
**Cultural Resources Study for
Glenview Terrace
2880-2890 San Bruno Avenue W. and 850 Glenview Drive
San Bruno, San Mateo County, California**

Eileen Barrow, MA/RPA

June 7, 2019
Revised
September 12, 2019



**Cultural Resources Study for
Glenview Terrace
2880-2890 San Bruno Avenue W. and 850 Glenview Drive
San Bruno, San Mateo County, California**

Prepared by:

Eileen Barrow, MA/RPA

Tom Origer & Associates
Post Office Box 1531
Rohnert Park, California 94927
(707) 584-8200

Prepared for:

Raney Planning & Management, Inc.
1501 Sports Drive, Suite A
Sacramento, California 95834

June 7, 2019
Revised
September 12, 2019

ABSTRACT

Tom Origer & Associates conducted a cultural resources study for Glenview Terrace, located at 2880-2890 San Bruno Avenue W. and 850 Glenview Drive, San Bruno, San Mateo County, California. The study was requested and authorized by Raney Planning & Management, Inc. This study was conducted to meet the requirements of the City of San Bruno and those of the California Environmental Quality Act. The purpose of this report is to identify potential historical resources other than Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code [PRC] 21074 (a)(1)(A)-(B) and discussed in the Regulatory Context section). Tribal Cultural Resources are defined in Public Resources Code [PRC] 21074 (a)(1)(A)-(B).

The proposed project includes the construction of 29 single-family homes on 3.28-acres located at the corner of San Bruno Avenue W. and Glenview Drive. Demolition of the current buildings will be conducted prior to development.

This study included archival research at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, examination of the library and files of Tom Origer & Associates, Native American contact, and field inspection of the study area. No cultural resources were found in the study area.

Synopsis

Project: Glenview Terrace
Location: 2880-2890 San Bruno Avenue W. and 850 Glenview Drive, San Bruno San Mateo County
APN: 019-042-150, 019-042-160, 019-042-170
Quadrangles: Montara Mountain 7.5' series
Study Type: Intensive
Scope: 3.28 acres
Field Hours: 1.5 person hours
NWIC #: 18-2116
TOA #: 2019-036
Finds: None

Key Personnel

Eileen Barrow conducted the fieldwork, conducted the records search at the Northwest Information Center, and authored the report. Ms. Barrow has been with Tom Origer & Associates since 2005. She holds a Master of Arts in cultural resources management from Sonoma State University. Ms. Barrow's experience includes work in compliance with local ordinances, the California Environmental Quality Act, the National Environmental Protection Act, and Section 106 (National Historic Preservation Act) requirements. Her professional affiliations include the Society for American Archaeology, the Society for California Archaeology, the California Historical Society, and the Sonoma County Historical Society. She is also listed on the Register of Professional Archaeologists (#989269).

Vicki R. Beard provided her architectural historian expertise for this project. Ms. Beard has been with Tom Origer & Associates since 1990 and holds a Master of Arts in cultural resources management with an emphasis in historical resources and meets the Secretary of the Interior's standards for archaeology, history, and architectural history. Graduate coursework and applied studies included building and structure evaluation, and historical research. Post-graduate work has been completed in historical architecture through the Architecture Department at the University of California Berkeley; heritage resource management at the University of Nevada, Reno; and architectural history and historic landscapes through the National Preservation Institute, Alexandria, Virginia. Professional affiliations include the Society of Architectural Historians, Northern California Chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians, and Vernacular Architecture Forum. She is also listed on the Register of Professional Archaeologists (#10634).

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
Synopsis.....	i
Key Personnel.....	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
REGULATORY CONTEXT.....	1
Resource Definitions	2
Significance Criteria.....	2
PROJECT SETTING.....	3
Study Area Location and Description	3
Cultural Setting.....	5
STUDY PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS.....	8
Native American Contact	8
Native American Contact Results.....	9
Archival Research Procedures.....	9
Archival Research Findings.....	10
Field Survey Procedures.....	10
Field Survey Findings.....	11
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
Archaeological Recommendations	11
Built Environment Recommendations.....	11
Accidental Discovery	12
SUMMARY.....	12
MATERIALS CONSULTED.....	13
APPENDIX A: Native American Contact	

FIGURES

Figure 1. Project vicinity	1
Figure 2. Study area location.	4
Figure 3. Overview photo of the study area, facing southeast.....	5

TABLES

Table 1. North Bay/San Francisco Bay Area Chronology.....	7
Table 2. Studies within a Quarter-mile of the Study Area.....	10

INTRODUCTION

This report describes a cultural resources study for Glenview Terrace, located at 2880-2890 San Bruno Avenue W. and 850 Glenview Drive, San Bruno, San Mateo County, California. The study was requested and authorized by Raney Planning & Management, Inc. This study was conducted to meet the requirements of the City of San Bruno and those of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposed project includes the construction of 29 single-family homes on part of the 3.28-acres located at the corner of San Bruno Avenue W. and Glenview Drive. Demolition of the current buildings is proposed as part of this project. Documentation pertaining to this study is on file at Tom Origer & Associates (File No. 2019-036).

