*. Center for Archaeological Research at Davis, Publication 5.
- Bethel, John P. (General Editor). 1969. *Webster's Geographical Dictionary*. G. & C. Merriam Co. The Collegiate Press. Menasha, Wisconsin.
- Bolton, Herbert E., ed. 1930. *Anza's California Expeditions*. 5 volumes. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- California Public Utilities Commission. 2002. *PG&E Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Project, Final Environmental Impact Report*, (Application No. A-02-09-043).
- City and County of San Francisco. 2004. *San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16* (CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources).
- Cook, Sherburne F. 1943. The Conflict between the California Indian and White Civilization, I: The Indian Versus the Spanish Mission. *Ibero-Americana 21*. Berkeley.
- Donley, Michael W., Stuart Allan, Patricia Caro, and Clyde P. Patton. 1979. *Atlas of California*. Pacific Book Center, Culver City, California.
- Fredrickson, David A. 1973. Early Cultures of the North Coast Ranges, California. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Davis; Department of Anthropology.
- Gerow, Bert A. and Roland W. Force 1968. An Analysis of the University Village Complex with a Reappraisal of Central California Archaeology. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.
- Hoover, Mildred B., Hero E. Rensch, Ethel G. Rensch, and William N. Abeloe. 1990. *Historic Spots of California*. Revised by Douglas E. Kyle. Stanford University Press. Stanford, California.
- Kemble, John Haskell. 1957. *San Francisco Bay, A Pictorial Maritime History*. Bonanza Books, New York.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington, D.C. [Reprinted by Dover Publications, New York, 1976].
- Levy, Richard. 1978. Costanoan. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 485-495. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8, William G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Moratto, Michael J. 1984. *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.
- Nelson, N.C. 1909. Shellmounds of the San Francisco Bay Region. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 7(4) 310-357. Berkeley.

- Palou, Francisco. 1924. Description of the Indians in the Vicinity of Mission San Francisco, 1976. *San Francisco or Mission Dolores*, by Zephyrin Engelhardt. Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Rodda, Peter et al. 1993. Late Pleistocene Vertebrates from Downtown San Francisco, California. *Journal of Paleontology*, Vol.67, No. 6, pp. 1058-1063.
- Shipley, William F. 1978. Native Languages of California. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 80-90. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8, William G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Western Neighborhoods Project. Information on Stonestown and Villas Parkmerced from <http://www.outsidelands.org>. Accessed November 2006.