

## 4.8 Cultural and Historical Resources

This section addresses potential impacts associated with cultural resources as a result of buildout of proposed land uses and implementation of programs proposed as part of the proposed Plan. This section was prepared with the assistance of Applied Earthworks, Inc.

This section takes into account proposed Plan policies, development standards, and programs that are intended to minimize potential adverse environmental effects. To address potentially significant impacts that are not minimized to less than significant by the Plan components, additional mitigation measures are proposed that minimize, reduce, or avoid these adverse environmental effects. These measures, if adopted, would become additional Plan development standards.

### 4.8.1 Setting

Cultural resources provide both tangible and intangible links with the historic and prehistoric past. They are valued as symbols of our shared history and group identity, as memorials to historical events and individuals, and for their scientific, aesthetic, and economic importance. Cultural resources include but are not limited to buildings and structures, archaeological and historical sites, rural historic landscapes, traditional cultural properties, tribal cultural resources, and traditional tribal cultural places. Such resources amplify the local population's sense of community, enhance perceptions and enjoyment of the community by residents and visitors, provide a measure of the physical quality of life in the community, and are an important element of the tourist economy. Because many sensitive cultural resources are associated with the coastal bluffs and streams, the issue of sea level rise threatens the integrity of these resources through coastal erosion and flooding. Sea level rise is also addressed in Sections 4.2, Transportation; 4.6, Biological Resources; 4.7, Flooding and Water Resources; and 4.13, Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

#### 4.8.1.1 Regional and Local Prehistory

The Gaviota Coast is located in an area that has been used and inhabited during multiple eras by Native American, Spanish, Mexican, and American people. The Plan Area contains significant cultural resources, many of which remain intact and well preserved.

#### Prehistory

The earliest human presence in the Santa Barbara Channel region dates to the period beginning sometime around 12,000 years ago, within the terminal Pleistocene and early Holocene (Erlandson 1994). Data regarding subsistence and settlement patterns during this remote phase of prehistory have been distorted by geomorphological processes and sea level changes that have destroyed, buried, or inundated sites from this era (Erlandson 1994). Based on available data, paleocoastal sites tend to be situated on elevated landforms, perhaps

reflecting proximity to oak forests (Rogers 1929), defensive logistics (King 1980), or avoidance of unstable lower-elevation landforms (Erlandson 1985, 1994).

Beginning shortly after 9,000 years ago, archaeological sites are characterized by abundant metates and manos (grinding slabs and handstones) — the milling stones for which the Millingstone Horizon is named (Erlandson 1993). These ground stone implements have been interpreted as evidence for a focus on seeds and other plant materials, and may imply increased storage of food between seasons (Glassow 1996). Although Millingstone Horizon sites reflect substantial variability across the region, subsistence remains appear to generally reflect a comparatively broad diet, incorporating most major faunal categories, plant foods, and shellfish (Glassow 1996; Glassow et al. 1988). Estuarine shell species are very common in sites of this age along the western channel coast and appear to have been more important than other animal food sources (Erlandson 1991, 1994; Warren 1968).

Shell beads are present in cemetery contexts on the order of 7,000 years old—within King's Early Period—although it was not until much later in prehistory that they became more common (Glassow 1996; King 1990). These early bead types in the channel area include modified *Olivella* sp., *Dentalium* sp., and *Cypraea spadica* whole shells; rectangular beads of *Olivella*, *Mytilus*, and *Haliotis*; clam disks; and stone cylinders (King 1990). Several types of double-perforated rectangular and circular ornaments and pendants fashioned from *Haliotis* spp. also are associated with early contexts (King 1990:30).

Settlements during the Millingstone Horizon tended to be at higher points of elevation within the coastal plains and foothills, and included larger base camps occupied for relatively long periods as well as short-term camps (Erlandson 1993). Mortuary traditions practiced during this period indicate that social status was determined by an individual's own accomplishments rather than on inherited or ascribed social standing (Erlandson 1993; Glassow 1996; King 1990). Millingstone occupations also lack evidence for other indicators of cultural complexity.

Comparatively few archaeological sites are associated with the period from 6,500 to 5,000 years ago, perhaps reflecting a time of scarce food supply brought about by lengthy dry climate conditions (Glassow 1996). Around 5,000 years ago, population appears to rebound, accompanied by the appearance of different milling equipment—the mortar and pestle—believed to be better suited for processing acorns and other larger, fleshier seeds. Manos and metates became less common, although they continued to be used. Side- or corner-notched projectile points, likely used as dart tips with the throwing stick (atlatl), appear after 5000 Before Present (B.P.) and are more abundant than were projectile points during the preceding period (Glassow 1996). Population densities and reliance on acorns, marine fish, and mammals appears to increase steadily from 5000 to 3000 B.P. (Glassow 1996). During this time, asphaltum came into common use as a basketry sealant and mastic for attaching basket hoppers to mortars and dart points to shafts (Glassow 1997).

The pattern of increased populations, intensification of subsistence practices, diversification in the food resource base, and technological elaboration appears to have accelerated beginning around 3000 or 2500 Before Present (B.P.). Hunting and fishing appear to have increased in importance (Glassow 1996).

At approximately the same time—around 3,000 years ago—changes in mortuary distributions of specific bead and ornament types have been cited as evidence of the beginnings of profound social changes. King (1990:95–96) postulates that circa 3000 B.P. the formerly egalitarian social traditions such as age- and achievement-based status, roughly equivalent wealth distribution, and socially diffuse religious knowledge began to give way to a more strongly centralized and stratified society characterized by inherited concentration of wealth, status, and religious knowledge within smaller segments of the social group. This emergence of ascribed status sometime between 3,000 and 2,550 years ago has been challenged by other researchers who argue that its first appearance, along with craft specialization and other hallmarks consistent with heightened social and political complexity, occurred some 800 years ago (Arnold 1991, 1992).

Several significant developments occurred beginning circa 3000 B.P. and continuing through 800 years ago. The single-piece shell fishhook (King 1990; Strudwick 1985) appears roughly concurrently with an increase in diversity of fish species composing the subsistence base. Fishing and sea mammal hunting increased steadily during this time (Lambert and Walker 1991; Walker and DeNiro 1986). Beginning around 2100 B.P., shell beads are manufactured in increasing numbers, particularly in the notably higher proportions of *Olivella* disk and oval beads relative to modified whole shell *Olivella* beads such as the spire- or spire-and-base ground beads that dominated earlier assemblages (King 1990:99, Graphs 1 and 2). By the end of the period, the bone-barbed harpoon, bow and arrow, and the plank canoe or *tomol* had all come into use (Glassow 1996).

Subsistence intensification is apparent beginning around *Anno Domini* (A.D.) 1150 in the increased contribution of fish to the Chumash diet. More effort was expended in netting smaller schooling fish, in addition to use of hook-and-line and harpooning techniques suggestive of a response to increased population-resource pressure. Shellfish and marine mammals continued to be taken, but their importance decreases compared to fish. Acorns achieve a prominent subsistence role in coastal sites, as implied by the rarity of manos and metates and increased investment in careful shaping of mortars (Glassow 1996).

Evidence from the archaeological record clearly implicates changing environmental conditions—in addition to growing populations and the resulting increased pressure on subsistence and other resources—as notable influences on changing Chumash social and cultural practices. Both shorter- and longer-term variations in overall health have been observed. Early prehistoric populations exhibit generally better overall health and lower rates of infectious disease and violent injuries than later populations (Walker 1989; Walker and Johnson 1992). Traumatic injuries increase through time, a trend believed to be related to increased population-resource pressures and resultant increased violent conflicts (Lambert 1993, 1994; Walker 1989; Walker

et al. 1989). Shorter-term periods of environmental perturbation appear to correlate with higher incidence of infectious disease and traumatic injuries indicative of violent conflict (Lambert 1994; Walker and Lambert 1989). Unfavorable climate conditions and introduction of the bow and arrow, both beginning circa A.D. 500, are associated with increased signs of interpersonal violence in channel populations (Walker et al. 1989).

### **Protohistoric Period**

The October 1542 arrival of the Cabrillo expedition in the Santa Barbara Channel marks the beginning of the 227-year period of limited direct European contact referred to as the Protohistoric Period. Among the few additional direct contacts between Europeans and the Chumash were visits by Pedro de Unamuno in 1587, Sebastián Cermeño in 1595, and Sebastián Vizcaíno in 1602–1603 (Walker and Johnson 1992). Additional undocumented visits by Manila galleons or privateers also may have occurred (Johnson et al. 1982; Walker and Johnson 1992). Both the limited direct contacts and indirect contacts via exchange networks through the southwestern United States and northern Mexico may have introduced European infectious diseases into the Chumash population several decades before Cabrillo's arrival (Erlandson and Bartoy 1995; Walker and Hudson 1993; Walker and Johnson 1992; Walker et al. 1989).