REGULATORY CONTEXT

The State of California requires that cultural resources be considered during the environmental review process. This process is outlined in CEQA and accomplished by an inventory of resources within a study area and by assessing the potential that historical resources could be affected by development. The term “Historical Resources” encompasses all forms of cultural resources including prehistoric and historical archaeological sites and built environment resources (e.g., buildings, bridges, canals), that would be eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register). An additional category of resources is defined in CEQA under the term “Tribal Cultural Resources” (Public Resources Code Section 21074). They are not addressed in this report because Tribal Cultural Resources are resources that are of specific concern to California Native American tribes, and knowledge of such resources is limited to tribal people. Pursuant to CEQA, as revised in July 2015, such resources are to be identified by tribal people in direct, confidential consultation with the lead agency (PRC §21080.3.1).



Figure 1. Project vicinity (adapted from the 1980 San Francisco 1:250,000-scale USGS map).

This cultural resources study was designed to satisfy environmental issues specified in the CEQA and its guidelines (Title 14 CCR §15064.5) by: (1) identifying historical resources within the project area; (2) offering a preliminary significance evaluation of the identified cultural resources; (3) assessing resource vulnerability to effects that could arise from project activities; and (4) offering suggestions designed to protect resource integrity, as warranted.

Resource Definitions

Historical resources are classified by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) as sites, buildings, structures, objects and districts, and each is described by OHP (1995) as follows.

Site. A site is the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure.

Building. A building, such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar construction, is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. “Building” may also be used to refer to a historically and functionally related unit, such as a courthouse and jail, or a house and barn.

Structure. The term “structure” is used to distinguish from buildings those functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating human shelter.

Object. The term “object” is used to distinguish from buildings and structures those constructions that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed. Although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is associated with a specific setting or environment.

District. A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

Significance Criteria

When a project might impact a cultural resource, the project proponent is required to conduct an assessment to determine whether the impact may be one that is significant. Consequently, it is necessary to determine the importance of resources that could be impacted. The importance of a resource is measured in terms of criteria for inclusion on the California Register. A resource may be important if it meets any one of the criteria, or if it is already listed on the California Register or a local register (Title 14 CCR, §4852).

An important resource is one which:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, eligibility for the California Register requires that a resource retains sufficient integrity to convey a sense of its significance or importance. Seven elements are considered key in considering a property's integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

The OHP advocates that all resources over 45 years old be recorded for inclusion in the OHP filing system (OHP 1995:2), although the use of professional judgment is urged in determining whether a resource warrants documentation.

PROJECT SETTING

Study Area Location and Description

The study area lies within the northern portion of the Santa Cruz Mountains, which are part of the Southern Coast Ranges. The Santa Cruz Mountains are generally a northwest/southeast trending range that parallels the Pacific Ocean to the west. The San Andreas Fault runs through a portion of the mountains and created a series of sag ponds; many of which were dammed to create larger man-made reservoirs. San Andreas Lake, which is less than a half-mile south of the study area, is one of these reservoirs. The vegetation within nearby Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco State Game Refuge, and other local parks has a mélange of vegetation which includes grassland, coastal scrub, and mixed evergreen forest; it is likely that, prior to development, the study area would have supported the growth of one or more of these plant communities (Buechel and Wagner 1996). This part of California features a Mediterranean climate with warm dry summers and cool, wet winters. San Bruno Creek is the closest source of natural freshwater and it is located 110 meters northeast of the northeastern end of the study area.

The study area is located at 2880-2890 San Bruno Avenue W. and 850 Glenview Drive (APN 019-042-150, 019-042-160, 019-042-170), San Bruno, San Mateo County, as shown on the Montara Mountain 7.5' USGS topographic map (Figure 2). This part of San Mateo County remained undeveloped until the 1950s when residential development began to expand from along San Francisco Bay up into the hills and mountains to the west. Currently the property consists of two vacant parcels, and a third parcel which contains a single-family residence and a church. Figure 3 provides a current overview of the study area.

The study area consists of 3.28 acres situated mostly on generally level land with the eastern portion of the study area having a steep slope. The generally level portion of the study area has an overall percent slope of less than 5%.

The geology of the study area consists of sheared rock of the Franciscan Complex which was formed during the Cretaceous and Jurassic periods (201.3 to 65.5 million years ago to present) (Pampeyan 1994).



Figure 2. Study area location (adapted from the 1997 Montara Mountain and the 1980 San Francisco South 7.5' USGS topographic maps).



Figure 3. Overview photo of the study area, facing southeast.

Soils within the study area belong to the Candlestick-Kron-Buriburi complex, Urban land, and Urban land-orthents (Kashiwagi and Hokholt 1991: Sheet 5). Candlestick-Kron-Buriburi soils are well-draining, sandy, gravelly loams found on coastal uplands. In a natural state, these soils support the growth of grasses, coastal brush, and forbs. Historically, parcels containing Candlestick-Kron-Buriburi soils were used for recreational development, wildlife or watershed habitat, and some homesite development (Kashiwagi and Hokholt 1991:22). Urban land is considered to be land where more than 85 percent is covered by asphalt, concrete, buildings, and other structures. The portion of the study area that contains this soil classification is approximately the west half of the study area.

