

1 3.5 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL

CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL - Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2 3.5.1 Environmental Setting

3 3.5.1.1 Prehistoric Context

4 Prehistoric sites in the Hercules area are generally found along the edge of historic San
 5 Francisco Bay margins, on valley and mid-slope terraces, and in hilly areas in terraces
 6 along seasonal waterways. These margins have been the location of numerous
 7 aboriginal villages and campsites due to the available food resources, which included a
 8 combination of shellfish and fish resources and an environment that attracted birds and
 9 wildlife (City of Hercules 1998). A Cultural Resource Assessment was done for the 2010
 10 Coscol Project, which was located in the same area as this Project (ESA 2009).

11 3.5.1.2 Ethnographic Setting

12 The Project area is within the traditional territory of the Costanoan or Ohlone peoples
 13 (ESA 2009). The Project area is located in the bordering territory of the Chochenyo and
 14 Karkin languages. The ethnographic village closest to the Project area was xučyun
 15 located south of Wildcat Creek southwest of the current Project area. In 1971,
 16 descendants of Costanoan-speaking peoples formed the Ohlone Indian Tribe. Several
 17 confirmed prehistoric sites are within the City and the nearest known prehistoric site is
 18 located near Lone Tree Point. This prehistoric site, CA-CCO-258, a shellmound was
 19 heavily disturbed by the Western Oil Refinery and substantially removed by the
 20 construction prior to 1907 (ESA 2009).

21 3.5.1.3 Historic-period Overview

22 The Spanish first explored Northern California during the latter part of the 18th century.
 23 Lone Tree Point was within the Pinole Rancho, confirmed to M.A.M. de Richardson in

1 1865. The Union Oil Company refinery at Oleum was constructed in 1895; it was the
2 first oil refinery in the County, and the largest of its kind on the coast, in 1897. By 1902
3 the Southern Pacific Railroad (now UPRR) was in place along the Bay shoreline. Office
4 of Historic Preservation data for Contra Costa County show that several properties in
5 the City date back to the late 19th century but these properties are not located on the
6 Project site or in the immediately adjacent area (ESA 2009).

7 A search of the CSLC shipwreck database showed four shipwrecks in the vicinity of the
8 Project site. A submerged cultural resource survey was done of the Pinole shores
9 channel area and the UNOCAL wharf in 1996 (ESA 2009). The remains tentatively
10 identified for the closest shipwreck, the Sagamore, are a few thousand feet west of the
11 former Coscol wharf and appear to be west of the Project site.

12 **3.5.2 Regulatory Setting**

13 Federal and State laws and regulations pertaining to this issue area and relevant to the
14 Project are identified in Table 3-1. Local goals, policies, and/or regulations applicable to
15 this issue area are summarized below.

16 Both City and County General Plan policy is to protect and preserve important
17 archeological, historic and prehistoric resources. On the County's Archeological
18 Sensitivity map, the Project site was excluded from the survey due to the urban nature
19 of the area.

20 **3.5.3 Impact Analysis**

21 ***a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical*** 22 ***resource as defined in § 15064.5?***

23 **No Impact.** A Cultural Resource Sensitivity Assessment was conducted for the Coscol
24 Project in 2010. The Coscol Project was located in the same onshore and offshore
25 areas as the proposed Project, including the first 700 feet of the offshore pipeline trench
26 area (ESA 2009) (see Figure 2-1). The records search conducted by White in 2005
27 indicated that a prehistoric onshore site (CA-CCO-258/P-07-000138) consisting of a
28 heavily disturbed shellmound first recorded in 1907 by N.C. Nelson, and later re-located
29 by Western Anthropological Research in 1998, was present in the Project area (ESA
30 2009). This prehistoric onshore site is not located within the Project boundaries. No
31 historic structures occur onsite. The onshore and offshore work for the Coscol Project
32 did not discover any historic resources. No impact to historic resource is expected from
33 the Project.

34 ***b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological*** 35 ***resource pursuant to § 15064.5?***

1 **Less than Significant Impact.** The onshore work and the first 700 feet of the 2,000
2 feet of offshore work are located in the same area as the Coscol Project (Figure 2-1).
3 While an archeological survey of the remaining 1,300 feet of the Project's offshore area
4 has not been conducted, the recent multi-beam survey work conducted to locate the
5 pipeline shows no evidence of any other unusual bottom features. An archeological
6 record search, which included shipwrecks, completed for the Coscol Project identified
7 that the closest shipwreck, the Sagamore, is expected to be to the west of the Project
8 site (ESA 2009).

9 **c) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or***
10 ***unique geologic feature?***

11 **No Impact.** The Project work onshore would only affect a very limited and highly
12 disturbed area of the shoreline. This would include temporarily relocating approximately
13 55 cubic yards of riprap, cutting and removing a short approximately 20-foot section of
14 pipeline, and grouting the remaining 140 feet of onshore pipeline from the cut end of the
15 pipeline. The proposed offshore pipeline removal would occur only in the upper layers of
16 Bay sediment, and where the pipe is covered it has less than 2 feet of sediment cover
17 (Pacific EcoRisk 2013). The covered portion of the pipeline is located in a previously
18 disturbed area (the pipe was laid into a trench, and the cover over the pipe therefore
19 consists of a combination of disturbed material and sediment that has accreted since
20 the pipeline was installed) (see Figures 1-2 and 1-3). In addition, any other disturbance
21 of the Bay bottom would be limited to the shallow recent sediment. Therefore impacts to
22 unique paleontological resources would not be expected.

23 **d) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal***
24 ***cemeteries?***

25 **No Impact.** The discovery of human remains is unlikely within the Project area because
26 most of the Project work would occur in areas already highly disturbed by the Coscol
27 Project and during the installation of the original MOT and associated pipelines (see
28 Figures 1-3 and 2-1). Since no human remains were found in this area during the
29 Coscol Project in 2010, it is also expected that no human remains would be disturbed.

30 **3.5.4 Mitigation Summary**

31 The Project would not result in significant impacts; therefore, no mitigation is required.