Observations recorded by Cabrillo and his crew provide valuable information regarding village locations, demographics, and cultural practices of the Chumash. These descriptions are an important information source for the contact-era cultural overview that follows.

### **Contact-Era Chumash**

Much of the descriptive richness of contact-era Chumash culture and society has been gleaned from ethnohistoric accounts by early European visitors and missionaries. Despite the inarguably biased and very much partial nature of these descriptions, from Cabrillo's October 1542 expedition onward, they provide a record of many traditions and practices only poorly preserved (if at all) in the archaeological record. Memory ethnographies collected during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries provide additional clues regarding Chumash society, traditions, and lifeways.

The Chumash at the time of contact inhabited villages and towns of coastal and inland areas extending from the Santa Monica Mountains in the south to Paso Robles in the north as well as the Northern Channel Islands. Early Spanish expeditions to the Santa Barbara Channel area encountered heavily populated villages along the Santa Barbara/Goleta coast, some with as many as 800-1,000 residents. Structures included sweat lodges (*temescals*) and hemispherical semisubterranean houses built of pole and thatch and oriented in rows along streets. Communal dance areas, cemeteries, and other features provide additional hallmarks of village layouts (Erlandson 1993; Gamble 1991). Other towns were significantly smaller than the populous villages flanking Goleta Slough. Interior mainland areas were more sparsely populated, although several larger communities existed in these areas as well (Johnson 1988). Other important

differences in subsistence practices, social and political organization, and other cultural features existed among the different zones within Chumash territory.

Chumash culture included a rich array of subsistence foods, heavily marine-oriented along the coast; well-developed technology and elaborate crafts; and an active exchange system linking island, mainland coast, and interior zones. Strings of shell beads served as a means for storing value and were used as a standard of exchange throughout the region. These beads were manufactured virtually exclusively by specialist artisans on the Northern Channel Islands who obtained the small, standardized chert bead drills from other island specialists.

In addition to its obvious utility in open-ocean fishing and transportation of people and materials, the ocean-going plank canoe, or *tomol*, figured prominently in this regional exchange system as it provided the critical means for cross-channel transportation between island bead makers and mainland populations (Arnold 2001).

The material culture of the Chumash included a wide array of finely made ornaments and bead types used in a variety of social, economic, and political contexts. Charmstones, effigies, and other objects used in ritual and ceremonial contexts; and utilitarian items such as fishing nets, woven mats, baskets, shell and bone fishhooks, cooking slabs (some imported from Catalina Island), digging stick weights, projectile points, and many others. Well-made stone bowls, mortars, and other utilitarian objects were sometimes decorated with asphaltum inlaid with shell beads.

Chumash political traditions were centered on permanent, largely autonomous, named towns. Ethnohistoric accounts identify hereditary political leaders by village; some towns had none, while others had more than one. The strength of intervillage ties varied and apparently depended at least in part on the town's size, geographical position relative to trade routes and social networks, and the level of personal influence wielded by individual political leaders. Shifting patterns of intervillage animosities also are recorded, and the concomitant shifting patterns of intervillage alliances suggests "some kind of cohesiveness among some towns and evidence for hegemony of certain chiefs over a number of towns" (Johnson and McLendon 1999:29–35). "Only the largest Chumash towns possessed individuals who were recognized as chiefs. Smaller villages, although largely independent from a subsistence standpoint, appear to have looked to the chiefs of larger towns for leadership in certain political and ceremonial spheres" (Johnson 2001:54).

Despite cultural and linguistic relatedness, no term equivalent to "Chumash" existed which encompassed the collective residents of the entire region. Rather, the general demographic term Chumash came into use during the twentieth century, when Kroeber (1925) extended its linguistics-derived use to one based on geographical territory (McLendon and Johnson 1999).

## **Euro-American History**

Euro-American history begins with the overland expedition of Gaspar de Portolá in 1769 to expand the New Spanish Empire into Alta California (Graesch 2001). The expedition arrived in Goleta on 18 August 1769 and observed somewhere between five and seven Chumash villages flanking Goleta Slough. Following a trail that would later become the primary route linking the northern and southern California missions, the explorers passed through what is now the Santa Barbara Airport and camped a short distance west where they were visited by many residents of the surrounding towns seeking to trade with them before the expedition continued west along the coast. Friar Juan Crespi in the expedition noted that

The country along the road is extremely delightful, abounding with pasture and covered with live oaks, willows and other trees, giving signs of its being a very fruitful land, capable of producing whatever one might wish to plant (Brown 2001).

In 1776, this route was used by the Anza expedition, with settlers, soldiers, and missionaries on their way to colonize San Francisco, which led to the founding of the San Francisco Presidio and the Mission San Francisco de Asis (Bradley 2005). On February 25, the expedition camped at the near Goleta Slough just east of the Gaviota Coast Community Plan Area. On the 26th they traveled around the slough and continued for about 6.5 leagues (roughly 22 miles) west, mostly along the beach, where they camped at Ranchería Nueva. On the following day, they continued westward for about 10 leagues (roughly 34 miles) and camped at Ranchería del Cojo before turning northwest and passing out of the Plan Area and onto what is now Vandenberg Air Force Base (AFB; <http://www.anzahistorictrail.org>). Today, the 1,200-mile route is designated the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail.

### **4.8.1.2 Regional and Local History**

#### **Mission Period**

The first Spanish settlements along the Santa Barbara Channel were founded in 1782 at the Santa Barbara Presidio. Starting in 1806, Mission Santa Barbara began a decline that culminated with secularization of mission holdings in 1834. Settlers and entrepreneurs from the United States and other countries began to arrive in the Santa Barbara area as early as the 1820s. “The men became citizens of Mexico and converts to Catholicism, and adopted the manners of their host country. They were allowed to settle permanently and become the beneficiaries of land grants” (King 1982:45). Secularization of Mission Santa Barbara in 1834 followed on the heels of Mexican independence.

In 1794, José Francisco Ortega was granted the 26,529-acre Rancho Nuestra Señora Del Refugio, the only land grant in the Plan Area while under Spanish rule. Ortega was the first Commandant of the Santa Barbara Presidio. Long and narrow, his Rancho extended west from Refugio Canyon to Cojo (east of Point Conception). After establishing headquarters at the eastern end of the property in 1794—one of the earliest Spanish settlements in California—the

Ortega family raised crops, cattle, and horses (EDAW 2002). A large portion of the current Gaviota Coast Community Plan Area is comprised of the former Rancho Refugio.

In the late 1830s and early 1840s, the Mexican government issued five land grants in what is now the Gaviota Coast Community Plan Area. To the east and only partly in the Plan Area was Rancho Dos Pueblos, granted to Nicholas Den (a naturalized Mexican) in 1842. Den married Rosa Hill, who was related to the Ortega family. Immediately west of Rancho Dos Pueblos was Rancho Cañada Del Corral, 8,876 acres that were granted to José Dolores Ortega (one of José Francisco Ortega's grandsons) in 1841. It was entirely within the Plan Area. North of José Francisco Ortega's Rancho Nuestra Señora Del Refugio, and entirely inland, was Rancho Las Cruces, which was granted in 1837 to Miguel Cordero and encompassed 8,888 acres. It was entirely within the Plan Area. To the west, and inland, was Rancho San Julian. Only the southwestern part of the property was within the Plan Area. Rancho San Julian encompassed 48,222 acres and was granted in 1837 to José de la Guerra y Noriega. The westernmost land grant was Rancho Punta de la Concepcion, which covered 24,992 acres and was granted to Anastacio Carrillo in 1837. Only the eastern portion of this property was within the Gaviota Coast Community Plan Area. Some buildings associated with these early land grants are still standing today, such as the Pedro Baron Adobe at Arroyo Quemado, the Ortega Adobe in Arroyo Hondo, and the Pico Adobe on Rancho del Cielo (Santa Barbara County 2013e).

### **Anglo-European Period**

Increasing numbers of settlers arriving from the eastern United States contributed to a series of territorial conflicts between the United States and Mexican governments. The United States assumed control over Alta California at the end of the Mexican War in 1848 according to the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The population continued to climb, spurred by the gold rush, and the territory was incorporated into the United States in 1850 as the thirty-first state (Erlandson 1993). In 1856, a lighthouse was erected at Point Conception to aid the increased shipping traffic entering the Santa Barbara Channel (Santa Barbara County 1993).