Cultural Setting

Prehistory

The concept of prehistory refers to the period of time before events were recorded in writing and varies worldwide. Because there is no written record, our understanding of California prehistory relies on archaeological materials and oral histories passed down through generations. Early archaeological research in this area began with the work of Max Uhle and Nels Nelson. Uhle is credited with the first scientific excavation in California with his work at the Emeryville Shellmound in 1902, and Nelson spent several years (1906 to 1908) surveying the San Francisco Bay margins and California coast for archaeological sites. In the 1930s, archaeologists from Sacramento Junior College and the University of California began piecing together a sequence of cultures primarily based on burial patterns and ornamental artifact from sites in the lower Sacramento Valley (Lillard *et al.* 1939; Heizer and Fenenga 1939). Their cultural sequence became known as the Central California Taxonomic System (CCTS), which identified three culture periods termed the Early, Middle, and Late Horizons, but without offering date ranges. Refinement of the CCTS became a chief concern of archaeologists as the century progressed with publications by Richard Beardsley (1948, 1954) and Clement Meighan (1955) based on materials excavated by the University of California archaeological survey.

In 1973, David Fredrickson synthesized prior work, and in combination with his own research, he developed a regional chronology that is used to this day, albeit modified for locality-specific

circumstances. Fredrickson's scheme shows that native peoples have occupied the region for over 11,000 years (which is supported by Erlandson *et al.* 2007), and during that time, shifts took place in their social, political, and ideological regimes (Fredrickson 1973). While Fredrickson's chronology was adopted by many archaeologists, Beardsley's cultural sequence was adopted by others creating a roughly North Bay-South Bay division in usage.

In an effort to bridge the differences between chronologies, Milliken *et al.* (2007: Figure 8.4) presented a concordance for comparing time periods, cultural patterns, and local variations for the San Francisco Bay Area. Milliken included Dating Scheme D, as presented by Groza in 2002, which is a refinement of previous radiocarbon-based temporal sequences for the San Francisco Bay Area. More recently, Byrd, Whitaker, Mikkelsen, and Rosenthal (2017) called upon archaeologist to abandon previous temporal sequences in favor of Scheme D, further refined in Groza *et al.* 2011. Table 1 assimilates Scheme D, Fredrickson's (1973) chronology, and the obsidian hydration dating scheme from Origer (1987). Note that the Early, Middle, Late Horizon scheme is still evident though refinements have been made within those categories.

Early occupants appear to have had an economy based largely on hunting, with limited exchange, and social structures based on the extended family unit. Later, milling technology and an inferred acorn economy were introduced. This diversification of economy appears to be coeval with the development of sedentism and population growth and expansion. Sociopolitical complexity and status distinctions based on wealth are also observable in the archaeological record, as evidenced by an increased range and distribution of trade goods (e.g., shell beads, obsidian tool stone), which are possible indicators of both status and increasingly complex exchange systems.

These horizons or periods are marked by a transition from large projectile points and millingslabs, indicating a focus on hunting and gathering during the Early Period, to a marine focus during the Middle Period evidenced by the number of shellmounds in the Bay Area. The Middle Period also saw more reliance on acorns and the use of bowl-shaped mortars and pestles. Acorn exploitation increased during the Late Period and the bow and arrow were introduced.

Prehistoric archaeological site indicators expected to be found in the region include but are not limited to: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements such as slabs and hand-stones, and mortars and pestles; and locally darkened midden soils containing some of the previously listed items plus fragments of bone, shellfish, and fire affected stones.

Table 1. North Bay/San Francisco Bay Area Chronology

Temporal Period ¹	Approximate Time Range ¹	~ Hydration Interval (μ) ²	Scheme D Periods ³	Approximate Time Range ⁴	~ Hydration Interval (μ) ⁵
Historical	< A.D. 1800	<1.20	Historic Mission	A.D. 1835 to A.D. 1770	1.10 - 1.27
Upper Emergent	A.D. 1800 to A.D. 1500	1.21 - 1.84	Late 2	A.D. 1770 to A.D. 1520	1.28 - 1.80
Lower Emergent	A.D. 1500 to A.D. 1000	1.85 - 2.58	Late 1b	A.D. 1520 to A.D. 1390	1.81 - 2.02
			Late 1a	A.D. 1390 to A.D. 1265	2.03 - 2.22
			Middle/Late Transition	A.D. 1265 to A.D. 1020	2.23 - 2.55
			Middle 4	A.D. 1020 to A.D. 750	2.56 - 2.88
Upper Archaic	A.D. 1000 to 500 B.C.	2.59 - 4.05	Middle 3	A.D. 750 to A.D. 585	2.89 - 3.06
			Middle 2	A.D. 585 to A.D. 420	3.07 - 3.23
			Middle 1	A.D. 420 to 200 B.C.	3.24 - 3.80
			Early/Middle Transition	200 B.C. to 600 B.C.	3.81 - 4.13
Middle Archaic	500 B.C. to 3000 B.C.	4.06 - 5.72	Early	600 B.C. to 2100 B.C.	4.14 - 5.18
Lower Archaic	3000 B.C. to 6000 B.C.	5.73 - 7.23			
Paleo-Indian	6000 B.C. to 8000 B.C.	7.24 - 8.08+			

¹ based on Fredrickson (1994)

² based on Napa Glass Mountain rate by Origer (1987)

³ based on Groza *et al.* (2011)

⁴ based on Groza *et al.* (2011) and Byrd *et al.* (2017)

⁵ based on Origer (1987) and EHT value from the vicinity of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County

Ethnography

Linguists and ethnographers tracing the evolution of languages have found that most of the indigenous languages of the California region belong to one of five widespread North American language groups (the Hokan and Penutian phyla, and the Uto-Aztecan, Algic, and Athabaskan language families). The distribution and internal diversity of four of these groups suggest that their original centers of dispersal were outside, or peripheral to, the core territory of California, that is, the Central Valley, the Sierra Nevada, the Coast Range from Cape Mendocino to Point Conception, and the Southern California coast and islands. Early in time, the Hokan phylum can plausibly be traced back to populations inhabiting parts of this region; however, between four and six thousand years ago Penutian speakers began to make their way into the Sacramento-San Joaquin River area from the Sierra Mountains (Moratto 2004). Between two and four thousand years ago, Penutian speakers inhabited the entire San Francisco Bay Area (Moratto 2004).