Cattle ranching flourished during this period, with as many as 500,000 cattle in Santa Barbara County during the 1850s. However, severe droughts during the 1860s decimated cattle herds and less than 5,000 cattle remained in the entire county. The combination of drought and change in government from Mexico to the United States caused substantial changes in land ownership. By 1851, approximately 42 percent of the land grants were owned by non-Mexicans; by 1864, after a few years of drought, 90 percent of the southern California ranchos were mortgaged (Palmer 1999). Ranchos in what is now the Gaviota Coast Community Plan Area were not immune as they were, to varying degrees, subdivided and sold. Buyers were often prominent families in the Santa Barbara area and included the Dibblee, Hollister, Lobero, Cordero, Orella, Hazard, Baron, Edwards, Welch, Rutherford, Doty, Dreyfus, Bishop, Cooper, and Storke families (EDAW 2002). Agriculture continued under the new owners, including grazing sheep and cattle, but diversified by raising fruit trees, wheat, and row crops such as vegetables and corn.

Early overland travel was primarily via the El Camino Real, which originally followed the coast for the length of the Plan Area. After the Mission Santa Inés was established in 1804, the route shifted inland and crossed the mountains at Refugio Pass to reach Santa Ynez. By the mid-1820s the inland portion was routed through Gaviota Pass, following the road used today. In 1861 the El Camino Real was made a county road and was used as a stage route to San Francisco (Santa Barbara County 1993).

As populations grew, so did the need for better access to markets for agricultural products. Prior to the 1870s, goods were floated to and from ships anchored offshore. One of the locations used for transferring goods and people was the Gaviota Landing at the current Gaviota State Park. Between 1871 and 1875, a wharf was constructed at Gaviota Landing by Hollister and Dibblee, under the supervision of Miguel Burke, to facilitate shipping (Guinn 1902; Mason 1883). It supplemented the Stearns Wharf built in 1872 in Santa Barbara. By the turn of the century, transferring goods by ship was declining as construction of the Southern Pacific Railroad reached Santa Barbara County from the south in 1887 and reached Surf (on what is now Vandenberg AFB) from the north in 1896. Due to difficult terrain, the gap between Santa Barbara and Surf was not completed until 1901 (Santa Barbara County 1993).

Naples received its name in 1887 from John H. Williams and his wife who were wealthy travelers and had dreams to build a world-class hotel called the Crescent Beach Hotel and a planned community called Naples-by-the Sea, based on its similarity in appearance to Naples, Italy. California was in the midst of a real estate boom, sparked by the completion of the Southern Pacific Railroad when Williams bought 900 acres of ocean front real estate with the intent of begin developing Naples Townsite. However, the economic downturn shortly after caused the major delay of the coastal railroad completion. As a result, the progress and success of the Williams' dream of a bustling hotel and social community had failed due to the lack of a major transportation link to bring construction supplies and visitors (Mogduno 2014).

The Railroad was completed after the death of Williams and Naples slowly started to resemble a small rural community, but never turned into a successful development along the Gaviota Coast. Meanwhile, a hotel resort in downtown Santa Barbara had attained the fame the Williams family dreamed of, which led to development of the Montecito community (Mogduno 2014). In 2008, the Naples Townsite (Santa Barbara Ranch) project has received preliminary County approval for 71 residential estates. In 1896, the Alcatraz Company purchased property at what is now the Gaviota Marine Terminal to process asphaltum and the oil industry began in the Plan Area. The Alcatraz Landing was constructed and by 1902 crude oil was being refined (Santa Barbara County 2013e), providing an exception to the agricultural based economy in the Gaviota Coast Community-Plan Area.

As the automobile developed in popularity, the Santa Barbara County road system developed correspondingly. In 1916, the Coast Highway was built largely following the El Camino Real (Santa Barbara County 1993) from Goleta west to Gaviota before turning north through the Gaviota Pass. The modern Highway 101 follows much the same route. These highways substantially reduced the role that the railroad played in the local economy.



~~Like many California cities, a Chinatown began to develop into a small community in downtown Santa Barbara in the late 1800s. Santa Barbara's Chinese population worked as a variety of professions including cooks, laborers, housekeepers, fishermen, merchants, and business owners. Chinatown comprised of a three-block area of what is now Canon Perdido Street and was once a main tourist attraction (Graffy 2010). However, Chinatown lost its architectural influence after the 1925 earthquake with community efforts to rebuild and establish the old Spanish style architecture in downtown Santa Barbara that remains prevalent today.~~

A portion of the Plan Area had an interesting role during World War II. German prisoners of war (POW) captured in Europe and North Africa were housed in camps across the United States, including Camp Cooke near Lompoc (what is now Vandenberg AFB). Camp Cooke distributed POWs to various branch camps, including the Goleta Camp located near Gato Creek at Edwards Ranch (Las Varas Ranch). It was activated in October 1944 and held as many as 302 prisoners in addition to the staff of two officers and 30 enlisted men. Prisoners were used as agricultural laborers. Goleta Camp was closed in December 1945 and all the buildings except a water tank tower were removed in the 1970s (Nye and Cole 2009).

Beginning in 1946, a substantial development boom associated with the post-World War II era greatly affected Santa Barbara County, much like other parts of California and the rest of the nation. Although the population did increase, farming and ranching continued to be the primary economic activity within the Plan Area. By the early 1950s, the city of Santa Barbara, Goleta, and Santa Maria had experienced exponential growth. During this period, the Plan Area experienced minimal change when compared with these urban areas due to its continued agricultural use. However, the natural beauty of the coast attracted recreational uses both private and public. New parks, campgrounds, and recreation areas were developed in tandem with the county's growth.

In 1943, the Bixby Ranch Company donated 23.5-acres of land north of Point Conception for the creation of a county park. Santa Barbara County established Jalama Beach County Park with campgrounds and day-use picnic areas. El Capitan State Beach and Gaviota State Park were acquired by California State Parks in 1953. In 1959, the state acquired additional land surrounding Refugio Cove and created the Refugio State Beach. All three state-owned recreation areas include campground sites, day-use facilities, walking trails, and concessions. Gaviota State Park also includes a pier and boat launch. Canada del Leon, Canada San Onofre, Canada del Molino, Canada de Guillermo, Corral Beach, and Phillips Tajiguas West are additional beach sites managed by California State Parks. There are no improvements at these sites. A privately owned recreation resort, El Capitan Canyon Resort, opened to the north of El Capitan State Beach in 1970. The Baron Ranch, Arroyo Hondo Preserve, and Los Padres National Forest provide additional recreational opportunities such as hiking, bicycling, and nature preserves. The recreational and agriculture uses of the Gaviota Coast foster the retention of the area's open, rural landscapes.

### 4.8.1.3 Prior Cultural Resources Studies and Recorded Cultural Sites

The Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) at the University of California, Santa Barbara identified at least 425 cultural resource investigations that have been completed in the Gaviota Coast Community Plan Area. Investigations range from small, simple surveys to identify archaeological resources to large, complex endeavors associated with undertakings such as utility installations. Those efforts have identified more than 260 archaeological sites, 7 historical resources, and 425 isolated artifacts in the Gaviota Coast Plan Area. The CCIC also identified 7 seven historical resources eligible for listing or listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and/or the California Historic Landmarks list. Prior cultural resource investigations and their findings only include studies on file at the CCIC.

Archaeological and sensitive Native American site locations are should not be included in copies of reports for general distribution. Archaeological site locations are exempt from the California Public Records Act, as specified in Government Code 6254.10, and from the Freedom of Information Act (Exemption 3), under the legal authority of both the NHPA (PL 102-574, Section 304[a]) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (PL 96-95, Section 9[a]). As such, this summary does not include details identifying the locations of eligible or potentially eligible archaeological sites and isolated artifacts in the Gaviota Coast Plan Area.

Too many sites are recorded to summarize individually but recorded archaeological sites include those encompassing both the pre-contact and post-contact eras. Pre-contact archaeological sites range from dense shell middens reflecting the remains of intense occupations of substantial duration—such as found at a village—to a few pieces of chipping debris that reflect a single episode of tool resharpening. Most aspects of pre-contact settlement systems can be found within the Plan Area, including villages where people spent a substantial amount of time and where some people, such as the elderly, may have spent most of their time; long-term residences where occupants spent weeks or months procuring seasonal resources; short-term residences where people spent a few days during seasonal rounds; and locations where resources were hunted or gathered in conjunction with residences located elsewhere. Residential sites (villages, and both short and long-term residences) tend to be near water (both fresh water and the ocean); but their locations correlate more with the locations of resources than with water.

Post-contact archaeological sites in the Plan Area generally must be 50 years old to be considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places Program (NPS 2015). Remains associated with settlement are common, particularly among the older post-contact sites. These remains include not only ruins of residences and associated outbuildings but also features such as aqueducts, rock walls (fences), and line shacks that may be great distances from the residences. Agricultural-related remains can be found, including those associated with barns, sheepherder camps, water systems, orchards, and vineyards. Post-contact sites also include transportation-related features, such as trails, early roads, and wharfs. Sites associated with resource extraction (such as mining asphaltum) are also present. Refuse scatters, such as trash dumps, are commonly associated with all of these site types.

## Santa Barbara County Historical Landmarks and Places of Historic Merit

The Gaviota Coast Community Plan Area contains one property listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and one listed California Historical Landmark. The County Historical Landmarks Advisory Commission (HLAC) has designed two properties within the Plan Area as Santa Barbara County Landmarks (SBCL) and one property as a Santa Barbara County Place of Historic Merit (SBCPHM). In addition, ~~seven~~six properties in the Plan Area are considered historical resources through survey evaluations. These properties are listed in Table 4.8-1 and further described below.

Location	Name	Construction Date	Description	Eligibility Status
Point Conception	Point Conception Light Station	1881, 1912	Six building, water tank, and two navigational aids	Listed on the NRHP
1.5 miles northwest of Gaviota	Gaviota Pass	Event took place in 1846	Site	Listed California Historical Landmark No. 248
12000 Calle Real, Cañada del Corral	Orella Adobes	circa 1790 circa 1841	Residence Schoolhouse	SBCL No. 32
Southwest corner Highway 101 & 1	Las Cruces Adobe	circa 1860	Adobe building	SBCL No. 36; eligible NRHP
Near Gaviota Pass on Highway 101	Vista del Mar School	1927	Spanish Colonial Revival School	SBCPHM
10 Refugio Road, Refugio State Beach	Refugio Beach Palm Trees	1929-1950	Landscape Architecture	NRHP eligible based on survey evaluation
10 Refugio Road, Refugio State Beach	Rutherford Beach Residence 1 & 2	Circa 1931	2 bungalows	NRHP eligible based on survey evaluation
State Route 101 Post mile 40.91	Arroyo Hondo Bridge No. 510027Y	1918	Open spandrel, concrete arch bridge	NRHP eligible based on survey evaluation
State Route 101 Post mile 39.75	Arroyo Quemada Bridge No. 510028L	1917	Open spandrel, concrete arch bridge	NRHP eligible based on survey evaluation
State Route 101 Post mile 47.19	Gaviota Gorge Tunnel No. 510172R	1953	Tunnel through mountain at Gaviota Pass	NRHP eligible based on survey evaluation
<u>13800 Calle Real</u>	<u>El Rancho Taiiguas</u>	<u>1924</u>	<u>Revival Hacienda style ranch house</u>	<u>Eligible for listing as a County Place of Historic Merit based on survey evaluation</u>
Highway 101 between Las Llagas & Las Varas creeks.	Las Varas Ranch	1880-1959	Eight residential and agricultural buildings are contributing	NRHP eligible as rural historic landscape based survey evaluation

<sup>1</sup>Resources that are listed or that have been formally evaluated and determined to be eligible for listing.

SOURCE: Applied Earthworks, Inc. 2015

The **Point Conception Light Station** is the only property within the Plan Area listed on the NRHP. The light station includes the following: Keepers dwelling with light tower (constructed 1881), coalhouse (circa 1881), water tank (1881), family quarters (1912), caretaker quarters, three-car garage, powerhouse, foghorn, and navigational visual aid. In addition to the buildings

and structures that comprise the station, the property also contains several historic and prehistoric archaeological sites. The property is operated and managed by the United States Coast Guard.

The **Gaviota Pass**, California Historical Landmark Number 248 marks the site of an averted Mexican-American War battle that furthered the American capture of the Presidio of Santa Barbara. The marker plaque describing the historic event is located at the northbound Highway 101 rest stop, 1.5 miles north of Gaviota.

Designated Santa Barbara County Landmark No. 32, the **Orella Adobes** consist of two adobe buildings: a schoolhouse constructed circa 1841 and a dwelling constructed between 1790 and 1840. José Dolores Ortega and family resided on the property prior to receiving the Rancho Cañada del Corral grant in 1841. The Ortega family utilized the land for cattle ranching, and the schoolhouse was reportedly constructed to validate the grant. Following the 1863–1864 drought, Bruno F. Orella leased the rancho from the Ortega family; he purchased the property in 1872. Orella operated a mercantile business in Santa Barbara, but the family primarily resided at the rancho. Bruno's daughter Elena Orella Covarrubias inherited the adobes in 1901 and oversaw the remodel of both buildings into the Spanish Colonial Revival architectural style in the early 1930s. The buildings are currently vacant and inaccessible.

Designated Santa Barbara County Landmark No. 36, the **Las Cruces Adobe** is located on San Julian Road near the southwest intersection of Highway 101 and State Route 1. The building rests on Rancho Las Cruces, land granted to Santa Barbara Presidio soldier Miguel Cordero in 1837. Although initially the abode served as a family dwelling, the building subsequently functioned as a stagecoach stop, post office, general store, restaurant, and bar. The State of California purchased the land surrounding the adobe in 1967 for inclusion in Gaviota State Park.

Constructed in 1927, the **Vista del Mar School** is designated as a Santa Barbara County Place of Historic Merit for its representation of the Spanish Colonial Revival architecture. The schoolhouse building was constructed to serve the newly consolidated Vista del Mar Union School District formed from four rural school districts. The building is located along northbound Highway 101, east of the Gaviota pass.

The **Refugio Beach Palm Trees and Nelson Rutherford Residences** are located at Refugio State Beach. Based on a NRHP survey evaluation, the Palm Trees and two residential buildings were found significant under Criteria A and B for their association with pioneering soil conservationist Nelson Rutherford and his attempt to develop a private beach resort at Refugio Cove from 1928 to 1950. In 1950, the State of California purchased the property, which would later be incorporated into the larger Refugio State Beach recreational area.

The Plan Area contains three historic structures on Highway 101 that have been found eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion C for their significant engineering accomplishments. Constructed in 1917, the **Arroyo Quemada Bridge** is 341 feet long and consists of two reinforced concrete open spandrel arches with reinforced concrete approach spans on two

column piers. Completed in 1919, the **Arroyo Hondo Bridge** is 530 feet long and constructed of reinforced concrete with eleven open spandrel arches. The Arroyo Hondo Bridge was preserved in situ when the highway was realigned in 1984. Located on northbound Highway 101, the **Gaviota Gorge Tunnel** cuts through 420 feet of the mountain at Gaviota Pass and was completed in 1953.

In 2013, a survey evaluation found the **El Rancho Tajiguas** eligible for listing as a County Place of Historical Merit. The 1924 Hacienda Revival ranch style house was designed by local architect George Washington Smith. The building is eligible for listing due to its design by master architect Smith and as the only example of the revival style in Santa Barbara County. Master architect May Cliff designed an addition to the building in 1963 further enhancing the architectural significance of the property. The period of significance is 1924 to 1964, incorporating both significant architect's designs.

Based on a survey evaluation completed in 2009, the **Las Varas Ranch** has been found eligible for listing on the NRHP as a rural historic landscape under Criterion A for its association with historical ranching in Santa Barbara County. The period of significance is defined as circa 1880 to 1959. The **rural historic landscape** is bounded by Las Varas Creek on the east, the high cliffs above the Pacific Ocean on the south, Las Llagas Creek on the west, and Highway 101 on the north. The historic property is divided into two (eastern and western) sections based on historical use: The **Las Varas Ranch** is Area 1 on the east, and the **Edwards Ranch** is Area 2 on the west. Contributing buildings in Area 1 include three residential buildings and a repair garage. Three barns and the main house in Area 2 also contribute to the property's eligibility. An additional nine buildings on the property do not contribute to the rural historic landscape, but were found to be individually significant. The main house in Area 2 was also found individually eligible for listing as a Santa Barbara County Place of Historical Merit.

#### 4.8.1.4 Other Potential Historical Resources

In addition to the known historical resources discussed above, other historical built resources within the Plan Area (buildings, structures, and districts) may be found significant upon further study. These resources represent various property types, relating closely to the developmental history of the different portions of the Plan Area.

Most of the Plan Area is characterized by agricultural and recreational uses, with the Los Padres National Forest encompassing a large northeastern portion of the Plan Area. As defined in the County of Santa Barbara Resource Management Department Cultural Resource Guidelines Historic Resources Element (revised 1993), significant historical themes associated with the historical development of the Plan Area include:

- Santa Barbara Mission 1760–1840;
- Ranching 1840–1870;
- Agricultural Development 1860–1950; and
- Recreational Development 1940–1990.