At the time of European settlement, the study area was situated within the area controlled by the Ramaytush linguistic group of the Ohlone/Costanoan (Levy 1978). The Ohlone/Costanoan were hunter-gatherers who lived in rich environments that allowed for dense populations with complex social structures (Kroeber 1925). They settled in large, permanent villages about which were distributed seasonal camps and task-specific sites. Permanent villages were occupied throughout the year and satellite sites were visited to procure particular resources that were especially abundant or only seasonally available. Sites often were situated near fresh water sources and in ecotones where plant life and animal life were diverse and abundant. For more information about the Ohlone/Costanoan see Bean (1994), Margolin (1978), Milliken (1995), and Teixeira (1997).

History

Historically, the study area lies within the Buri Buri land grant. Rancho Buri Buri was officially granted to José Antonio Sanchez in 1835, though he may have received it as early as 1827 (Cowan 1977:21; Hoover *et al.* 1966:402). The rancho was confirmed to his heirs (José de la Cruz Sanchez and others) in 1872. By 1894, maps show the study area under the ownership of D. O. Mills (Bromfield 1894, 1910).

Darius Ogden Mills was a merchant and banker whose estate, known as Mill's Brae, once included elaborate gardens and a 42-room mansion. Mills was once the richest man in the state. After his death in 1910, his lands remained in the family for several years which is likely why this part of San Bruno and San Mateo County remained undeveloped until the 1950s (Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration 2011:463; Postel 2014:8).

Historic period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps).

STUDY PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

Native American Contact

A request was sent to the State of California's Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) seeking information from the Sacred Lands File and the names of Native American individuals and groups that would be appropriate to contact regarding this project. Letters were also sent to the following groups:

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista

Costanoan Ohlone Rumsen-Mutsun Tribe
Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area
The Ohlone Indian Tribe

This contact does not constitute consultation with tribes.

Native American Contact Results

The NAHC replied with a letter dated May 14, 2019, which indicated that the Sacred Lands File has no information about the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. No other comments have been received as of the date of this report. A log of contact efforts is appended to this report, along with copies of correspondence (see Appendix A).

Archival Research Procedures

Archival research included examination of the library and project files at Tom Origer & Associates. This research is meant to assess the potential to encounter archaeological sites and built environment within the study area. Research was also completed to determine the potential for buried archaeological deposits.

A review (NWIC File No. 18-2116) was completed of the archaeological site base maps and records, survey reports, and other materials on file at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park by Eileen Barrow on May 2, 2019. Sources of information included but were not limited to the current listings of properties on the National Register of Historic Places, California Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, and California Points of Historical Interest as listed in the OHP's *Historic Property Directory* (2012).

The OHP has determined that structures in excess of 45 years of age could be important historical resources, and former building and structure locations could be important archaeological sites. Archival research included an examination of 19th and 20th-century maps and aerial photographs to gain insight into the nature and extent of historical development in the general vicinity, and especially within the study area.

Ethnographic literature that describes appropriate Native American groups, county histories, and other primary and secondary sources were reviewed. Sources reviewed are listed in the "Materials Consulted" section of this report.

A model for predicting a location's sensitivity for buried archaeological sites was formulated by Byrd *et al.* (2017) based on the age of the landform, slope, and proximity to water. A location is considered to have the highest sensitivity if the landform dates to the Holocene, has a slope of five percent or less, is within 150 meters of fresh water, and 150 meters of a confluence. Note: the Holocene Epoch is the current period of geologic time, which began about 11,700 years ago, and coincides with the emergence of human occupation of the area. A basic premise of the model is that archaeological deposits will not be buried within landforms that predate human colonization of the area. Calculating these factors using the buried site model (Byrd *et al.* 2017:Tables 11 and 12), a location's sensitivity will be scored on a scale of 1-10 and classed as follows: lowest (<1); low (1-3); moderate (3-5.5); high (5.5-7.5); highest (>7.5).

Archival Research Findings

Archival research found that the study area had not been previously subjected to a cultural resources study. Two studies have been conducted adjacent to the study area and eight within a quarter-mile of the study area (Table 2). There are no cultural resources recorded within a quarter-mile of the study area.

Table 2. Studies within a Quarter-mile of the Study Area

Author	Date	S#
Brown et al.	2003	27930
Dowdall	1991	12769
Dowdall	1991	13225
Huster et al.	2004	29704
Melandry	1980	5398
Moratto	1971	4876
Moratto	1974	4877
Panich et al.	2009	36836
Spillane	2014	46397
Whitacker	2011	37886

There are no reported ethnographic sites within one mile of the study area (Levy 1978)).

A review of 19th and 20th-century maps shows no buildings within the study area until 1968 when two buildings are shown along San Bruno Avenue W. (Bromfield 1894, 1910; GLO 1864; USACE 1939; USGS 1896, 1899, 1915, 1949, 1956, 1968). Review of aerial photos shows that these two buildings were present by 1965. The eastern building was demolished prior to 1993 and the western building was demolished in 2003 (GoogleEarth 2019). The house within the study area was built in 1990 according to county records.