Properties and their built environment associated with these themes may be considered significant for their association with the growth and development of the Plan Area. As identified above in Section 4.8.1.3, Prior Cultural Resources Studies and Recorded Cultural Sites, several properties in the Plan Area have previously been determined significant for their association with these themes. Additional unevaluated properties also may be found historically significant in future studies. The resources discussed here, and listed in Table 4.8-2, Other Potential Historical Built Resources, are not inclusive of all potentially significant cultural resources in the Plan Area, only those that have been previously identified in County planning documents such as the Conservation Element.

~~Two adobe buildings associated with the Ranching Period have been identified within the Plan Area: the Vicente Ortega Adobe and the Pedro Baron Adobe. Constructed in 1842, the Vicente Ortega Adobe is located on Rancho Nuestra Señora del Refugio, the only land granted by Spain in Santa Barbara County. The rancho is significant for its association with Captain José Francisco Ortega, the first commandant of the Santa Barbara Presidio, and his descendants who resided on the property until 1889. The Pedro Baron Adobe is also located on the Rancho Nuestra Señora del Refugio, adjacent to the Arroyo Quemada. Pedro Baron purchased the land from the Ortega family in 1872. Although Baron expanded the adobe building in 1875, it appears that the adobe may have been constructed prior to its purchase by the Ortega family. These properties and their associated buildings have not undergone significance evaluations and may be found eligible for listing on a local, state, or national register.~~

**Table 4.8-2: Other Potential<sup>1</sup> Historical Built Resources**

Location	Name	Construction Date	Description	Eligibility Status
Arroyo Hondo Preserve	Vicente Ortega Adobe	1842	Adobe building	Likely eligible for listing NRHP
Arroyo Quemada, west Refugio SB	Pedro Baron Adobe	Circa 1860	Adobe building	Not determined
Gaviota State Park	Gaviota Landing	1875	Original pier destroyed 1912	Not determined
El Bulito Canyon, Hollister Ranch	Hollister Family Ranch House	Circa 1900	Residential building	Not determined
Rancho Dos Pueblos	Casa Grande and associated buildings	1920	Residential building and barn	Not determined
Refugio State Beach		1950	Campground and day use facilities	Not determined
El Capitan State Beach	El Capitan Beach Park	1953	Campground and day use facilities	Not determined
Reagan Ranch, Rancho del Cielo	Western White House/ Pico Adobe	1974–1998	Stable, barn, and residential building	Appears eligible for listing NRHP
<u>10000 Jalama Road</u>	<u>Cojo-Jalama Ranch</u>	<u>Ranch established in 1913</u>	<u>Rural historic landscape</u>	<u>Not determined</u>

<sup>1</sup>Resources not listed or formally evaluated to determine eligibility for listing.

SOURCE: Applied Earthworks, Inc. 2015

Two adobe buildings associated with the Ranching Period have been identified within the Plan Area: the Vicente Ortega Adobe and the Pedro Baron Adobe. Constructed in 1842, the **Vicente Ortega Adobe** is located on Rancho Nuestra Señora del Refugio, the only land granted by Spain in Santa Barbara County. The rancho is significant for its association with Captain José Francisco Ortega, the first commandant of the Santa Barbara Presidio, and his descendants who resided on the property until 1984~~1889~~. The **Pedro Baron Adobe** is also located on the Rancho Nuestra Señora del Refugio, adjacent to the Arroyo Quemada. Pedro Baron purchased the land from the Ortega family in 1872. Although Baron expanded the adobe building in 1875, it appears that the adobe may have been constructed prior to its purchase by the Ortega family. These properties and their associated buildings have not undergone significance evaluations and may be found eligible for listing on a local, state, or national register.

The **Gaviota Landing** in what is now Gaviota State Park is the site of a wharf built at this location in 1875. Before the arrival of the railroad, the wharf allowed local farmers and ranchers to ship their products out of the area. The original wharf was demolished by a storm in 1912 and has since been replaced multiple times. The **Hollister Family Ranch House** was constructed in circa 1900 between Gaviota State Park and Point Conception after the Southern Pacific Railroad filled the Santa Anita Canyon for a railroad crossing, ruining the coastal views from their older home. The **Casa Grande at Rancho Dos Pueblos** was constructed in 1920 for Herbert George Wylie. Wylie incorporated the “Dos Pueblos Ranch and Improvement Company,” registered a new cattle brand, planted lemon trees, and a walnut orchard. Both properties are associated with the agricultural development theme, but have been not been evaluated for historical significance.

The campground and day use facilities at **Refugio and El Capitan State Beaches** are properties that may be significant for their association with the recreational development theme. These parks have been used by county residents and travelers for more than 50 years. It is currently unknown if California State Parks has evaluated the properties for historical significance.

In 2003, the National Park Service (NPS) prepared the *Draft Gaviota Coast Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment* to consider including the entire Gaviota Coast in the National Park System (2003:i). Ultimately, the report found that the inclusion was not feasible. The study also considered the eligibility of the **Western White House** located on Rancho del Cielo. This property served as the second home to President Ronald Reagan between 1974 and 1998. The NPS study found that “even though the Rancho del Cielo is significant for events that have happened within the last fifty years, the association with President Reagan and the political events that took place at this location are of transcendent importance to United States history” (NPS 2003:51). It does not appear that a formal determination was made but the property does appear to be eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criteria A and B.

The **Cojo-Jalama Ranch** appears to be potentially significant as a rural historic landscape for its association with historical ranching in Santa Barbara County. In 1913, Fred H. Bixby established a cattle ranch with the purchase of the Cojo Ranch and added to the property in

1939 with the purchase of the Jalama Ranch. The combined property contains several ranch dwellings, associated ranching buildings and structures, and possibly a historical adobe associated with the Bixby family. The ranch and its associated buildings and structures have not undergone significance evaluations and may be found eligible for listing on a local, state, or national register.

#### **4.8.1.5 Rural Historic Landscapes as Cultural Resources**

Rural historic landscapes are defined for federal undertakings but are discussed here because they are discussed in Chapter 2 of the Plan, and much of the Plan Area could be considered a rural historic landscape. The NPS defines a rural historic landscape as “a geographical area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention, and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features” (McClelland et. al. 1999:1–2). The National Register Bulletin *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes* identifies several types of rural historic landscapes based upon historical occupation and uses. They are:

- Agriculture;
- Industry;
- Maritime activities;
- Recreation;
- Transportation systems;
- Migration trails;
- Conservation; and
- Sites adapted for ceremonial, religious, or other cultural activities.

Through survey and evaluation, Las Varas Ranch has been found eligible for listing on the NRHP as a rural historic landscape for its association with historical ranching from circa 1880 to 1959 (Nye and Cole 2009). Las Varas Ranch retains its historical land uses, such as cattle grazing and orchard crop production, and its physical characteristics, such as the agricultural buildings, spatial organization, and historical views and vistas. As such, the ranch possesses the ability to convey its significance; any plans to alter the property should be reviewed by planning staff for significant impacts to those land uses and physical characteristics.

With 75 percent of the Gaviota Coast zoned for agricultural uses and several large areas devoted to recreational uses, it is likely that additional rural historic landscapes could be identified within the Plan Area. Although parts of the coastline possess newer residential development, sections of the Gaviota Coast from Gaviota State Park to El Capitan State Beach may qualify as rural historic landscapes for their association with recreation, agriculture, and industry.



### 4.8.1.6 Traditional Cultural Properties as Cultural Resources

Traditional cultural properties are also federally defined resources. They are presented here because the federal definition is fairly well established and because they are identified in the Plan. This discussion is also included to provide context for the following discussions of two relatively new California state laws, Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 (see 4.8.2.1 State below).

The NPS defines a traditional cultural property as one that is significant due to “its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community’s history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community” (Parker and King 1998:1). Alteration of the values imbedded in a traditional cultural property can be offensive and even destructive to the group that holds those values. Consequently, it is important to consider the effects of actions that have the potential to alter those values.

Traditional cultural values can be hard to recognize. To help with recognition, the National Park Service offers these examples of traditional cultural properties.

- a location associated with the traditional beliefs of a Native American group about its origins, its cultural history, or the nature of the world;
- a rural community whose organization, buildings and structures, or patterns of land use reflect the cultural traditions valued by its longterm residents;
- an urban neighborhood that is the traditional home of a particular cultural group, and that reflects its beliefs and practices;
- a location where Native American religious practitioners have historically gone, and are known or thought to go today, to perform ceremonial activities in accordance with traditional cultural rules of practice; and
- a location where a community has traditionally carried out economic, artistic, or other cultural practices important in maintaining its historic identity (Parker and King 1998:1).

In addition to the difficulty of recognition, traditional cultural properties do not necessarily have to be known to the practitioners of the cultural values. For example, rock art sites, even if unknown to native groups, might qualify as a traditional cultural property just as a pioneer cemetery that is overgrown and lost from memory might qualify to a nearby rural community (Earle 1999).

With that caveat, identification of traditional cultural properties is typically made through interviews and ethnographic studies. Even that process is fraught with difficulty, however, as often such properties are considered sacred or otherwise secret, particularly to native groups. Currently, Santa Barbara County does not require identification of traditional cultural properties (see the discussion of AB 52 in Section 4.8.2.1 State below) and thus types of resources that might fall in this category are unknown.

A study for Vandenberg AFB, immediately north of the Plan Area, is relevant to a discussion of the types of resources that might be traditional cultural properties in the Plan Area (Earle and Johnson 1999). That effort focused on Native American values and identified potential traditional cultural properties as:

- Sacred sites and sacred places, including shrines, sacred localities, sacred enclosures, and cemeteries.
- Landforms and places traditionally used for fishing, gathering shellfish, and collecting plants and mushrooms. Plants may have been collected for food or producing baskets, matting, and other goods. Important plants collected for basketry include juncus (*Juncus* spp.), deer grass (*Muhlenbergia rigens*), willow (*Salix* spp.), sumac (*Rhus trilobata*), Indian hemp (*Apocynum* spp), nettle (*Urtica* spp.), narrow-leaf milkweed (*Asclepias fascicularis*), elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*), coffeeberry (*Rhamnus californica*), yerba santa (*Eriodictyon trichocalyx*), and yerba mansa (*Anemopsis californica*).
- Places where asphaltum was collected.
- Unusual geographic features such as certain mountain peaks, caves, or waterfalls.

#### 4.8.1.7 Traditional Cultural Properties

The National Park Service defines a traditional cultural property, generally, as one that is eligible for inclusion in the National Register because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community's history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community (Parker and King, 1998)

No studies of traditional cultural properties have been completed within the Plan Area. Given the undeveloped nature of much of the Plan Area, the presence of traditional cultural properties is possible.

## 4.8.2 Regulatory Framework

### 4.8.2.1 State

#### CEQA

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 states that a resource shall be considered “historically significant” if it meets the criteria for listing on the Center for Regional Heritage Research (CRHR; Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 4852).

A resource may qualify for CRHR listing if it:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history or cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the 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.

Cultural resources meeting one or more of these criteria are defined as “historical resources” under CEQA. Included in the definition of historical resources are prehistoric archaeological sites, historic archaeological sites, historic buildings and structures, traditional cultural properties important to a tribe or other ethnic group, cultural districts and landscapes, and a variety of other property types.

Resources included in a local register of historical resources [pursuant to the Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)], or identified as significant in an historical resources survey [meeting the criteria in Public Resources Code Section 5024.8(g)] also are considered “historical resources” for the purposes of CEQA.

The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources, or identified in an historical resources survey, does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.8.

## **Assembly Bill 52**

AB 52 amends Section 5097.94 of the CEQA and adds eight new sections to the Public Resource Code relating to Native Americans. It was passed and signed into law in 2014 and takes effect on July 1, 2015. At the time of this EIR preparation, Santa Barbara County has not yet incorporated the requirements of AB 52 into their Comprehensive Plan policies and programs. State CEQA guidelines are expected by July 1, 2016.

The new law establishes a new category of resource called tribal cultural resources (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21074) and establishes a process for consulting with Native American tribes and groups regarding those resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. Native American tribes to be included in the process are identified through consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (PRC Section 21080.3.1).

Tribal cultural resources are defined as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” (PRC Section 21074.1). As a category, tribal cultural resources are more somewhat more encompassing and comprehensive than the traditional cultural properties discussed above, particularly in that they include archaeological resources. A tribal cultural resource must be on, or eligible for, the California Register of Historical Resources as described above for historical resources, or must be included in a local register of historical resources. Also as discussed above for historical resources, the lead agency can determine that a tribal cultural resource is significant even if it has not been evaluated as eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources or is not on a local register.

AB 52 establishes that “A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3).

## **Senate Bill 18**

Passed in 2004, SB 18 requires cities and counties to consult with Native American tribes to help protect traditional tribal cultural places through the land use planning process. Unlike AB 52, SB 18 is not an amendment to, or otherwise associated with, the CEQA. Instead, SB 18 requires cities and counties to consult with Native American tribes early during broad land use planning efforts on both public and private lands, prior to site- and project-specific land use decisions. Simply put, the Bill applies to general plan adoption or amendments and to specific plan adoption or amendments. Consequently, it applies to the proposed Plan (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 2005). Santa Barbara County Planning and Development has developed protocols for Native American consultation under SB 18 and has incorporated the requirement into their Permit Process Procedures.

For the purposes of SB18, a Native American tribe is defined as “a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission” (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 2005:6). Traditional tribal cultural places are defined in PRC Section 5097.9 and Section 5097.993 to include sanctified cemeteries, places of worship, religious or ceremonial sites, or sacred shrines, or any historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed on or eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources including any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, or archaeological sites (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 2005:4).

Under SB 18, cities and counties must notify the appropriate Native American tribe(s) of intended adoption or amendments to general plans or specific plans, and offer the opportunity for the tribe(s) to consult regarding traditional tribal cultural places within the proposed Plan Area. Consultation is intended to encourage preservation and protection of traditional tribal cultural places by developing treatment and management plans that might include incorporating the cultural places into designated open spaces (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 2005:15).

### **Coastal Act**

The Coastal Act contains the following policy addressing archaeological and paleontological resources, which is also included in the Coastal Land Use Plan (CLUP):

1. Coastal Act Policy 30244: Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

### **Codes Governing Human Remains**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 also assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. The disposition of human remains is governed by the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and the Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98, and falls within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). If human remains are discovered, the County Coroner must be notified within 48 hours and there should be no further disturbance to the site where the remains were found. If the remains are determined by the coroner to be Native American, the coroner is responsible for contacting the NAHC within 24 hours. The NAHC, pursuant to Section 5097.98, will immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native Americans so they can inspect the burial site and make recommendations for treatment and/or disposition of the remains.

### **4.8.2.2 Local**

#### **Comprehensive Plan Policies and Programs**

The County requires protection of significant archaeological and historic resources to the greatest extent possible.

The Land Use Element contains the following Historical and Archaeological Sites Policies (p. 81):

1. All available measures, including purchase, tax relief, purchase of development rights, etc., shall be explored to avoid development on significant historic, prehistoric, archaeological, and other classes of cultural sites.
2. When developments are proposed for parcels where archaeological or other cultural sites are located, project design shall be required which avoids impacts to such cultural sites if possible.
3. When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit avoiding construction on archaeological or other types of cultural sites, adequate mitigation shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed in accord with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California NAHC.
4. Off-road vehicle use, unauthorized collection of artifacts, and other activities other than development which could destroy or damage archaeological or cultural sites shall be prohibited.
5. Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.

#### **Coastal Land Use Plan**

The CLUP contains the following policies addressing cultural resources:

1. Policy 10-1: All available measures, including purchase, tax relief, purchase of development rights, etc., shall be explored to avoid development on significant historic, prehistoric, archaeological, and other classes of cultural sites.
2. Policy 10-2: When developments are proposed for parcels where archaeological or other cultural sites are located, project design shall be required which avoids impacts to such cultural sites if possible.
3. Policy 10-3: When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit avoiding construction on archaeological or other types of cultural sites, adequate mitigation

shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed in accord with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California NAHC.

4. Policy 10-4: Off-road vehicle use, unauthorized collecting of artifacts, and other activities other than development which could destroy or damage archaeological or cultural sites shall be prohibited.
5. Policy 10-5: Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.

Policies 10-2, 10-3, and 10-5 above are also contained in Coastal Zoning Ordinance Section 35-65.

Although the CLUP does not specifically call for the protection of historical resources, it makes the following recommendations to ensure that important historical sites in the Coastal Zone are protected (page 147):

1. The County should undertake an inventory of historical sites in the unincorporated areas of the County.
2. Significant sites should be designated as landmarks by the County Advisory Landmark Committee and restrictions imposed as currently permitted by County Ordinance No. 1716.
3. Historic sites of national significance should be nominated for landmark status by the National Historic Landmarks Program and the NRHP. Those of statewide significance should be nominated for inclusion on the register of California Historical Landmarks.
4. Owners of historical sites meeting the criteria specified in Sections 50280-50289 of the Government Code should be encouraged to enter into historical properties contracts with the County (the contract gives the owner the benefit of assessment based on restricted use of the property) it insure permanent preservation of significant sites.