Although not indicated on 19th and 20th-century maps, aerial photos show church was constructed within the study area between 1956 and 1965. Review of city directories shows that it was constructed prior to 1959 (FrameFinder 1965; R.L. Polk & Co. 1959; USGS 1956). Based on limited archival research, it appears that the church was often utilized as a Lutheran church. The 1959 city directory for San Bruno shows a listing for Church of the Resurrection. Later, Peace Lutheran Church occupied the building for many years. The last ecclesiastical group to own the church was Church of the Highland, though it does not appear they ever had services on-site.

Based on landform age, our analysis of the environmental setting, and incorporating Meyer and Kaijankoski (2017) analysis of sensitivity for buried sites, there is a very low potential (<1.0) for buried archaeological site indicators within the study area.

Field Survey Procedures

An intensive field survey was completed Eileen Barrow on May 27, 2019. Less than two person-hours were spent in the field and field conditions were precipitous. Surface examination consisted of walking in 15-meter transects and a hoe was used, as needed, to expose the ground surface. Ground visibility ranged from excellent to poor, with vegetation, asphalt, buildings, and steep conditions being the

primary hindrances. An approximately 10,000 square foot area at the very eastern end of the study area was unsurveyable due to dense vegetation and steep slopes.

Field Survey Findings

Archaeology

No archaeological site indicators were observed during the course of the survey.

Built Environment

As previously mentioned, the buildings that fronted onto San Bruno Avenue W. have been demolished. Only a few chunks of concrete, a brick, and some broken glass were noted in this portion of the study area.

A house and a church are found within the study area. County records indicate the house was constructed in 1990. It is a single-story gabled building with an attached garage.

The church is a rectangular building with shallow wings on the north and south sides of the building. The roof is gabled and there is a gabled addition on the rear (east side). The windows on the north and south sides of the building are tall, narrow, and grouped by five. The windows on the addition on the rear of the building consist of two tall, narrow, fixed side-by-side panes. Below the fixed panes are two short rectangular panes that swing outward to allow for ventilation. It appears there may have been a round, stained-glass window on the front (west side of the building), but this opening has been boarded over. The main entrance was through double-doors on the south side of the building.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Field survey found no archaeological sites within the study area. Based on the geologic landform upon which the study area lies, there is a very low potential for there to be buried archaeological site indicators within the study area.

The house is too recently constructed to be considered important under CEQA. The church meets the age requirements of CEQA; however, architecturally it is a very simple design and there are no overt features that suggest a mid-twentieth century style. In addition, limited research shows that the church was owned by at least three Lutheran church groups; none of which are particularly known historically.

Archaeological Recommendations

No recommendations are warranted.

Built Environment Recommendations

The house within the study area is too recently constructed to be considered important under CEQA; therefore, no further recommendations are required.

The church does not appear to be associated with any important events or people who would have contributed to local, California, or United States history; therefore, it does not appear to be eligible for Criteria 1 or 2 of the California Register. The building is of simple design and does not embody

characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; therefore, it does not appear eligible for Criterion 3 of the California Register. Criterion 4 is typically utilized for determining the importance of archaeological sites; the church is not eligible under Criterion 4.

Because the church building does not appear to meet criteria for inclusion on the California Register, no further recommendations are warranted.

Accidental Discovery

In keeping with the CEQA guidelines, if archaeological remains are uncovered, work at the place of discovery should be halted within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds (§15064.5 [f]). Prehistoric archaeological site indicators include: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements (e.g., slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles); bedrock outcrops and boulders with mortar cups; and locally darkened midden soils. Midden soils may contain a combination of any of the previously listed items with the possible addition of bone and shell remains, and fire-affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps).

The following actions are promulgated in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d) and pertain to the discovery of human remains. If human remains are encountered, excavation or disturbance of the location must be halted in the vicinity of the find, and the county coroner contacted. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner will contact the NAHC. The NAHC will identify the person or persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent makes recommendations regarding the treatment of the remains with appropriate dignity.

SUMMARY

Tom Origer & Associates completed a cultural resources study for Glenview Terrace, located at 2880-2890 San Bruno Avenue W. and 850 Glenview Drive, San Bruno, San Mateo County, California. The study was requested and authorized by Raney Planning & Management, Inc. This study was conducted to meet the requirements of the City of San Bruno and with CEQA requirements. No cultural resources were found within the study area and therefore no resource-specific recommendations are warranted. Documentation pertaining to this study is on file at the offices of Tom Origer & Associates (File No. 2019-036).

MATERIALS CONSULTED

Barbour, M. and J. Major, ed.

1988 *Terrestrial Vegetation of California*. California Native Plant Society.

Bean, L. J.

1994 *The Ohlone Past and Present: Native Americans of San Francisco Bay Region*. Series ed. Sylvia Brakke Vane, Ballena Press Anthropological Papers no. 42: Menlo Park.

Beardsley, R.

1948 Culture Sequences in Central California Archaeology. In *American Antiquity* Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 1-28.

1954 *Temporal and Areal Relationships in Central California Archaeology*. Reports of the University of California Archaeological Survey 24-25. Berkeley, California.

Bromfield, D.

1894 *Official map of San Mateo County, California*. Schmidt Label & Lith. Co. San Francisco.

1910 Official map of San Mateo County, California. Britton & Rey. San Francisco.

Brown, K., A. Marlow, J. Allan, and W. Self

2003 *Cultural Resource Assessment of Alternative Routes for PG&E's Jefferson-Martin Transmission Line, San Mateo County, California*. Document S-27930 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.

Buechel, S. and A. Wagner

1996 *Map Showing Vegetation in San Mateo County, California*. Miscellaneous Investigations Series Map I-1257-N. U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey. Denver, Colorado.

Byrd, B., A. Whitaker, P. Mikkelsen, and J. Rosenthal

2017 *San Francisco Bay-Delta Region Context and Research Design for Native American Archaeological Resources Caltrans District 4*. On file at the Caltrans District 04 Office of Cultural Resource Studies, Oakland, California.

Byrd, B., A. Whitaker, P. Mikkelsen, J. Rosenthal, J. Meyer, and P. Kaijankoski

2017 Discovering Sites: Geoarchaeological Approaches to Site Sensitivity and Predictive Modeling. In, *San Francisco Bay-Delta Region Context and Research Design for Native American Archaeological Resources Caltrans District 4*. B. Byrd, A. Whitaker, P. Mikkelsen, and J. Rosenthal. Pp 4-1 through 4-13. On file at the Caltrans District 04 Office of Cultural Resource Studies, Oakland, California.

Cowan, R.

1977 *Ranchos of California: A List of Spanish Concessions 1775-1822 and Mexican Grants 1822-1846*. Academy Library Guild, Fresno, California.

Department of Parks and Recreation

1976 *California Inventory of Historical Resources*. State of California, Sacramento.

Dowdall, K.

1991 *Department of Transportation Negative Archaeological Survey Report District 04, County SM, Route 35, Post Mile 23.6/24.3, Charge Unit 4336-13503K, EA 910076*. Document S-12769 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.

1991 *Department of Transportation Negative Archaeological Survey Report District 04, County SM, Route 35, Post Mile 22.8/24.9, Charge Unit 4336-13503K*. Document S-13225 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.

Erlandson, J., T. Rick, T. Jones, and J. Porcasi

2007 One if by Land, Two if by Sea: Who Were the First Californians? In: *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*. (pp 53-62) T. Jones and K. Klar, editors. AltaMira Press. Lanham, MD.

Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration

2011 *San Francisco in the 1930s: The WPA Guide to the City by the Bay*. University of California Press. Berkeley.

Fredrickson, D.

1973 *Early Cultures of the North Coast Ranges, California*. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

1984 The North Coastal Region. In *California Archaeology*, edited by M. Moratto. Academic Press, San Francisco.

General Land Office (GLO)

1864 *Plat of the Rancho Buri Buri*. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Golla, V.

2007 Linguistic Prehistory. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity* edited by T. Jones and K. Klar, pp. 71-82. Alta Mira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Groza, R.

2002 An AMS Chronology for Central California *Olivella* Shell Beads. Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California.

Groza, R., J. Rosenthal, J. Southon, and R. Milliken

2011 A Refined Shell Bead Chronology for Late Holocene Central California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 31(2):13-32.

Heizer, R. and F. Fenenga

1939 Archaeological Horizons in Central California. *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 41, pp. 378-399.

Hoover, M., H. Rensch, E. Rensch, and W. Abeloe

1966 *Historic Spots in California*. 3rd edition. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Hoover, M., H. Rensch, E. Rensch, W. Abeloe, and D. Kyle

1990 *Historic Spots in California*. 4th edition. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

2002 *Historic Spots in California*. 5th edition. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Huster, S., N. Kaptain, and B. Matzen

2004 *A Cultural and Paleontological Resources Study for the Skycrest Project, San Bruno, San Mateo County, California*. Document S-29704 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.

Kashiwagi, J., and L. Hokholt

1991 *Soil Survey of San Mateo County, Eastern Part, and San Francisco County, California*. U.S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the University of California Agricultural Experiment Station.

Kroeber, A.

1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 78, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Levy, R.

1978 Costanoan. In *California* edited by R. Heizer, pp. 485-495. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, W. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Lillard, J., R. Heizer, and F. Fenenga

1939 *An Introduction to the Archaeology of Central California*. Sacramento Junior College Department of Anthropology, Bulletin 2, pp. 93, figs. 20 and map, pls. 31).

Margolin, M.

1978 *The Ohlone Way*. Heyday Books, Berkeley, California.

Meighan, C.

1955 *Archaeology of the North Coast Ranges, California*. Reports of the University of California Archaeological Survey No. 30. University of California, Berkeley.

Melandry, M.

1980 *Archaeological Survey Report, Excess Parcels on Rescinded Route 380, San Mateo County, 04452-911038*. Document S-5398 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.

Meyer, J. and J. Rosenthal

2007 *Geoarchaeological Overview of the Nine Bay Area Counties in Caltrans District 4*. Document S-33600 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.

Milliken, R.

1995 *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area 1769-1810*. Series ed. Thomas Blackburn, Ballena Press Anthropological Papers no. 43: Menlo Park.

Milliken, R., R. Fitzgerald, M. Hylkema, R. Groza, T. Origer, D. Bieling, A. Leventhal, R. Wiberg, A. Gottsfeld, D. Gillette, V. Bellifemine, E. Strother, R. Cartier, and D. Fredrickson

2007 Punctuated Cultural Change in the San Francisco Bay Area. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn Klar, pp. 99-124. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Moratto, M.