### **Land Use and Development Code**

The County Land Use and Development Code Section 35.60.040 has the following standards for archaeological resources in the Inland area:

1. Development proposed on a lot where archaeological or other cultural sites are located shall be designed to avoid impacts to the cultural sites if possible.

2. When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit avoiding construction on an archaeological or other cultural site, adequate mitigation shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed in compliance with the guidelines of the state Office of Historic Preservation and the state of California NAHC.
3. Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted that impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.

## **4.8.3 Impact Analysis**

### **4.8.3.1 Thresholds of Significance and Methodology**

#### **CEQA Guidelines**

The significance of a historical resource, and consequently the significance of any impacts, is determined by whether or not that resource meets the significance criteria outlined in the CEQA Guidelines. A project is judged to have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause a substantial adverse change in the characteristics of a historical resource that convey its significance or justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR or a local register, either through demolition, destruction, relocation, alteration, or other means (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)).

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, implementation of the Plan would have significant environmental impacts on cultural resources if it would:

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Removal, demolition, or alteration of historical resources can directly impact their significance by destroying the historic fabric of an archaeological site, structure, historic district, traditional cultural property, tribal cultural resource, or traditional tribal cultural place. Direct impacts can be assessed by identifying the types and locations of proposed development, determining the exact locations of cultural resources within the project area, assessing the significance of the resources that may be affected, and determining the appropriate mitigation.

Indirect impacts result primarily from the effects of project-induced population growth. Such growth can result in increased construction as well as increased recreational activities that can disturb or destroy cultural resources. Due to their nature, indirect impacts are much harder to assess and quantify.



CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b) provides guidelines for mitigating impacts to historical resources. Specifically, public agencies should, whenever feasible, seek to avoid damaging effects on any historical resource of an archaeological or traditional cultural property nature. The following factors shall be considered for a project involving such a resource:

- (A) Preservation in place (avoidance) is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites, tribal cultural resources, or traditional tribal cultural places. Preservation in place maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context. Preservation may also avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the site.
- (B) Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to, the following:
- Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites;
  - Incorporation of sites within parks, greenspace, or other open space;
  - Covering archaeological sites with a layer of chemically stable soil before building tennis courts, parking lots, or similar facilities on the site.
  - Deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement.
- (C) In terms of archaeological resources, when data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, a data recovery plan, which makes provision for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the historical resource, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any excavation being undertaken. Such studies shall be deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center. Archaeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 Health and Safety Code.
- (D) Data recovery shall not be required for an historical resource if the lead agency determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological or historical resource, provided that the determination is documented in the EIR and that the studies are deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center.

Typically, such measures will reduce impacts on archaeological resources to less than significant levels.

For traditional cultural properties, tribal cultural resources, and traditional tribal cultural places, mitigation measures must be developed in consultation with the Native American tribe(s) designated by the NAHC. Mitigation measures for rural historic landscapes should include a design review that considers siting to minimize impacts to the visual character of the landscape, clustering of buildings and structures, and architectural style and massing for compatibility with

rural properties. To further minimize impacts, the historical use of the property, such as agriculture, industry, or recreation, should be retained.

For architectural resources, maintenance, repair, stabilization, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Weeks and Grimmer 1995) generally will constitute mitigation of impacts to a less-than-significant level. Documentation of historic buildings and structures, including documentation to the standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey or Historic American Engineering Record, may lessen impacts but may not reduce them to less-than-significant levels.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties defines four options for the treatment of historic buildings: (1) preservation, (2) rehabilitation, (3) restoration, and (4) reconstruction. Generally:

1. Preservation involves the application of measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment (Weeks and Grimmer 1995:17).
2. Rehabilitation entails making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values (Weeks and Grimmer 1995:62).
3. Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period (Weeks and Grimmer 1995:118).
4. Reconstruction involves new construction to recreate the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location (Weeks and Grimmer 1995:166).

The Secretary's Standards are not prescriptive but instead provide general guidelines and are intended to be flexible and adaptable to specific project conditions, including aspects of adaptive use, functionality, and accessibility. The goal is to balance continuity and change and retain historic building fabric to the maximum extent feasible. The NPS has compiled a series of bulletins to provide guidance on specific historic preservation topics.

## County of Santa Barbara Cultural Resource Guidelines

Chapter 8 of the County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (Regulations Governing Cultural Resource Projects Undertaken in Conformance with Federal and State Environmental Protection Acts) and its supporting technical documents contain guidelines for implementing CEQA's provisions pertaining to sites of archaeological, historic, or ethnic importance. Chapter 8 contains specific thresholds similar to those found in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The supporting technical documents consist of the following three individual documents: (1) Archaeological Element (1986, reissued January 1993), (2) Historic Resources Element (1986, revised January 1993), and (3) Regulations Governing Archaeological and Historical Projects Undertaken in Conformance with the CEQA and Related Laws: Cultural Resources Guidelines (1986, revised January 1993) (referenced simply as the "Cultural Resources Guidelines").

Under County standards, an "important archaeological resource" can be defined by one of several criteria. An archaeological site is considered significant for the purposes of CEQA if it demonstrates one or more of the following:

1. Is associated with an event or person of recognized significance in California or American history or recognized scientific importance in prehistory;
2. Can provide information that is of demonstrable public interest and is useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable research questions;
3. Has a special or particular quality such as oldest, best example, largest or last surviving example of its kind;
4. Is at least 100 years old and possesses substantial stratigraphic integrity; or
5. Involves important research questions that historical research has shown can be answered only with archaeological methods.

Buildings, structures, and sites from the historical period can also be significant historical resources under CEQA. A list of significance criteria for such resources is also found in the County Historic Resources Element, which states that a building, structure, or site may be historically significant if it possesses integrity, is at least 50 years old, and meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with an event, movement, organization, or person that/who has made an important contribution to the community, state, or nation;
2. Was designed or built by an architect, engineer, builder, artists, or other designer who has made an important contribution to the community, state, or nation;

3. Is associated with a particular architectural style or building type important to the community, state, or nation;
4. Embodies elements demonstration outstanding attention to design, detail, craftsmanship, or outstanding use of a particular structural material, surface material, or method of construction or technology;
5. Is associated with a traditional way of life important to an ethnic, national, racial, or social group, or to the community at large;
6. Illustrates broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, or industrial history;
7. Is a feature or a cluster of features which convey a sense of time and place that is important to the community, state, or nation;
8. Is able to yield information important to the community or is relevant to the scholarly study of history, historical archaeology, ethnography, folklore, or cultural geography.

### 4.8.3.2 Impact Determination and Mitigation Measures

#### Impacts

##### ***Impact CR-1: Impacts on Historical and Archaeological Resources***

The impact analysis contained in this section evaluates impacts associated with the Plan. Impacts include buildout of the Plan Area, as well as proposed land use and zoning changes, policy changes, and programs proposed as part of the Plan. Project-specific analysis may be required for individual future projects proposed under the amended programs and policies. A detailed analysis of potential impacts to cultural resources resulting from PRT Maps Amendments is included in Section 4.13.

The 20-year actions under the proposed Plan would result in minimal residential and commercial development. Many of the goals, policies, and development standards presented in the Plan would protect cultural resources due to their intent to protect natural resources, open spaces, recreational and agricultural lands.

Although some of the Plan Area has been inventoried for cultural resources, surveys conducted to date have not covered all of the Plan Area, nor have they covered all of the areas identified, based on the distribution pattern of existing prehistoric sites, as having a high potential to contain such resources. In addition, as the built environment in the Plan Area continues to age through the life of the Plan, additional resources will reach 50 years of age, and that may qualify as “historical resources.” As noted above, the term “historical resource” refers to a significant prehistoric or historic resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and Public Resources Code Sections 21084.8, 21074, 5097.9, and 5097.993. As a result, the possibility

exists that some of the potential new development could be proposed in areas containing historical buildings and structures, and historic or prehistoric sites or artifacts, as well as areas characterized as rural historic landscapes, traditional cultural properties, tribal cultural resources, and traditional tribal cultural places. Policies proposed in the Plan may result in significant impacts to historical resources through damage to or destruction of significant properties, or by diminishing the integrity of the context and setting of such properties.

As described above, a project is considered to have a significant impact on a cultural resource if it may cause a substantial adverse change in the characteristics that make the resource important under CEQA. Consequently, the ground-disturbing activities related to construction of new buildings and structures have the potential to impact prehistoric archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and traditional tribal cultural places as well as any subsurface remains associated with historic structures that may have once been located on the property. No listed or previously identified historical resources are currently planned for alteration or demolition. However, impacts to historical resources could result from demolition or alterations to resources not listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources, or not identified in an historical resources survey. Demolition of a building that qualifies as a historical resource is a significant and unavoidable impact. Historical research and documentation of the property may reduce the impact, but not necessarily to a less than significant level if the building is demolished.

Existing ordinance and policy requirements, along with the mitigation measures proposed below, would ensure that impacts to historical resources (including archaeological sites, traditionally important properties, and historic buildings, structures, and districts) are taken into consideration and reduced or minimized to the fullest extent feasible. These requirements mandate that when possible, significant cultural resources are avoided; and, if avoidance is not possible, that measures to mitigate impacts are conducted in accordance with County Cultural Resource Guidelines. However, overall, at a program level, impacts to historical and archaeological resources would be potentially significant.

## **Mitigation**

The Plan contains policies, actions, and development standards intended to help meet the goal of preserving and protecting significant historic, archaeological, and ethnic resources in the Plan Area. These will help to minimize impacts to historical resources. However, certain policies, actions and standards should be added for clarity and consistency with current County Cultural Resources Guidelines and professional best practices. In addition to the above policies from the Plan, mitigation measures are required to ensure that the treatment of historical resources within the Plan Area is consistent with the County *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines* Manual and CEQA Guidelines.

---

### ***MM CR-1 Addresses CR-1, Impacts on Historic and Archaeological Resources***

---

MM CR-1 addresses CR-1 Impacts on historic, archaeological, and traditional resources.

**CR-1 Treatment of Historical Resources.** Existing development standards and actions in the draft Plan shall be revised and augmented as follows (additions with underline, deletions with strikethrough).

#### **Cultural Resources Stewardship Policies**

- **Policy CS-2: Properties of Concern.** Potentially significant cultural resources including historic ~~buildings,~~ structures, ~~Rural~~ ~~Historic~~ ~~Landscapes,~~ archaeological sites, ~~Traditional~~ ~~Cultural~~ ~~Properties,~~ ~~Tribal~~ ~~Cultural~~ ~~Resources,~~ and other traditional tribal cultural places and other places of concern to the Native Americans shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible.

#### **Cultural Resources Stewardship Implementing Actions**

- **Action CS-1: Landmarking Buildings, Structures, & Places.** The County and the community should continue to work with willing landowners to identify buildings, structures, and places, including Rural Historic Landscapes, ~~Traditional~~ ~~Cultural~~ ~~Properties,~~ ~~Tribal~~ ~~Cultural~~ ~~Resources,~~ and other traditional tribal cultural places that qualify for ~~nominations to Historic listing as a County Landmark or Place of Historical Merit Status~~ and forward these ~~requests~~ nominations to the County Historical Landmarks Advisory Commission (HLAC).
- **Action CS-2: New Development and Rehabilitation Projects.** Development resulting in increased building size or demolition of buildings/structures included in the list of historic resources, or buildings and structures over 50 years of age and evaluated as important at the local, state, or national level, shall be reviewed by Planning & Development for consistency with historic resource preservation policies.
- **Action CS-32: Community Cultural Center.** The County and Gaviota Coast residents shall investigate, consider and pursue options to develop a community cultural center and/or other community cultural research and education opportunities including Native American culture.
- **Action CS-43: Government-To-Government Native American Consultation.** The County shall continue its ~~government-to-government~~ consultations with the tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 and Senate Bill 18 to ensure that ~~traditional-cultural~~ resources of concern to the Chumash are identified and taken into account in future development planning.

- **Action CS-54: Confidential Site Locations.** The County shall maintain as confidential information about the location of ~~†Traditional eCultural pProperties, †Tribal eCultural rResources, and other traditional tribal cultural places,~~ historical, and spiritual areas as confidential.
- **Action CS-65: Tribal Access.** The County, Chumash representatives and willing landowners should work together to ensure appropriate tribal access to ~~†Traditional eCultural pProperties (TCP), †Tribal eCultural rResources, and other traditional tribal cultural places~~ historical, and spiritual properties while still respecting the rights and privileges of property owners.
- **Cultural Resources Stewardship Development Standards**  
*(Development Standards will be implemented in the Land Use Development Code and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance but are included here for review and discussion)*
- **Dev Std CS-1: Phase 1 Archaeological Surveys.** A Phase 1 archaeological survey shall be performed when identified as necessary by a County archaeologist or contract archaeologist. The survey shall include all areas of the project that would result in ground disturbance. The content, format, and length of the Phase 1 survey report shall be consistent with the nature and size of the project and findings of the survey.
- **Dev Std CS-2: Phase 2 and 3 Archaeological Studies.** If archaeological remains are identified and cannot be avoided through project redesign, the proponent shall fund a Phase 2 study to determine the significance of the resource prior to issuance of any permit for development. All feasible mitigation recommendations resulting from the Phase 1 or Phase 2 work, including completion of additional archaeological analysis (Phase 3) and/or project redesign shall be incorporated into any permit issued for development.
- **Dev Std CS-3: Identification of Traditional Cultural, Historical, and Spiritual Sites.** Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted that impact significant archaeological or cultural sites. Cultural sites may include ~~†Traditional eCultural pProperties (TCP), †Tribal eCultural rResources, and other traditional tribal cultural places~~ and cultural landscapes as identified through consultation with by Native Americans.
- **Dev Std CS-4: Native American Contact List.** When existing documentation or a Phase 1 survey indicates that significant prehistoric cultural resources may be affected by a proposed project, the County shall obtain a Native American Contact List from the NAHC and consult with the Chumash in accordance with Assembly Bill 52 during each stage of cultural resources review.

- **Dev Std CS-5: Integrity of Historic Resources.** No permits shall be issued for any development or activity that would adversely affect the integrity of officially designated Historic County Landmarks and Places of Historical Merit, historical resources eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources, or identified historical ~~districts~~-resources unless a professional evaluation of the proposed project has been performed by a qualified Architectural Historian pursuant to the County's most current Regulations Governing Archaeological and Historical Projects. All such professional studies shall be reviewed and approved by Planning & Development, and reviewed by the HLAC and all feasible mitigation measures shall be incorporated into any permit issued for development.
- **Dev Std CS-6: Historical Resources Studies.** A Phase 1, and if required Phase 2, historical resources investigation and report shall be performed when identified as necessary by the Director of Planning and Development. The investigation shall include areas of the project that could result in direct or indirect impacts to historic-age buildings, structures, rural historic landscapes, or districts or that could change the integrity of the setting and context for such resources on adjacent parcels. The content, format, and length of the Phase 1, and if required Phase 2, historic report shall be consistent with the nature and size of the project and findings of the investigation. The investigation shall be performed by a qualified Architectural Historian pursuant to the County's most current regulations governing archaeological and historical projects. All such professional studies shall be reviewed and approved by the HLAC and Planning and Development. All feasible recommendations resulting from the Phase 1, and if required Phase 2, shall be incorporated into any permit approved for development.

This language would be incorporated in the final version of the proposed Plan. Planning and Development shall verify that Board of Supervisors-approved revisions are incorporated into the Plan.

## Residual Impacts

Impacts to historical and archaeological resources from Plan Area buildout and rezones would be significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures discussed above (Class I).

### 4.8.4 Cumulative Impacts Analysis

#### Impacts

Cumulative impacts on significant cultural resources would result from new development, and increased development and construction over the planning horizon. Cumulative cultural resources impacts from Plan buildout are addressed as a part of the impact analysis above. As future applications for individual projects are submitted at a project level of detail, the precise evaluation of future project cumulative impacts would be coordinated through the required



individual project-level environmental review, as applicable. Careful review of design and siting, and compliance with existing and proposed policies and programs, would reduce but not eliminate the impacts related to the change in the integrity of significant cultural resources. At a program level, no potential mitigation measures are available to fully address this impact, which would remain cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.

### **Mitigation Measures**

As discussed in the impact discussion above, a number of policies, standards, and actions within the proposed Plan would have a beneficial effect on significant cultural resources within the Plan Area by providing protection measures that currently do not exist.

### **Residual Impacts**

Application of mitigation measures in combination with policies and development standards would ensure that impacts are mitigated to the fullest extent possible. However, at a program level, no potential mitigation measures are available to fully address impacts, which would remain cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable (Class I impact).

*THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.*