- 1971 Letter report regarding the completion of an archaeological Reconnaissance of the proposed freeway route 380 between the Coast Highway and Skyline Blvd. Document S-4876 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.
- 1974 Letter report regarding the final report of the archaeological reconnaissance of proposed Route 380, between Hwy. 280 on the east and Hwy. 1 on the west. Document S-4877 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.
- 1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, San Francisco.
- 2004 *California Archaeology*. 2nd. Addition. Academic Press, San Francisco.
- Munz, P. and D. Keck
 1973 *A California Flora and Supplement*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Office of Historic Preservation (OHP)
 1995 *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*. California Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento.
- 2012 *Historic Property Directory*. Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento.
- Origer, T.
 1987 *Temporal Control in the Southern North Coast Ranges of California: The Application of Obsidian Hydration Analysis*. Papers in Northern California Anthropology, Number 1, Berkeley.
- Pampeyan, E.
 1994 *Geologic Map of the Montara Mountain and San Mateo 7-1/2' Quadrangles, San Mateo County, California*. File <https://pubs.usgs.gov/imap/2390/plate-1.pdf>, accessed on May 27, 2019.
- Panich, L., J. Holson, and A. Vanderslice
 2009 *Historic Context and Archaeological/Architectural Survey Report for the Habitat Reserve Program, Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Tuolumne Counties, California*. Document S-36836 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.
- Postel, M.
 2014 San Bruno before the Gold Rush. In, *La Peninsula: The Journal of the San Mateo Historical Associates*. Vol. xlii, No. 2 pp.4-8.
- R.L. Polk & Co.
 1959 Polk's San Bruno (San Mateo County, Calif.) City Directory. R.L. Polk & Co., Publishers. Los Angeles.
- Spillane, T.
 2014 *Archaeological Overview and Assessment: Indigenous Sites of the GGNRA, 2014*. Document S-46397 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.
- Teixeira, L.
 1997 *The Costanoan/Ohlone Indians of the San Francisco and Monterey Bay Area: A Research Guide*. Ballena Press: Menlo Park.

United States Army Corps of Engineers

1939 San Mateo, California tactical map. War Department, Washington, D.C.

United States Geological Survey

1896 San Mateo, California. 15' series map. Geologic Survey, Washington, D.C.

1899 San Mateo, California. 15' series map. Geologic Survey, Washington, D.C.

1915 San Mateo, California. 15' series map. Geologic Survey, Washington, D.C.

1949 Montara Mountain. 7.5' series map. Geologic Survey, Washington, D.C.

1956 Montara Mountain. 7.5' series map. Geologic Survey, Washington, D.C.

1968 Montara Mountain. 7.5' series map. Geologic Survey, Washington, D.C.

Whitaker, A.

2011 Letter report regarding the Sneath Substation Expansion and Fiber Optic Line Connection. Document S-37886 on file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.

APPENDIX A

Native American Contact

Copies of Correspondence

**Native American Contact Efforts
Glenview Terrace, San Bruno, San Mateo County**

Organization	Contact	Action	Results
Native American Heritage Commission		Letter 5/6/19	A response was received which indicated that the Sacred Lands File has no information about the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. A list of additional contacts was provided.
Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista	Irenne Zwierlein	Letter 5/20/19	No response received as of the date of this report.
Costanoan Ohlone Rumsen-Mutsun Tribe	Patrick Orozco	Letter 5/20/19	No response received as of the date of this report.
Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe	Tony Cerda	Letter 5/20/19	No response received as of the date of this report.
Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan	Ann Marie Sayers	Letter 5/20/19	No response received as of the date of this report.
Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area	Charlene Nijmeh	Letter 5/20/19	No response received as of the date of this report.
The Ohlone Indian Tribe	Andrew Galvan	Letter 5/20/19	No response received as of the date of this report.

Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

1550 Harbor Blvd., Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95691
(916) 373-3710
(916) 373-5471 – Fax
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search

Project: Glenview Terrace
County: San Mateo

USGS Quadrangles
Name: Montara Mountain
Township T4S Range R5W Section(s) MDBM (within the Buri Buri land grant)

Date: May 6, 2019
Company/Firm/Agency: Tom Origer & Associates
Contact Person: Eileen Barrow

Address: P.O. Box 1531
City: Rohnert Park Zip: 94927
Phone: (707) 584-8200 Fax: (707) 584-8300
Email: eileen@origer.com

Project Description: The project proponent is obtaining permits from the City of San Bruno for the construction of single-family residences on 3.28-acres of land.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION
Cultural and Environmental Department
1550 Harbor Blvd., Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95691
Phone: (916) 373-3710
Email: nahc@nahc.ca.gov
Website: <http://www.nahc.ca.gov>



May 14, 2019

Eileen Barrow
Tom Origer & Associates

VIA Email to: eileen@origer.com

RE: **Glenview Terrace Project**, City of San Bruno; Montara Mountain USGS Quadrangle,
San Mateo County, California.

Dear Ms. Barrow:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information you have submitted for the above referenced project. The results were negative. The absence of specific site information in the SLF does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated; if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call or email to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we can assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gayle Totton".

Gayle Totton, B.S., M.A., Ph.D.

Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

**Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
San Mateo County
5/14/2019**

***Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of
Mission San Juan Bautista***

Irenne Zwielerlein, Chairperson
789 Canada Road
Woodside, CA, 94062
Phone: (650) 851 - 7489
Fax: (650) 332-1526
amahmutsuntribal@gmail.com

Costanoan

***Costanoan Ohlone Rumsen-
Mutsun Tribe***

Patrick Orozco, Chairman
644 Peartree Drive
Watsonville, CA, 95076
Phone: (831) 728 - 8471
yanapvoic97@gmail.com

Costanoan

***Costanoan Rumsen Carmel
Tribe***

Tony Cerda, Chairperson
244 E. 1st Street
Pomona, CA, 91766
Phone: (909) 629 - 6081
Fax: (909) 524-8041
rumsen@aol.com

Costanoan

***Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of
Costanoan***

Ann Marie Sayers, Chairperson
P.O. Box 28
Hollister, CA, 95024
Phone: (831) 637 - 4238
ams@indiancanyon.org

Costanoan

***Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe
of the SF Bay Area***

Charlene Nijmeh, Chairperson
20885 Redwood Road, Suite 232
Castro Valley, CA, 94546
Phone: (408) 464 - 2892
cnijmeh@muwekma.org

Costanoan

The Ohlone Indian Tribe

Andrew Galvan,
P.O. Box 3388
Fremont, CA, 94539
Phone: (510) 882 - 0527
Fax: (510) 687-9393
chochenyo@AOL.com

Bay Miwok
Ohlone
Patwin
Plains Miwok

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Glenview Terrace Project, San Mateo County.

Tom Origer & Associates

Archaeology / Historical Research

May 20, 2019

Irene Zwierlein
Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista
789 Canada Road
Woodside, CA 94062

RE: Glenview Terrace Project, 2880 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno, San Mateo County

Dear Ms. Zwierlein:

I am writing to notify you of a proposed project within City of San Bruno, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. The project proponent is obtaining permits from the City of San Bruno for the construction of single-family residences on 3.28-acres of land. The City of San Bruno is reviewing the project for California Environmental Quality Act compliance.

This letter serves as notification of the project and does not constitute consultation.

Enclosed is a portion of the Montara Mountain, Calif. 7.5' USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,



Eileen Barrow
Senior Associate

Tom Origer & Associates

Archaeology / Historical Research

May 20, 2019

Ann Marie Sayers
Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
P.O. Box 28
Hollister, CA 95024

RE: Glenview Terrace Project, 2880 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno, San Mateo County

Dear Ms. Sayers:

I am writing to notify you of a proposed project within City of San Bruno, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. The project proponent is obtaining permits from the City of San Bruno for the construction of single-family residences on 3.28-acres of land. The City of San Bruno is reviewing the project for California Environmental Quality Act compliance.

This letter serves as notification of the project and does not constitute consultation.

Enclosed is a portion of the Montara Mountain, Calif. 7.5' USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,



Eileen Barrow
Senior Associate

Tom Origer & Associates

Archaeology / Historical Research

May 20, 2019

Charlene Nijmeh
Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area
20885 Redwood Road, Suite 232
Castro Valley, CA 94546

RE: Glenview Terrace Project, 2880 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno, San Mateo County

Dear Ms. Nijmeh:

I am writing to notify you of a proposed project within City of San Bruno, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. The project proponent is obtaining permits from the City of San Bruno for the construction of single-family residences on 3.28-acres of land. The City of San Bruno is reviewing the project for California Environmental Quality Act compliance.

This letter serves as notification of the project and does not constitute consultation.

Enclosed is a portion of the Montara Mountain, Calif. 7.5' USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,



Eileen Barrow
Senior Associate

Tom Origer & Associates

Archaeology / Historical Research

May 20, 2019

Tony Cerda
Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
240 E. 1st Street
Pomona, CA 91766

RE: Glenview Terrace Project, 2880 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno, San Mateo County

Dear Mr. Cerda:

I am writing to notify you of a proposed project within City of San Bruno, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. The project proponent is obtaining permits from the City of San Bruno for the construction of single-family residences on 3.28-acres of land. The City of San Bruno is reviewing the project for California Environmental Quality Act compliance.

This letter serves as notification of the project and does not constitute consultation.

Enclosed is a portion of the Montara Mountain, Calif. 7.5' USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,



Eileen Barrow
Senior Associate

Tom Origer & Associates

Archaeology / Historical Research

May 20, 2019

Patrick Orozco
Costanoan Ohlone Rumsen-Mutsun Tribe
644 Peartree Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076

RE: Glenview Terrace Project, 2880 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno, San Mateo County

Dear Mr. Orozco:

I am writing to notify you of a proposed project within City of San Bruno, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. The project proponent is obtaining permits from the City of San Bruno for the construction of single-family residences on 3.28-acres of land. The City of San Bruno is reviewing the project for California Environmental Quality Act compliance.

This letter serves as notification of the project and does not constitute consultation.

Enclosed is a portion of the Montara Mountain, Calif. 7.5' USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,



Eileen Barrow
Senior Associate

Tom Origer & Associates

Archaeology / Historical Research

May 20, 2019

Andrew Galvan
The Ohlone Indian Tribe
P.O. Box 3388
Fremont, CA 94539

RE: Glenview Terrace Project, 2880 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno, San Mateo County

Dear Mr. Galvan:

I am writing to notify you of a proposed project within City of San Bruno, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. The project proponent is obtaining permits from the City of San Bruno for the construction of single-family residences on 3.28-acres of land. The City of San Bruno is reviewing the project for California Environmental Quality Act compliance.

This letter serves as notification of the project and does not constitute consultation.

Enclosed is a portion of the Montara Mountain, Calif. 7.5' USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,



Eileen Barrow
Senior Associate

