

## 3.6 CULTURAL/HISTORIC RESOURCES

This section describes known cultural and historical resources (including their potential significance), assesses potential impacts of development proposed by the IVMP, and recommends mitigation measures to reduce the significance of potential project impacts. Additionally, this section discusses regulatory policies relative to cultural and historical resources.

### 3.6.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area has experienced long and significant occupation by humans going back at least 8,000 years. There are a number of remains known to be present in the general project region.

#### Prehistoric Overview

The creeks, river valleys, and flood plains in the general project region, along with the fringe coastline, have supported a continuous prehistoric cultural occupation. An early Holocene occupation has been identified in the archaeological record that reflects the early emergence of non-agricultural, village-based groups in the region. Current archaeological evidence suggests that a relatively small population existed in these areas, but by 2000 years before present (B.P.), i.e., approximately 2000 years ago, populations appear to have expanded considerably into resource-rich coastal and near-shore, estuarine environments (Dillon, 1990: 6). Accounts by Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo (Wagner, 1929: 79-93) and Sebastian Vizcaino (Bolton, 1930: 52-103) indicated that by the time of European contact to this area of the California coast, some of the large, coastal villages had hundreds of occupants and were engaged in both terrestrial and maritime long-distance trade.

**Paleoindian Period.** The Paleoindian Period extends from 8,000 B.P. back to 50,000 B.P. The San Dieguito Complex, a culture known for its non-fluted points such as leaf-shaped projectile points and various leaf-shaped, bifacial tools, is found throughout Southern California (Wallace, 1978: 27; Warren, 1967). Unfortunately, there are few reliable published radiometric dates from this period, with most of the artifacts identified as isolated find spots. One fluted-point fragment is known from the Santa Barbara area, consisting of a basal fragment found at CA-SBA-1951 on the coastal plain to the west of Santa Barbara (Erlandson et al., 1987; Erlandson, 1994: 44).

**The Millingstone Period.** The Millingstone Period extends to at least 6000 B.P. and probably as far back to 8500 + B.P. (*cf.* Wallace, 1955; Warren, 1968). Hard seed processing became one of the major components of subsistence during this period. Overall, the economy was based on plant collecting, but was supplemented by fishing and hunting, and general exploitation of marine and estuarine resources (Wallace, 1955). Large, heavy, ground stone milling tools such as deep basin metates and wedge-shaped manos, and large core/cobble choppers and scrapers, typify the Millingstone Period. In the northern Channel Islands, two sites have produced fairly reliable early Holocene dates. Radiometric dates have been

obtained from shells at Daisy Cave, on San Miguel Island (Erlandson et al., 1996; Rick et al., 2001), and human remains were found in a secure early Holocene context on Santa Rosa Island at Arlington Springs (the so-called Arlington Woman). Both locations did not have extensive archaeological remains, but nevertheless, these dates put humans on the Channel Islands by at least 11750 B.P., and possibly earlier (circa 13000 B.P. for the Arlington Woman).

Along Santa Barbara coastal areas, Millingstone sites are common on terraces and knolls, typically set back from the current coastline (Erlandson, 1994: 46; Glassow et al., 1988: 68). The larger sites can contain extensive midden deposits, possible subterranean house pits, and cemeteries. Other large accumulations of millingstones have been found absent shellfish, bone, or other food remains (i.e., CA-SBA-16 in Summerland, CA-SBA-2499 in Goleta, and CA-SBA-2254 at El Capitan (personal communication, David Stone, 2005). Most of these sites probably reflect intermittent use over many years of local cultural habitation and resource exploitation. Erlandson has noted that the typical Millingstone manos/metates are not common on contemporaneous Channel Island sites, possibly reflecting alternate island resource exploitation (Erlandson, 1994: 47).

Several millingstone sites have been recorded in the vicinity of the project area and the Goleta Valley. CA-SBA-142 is located in the foothills above the Goleta Slough, and several sites were occupied on the margins of this important estuary: CA-SBA-54, CA-SBA-57, and CA-SBA-1203 (Wilcoxon et al 1981), and CA-SBA-2499 (SAIC 1997).

**The Intermediate Period.** The Intermediate period has also been called the “Hunting Period” or “Middle Horizon.” About 7000 years B.P., the Millingstone traditions, with their heavy reliance on vegetal food sources, began to gravitate more toward animal proteins and marine resources. Procurement of plants for caloric intake was not necessarily replaced in kind by game hunting, but rather the local Millingstone dietary regimen began to transition toward other alternate resources. Mortars and pestles dominate the tool kit, rather than manos and metates. In the Santa Barbara geographic setting, this could reflect greater use of acorns (Glassow et al., 1988). In the Santa Barbara area, the reliance on shellfish probably declined during the Intermediate Period, as the maritime and coastal marine exploitations expanded into the aforementioned terrestrial resources (Erlandson, 1988). Sites in the project vicinity dating to this period include those on the margins of the Goleta Slough, (i.e., CA-SBA-52) and More Mesa (CA-SBA-42) (Wilcoxon *et al* 1981).

**The Late Period.** The Late Period is commonly recognized by archaeologists as beginning around 1100 AD, or approximately 900 B.P. (King 1981, and ending at the close of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, when native populations were completely under then influence of the Spanish Mission system. The Santa Barbara coastal areas, along with the western areas of Ventura and the Los Angeles Basin, were occupied during the Late Prehistoric Period by the so-called “Canaliño” culture (Rogers, 1929). During this period, the coastal populations expanded greatly and probably took advantage of a wide variety of ecological niches, especially marine resources. Small projectile points, frequently side-notched, are typical in the bow and arrow-based toolkit. Specialty items such as basketry, ollas or large water vessels, shell and stone

beads, and shell and bone fish hooks appear, as does elaborate rock painting (Grant, 1965). Anthropologists believe that the Chumash are directly descended from the Canaliño culture of the archaeological record.

During the Late Period, a highly advanced fishing and hunting strategy developed that included the exploitation of a wider variety of fish and shellfish. These new subsistence strategies, coupled with the appearance of the bow and arrow, enabled a substantial increase in local populations, the development of permanent settlements, and a 'money' economy based on the shell trade.

The Barbareño Chumash, speakers of the Hokan linguistic family, lived in large villages along the Santa Barbara Channel and estuaries including the Goleta Slough (Grant 1978). This ethnohistoric population was surrounded by other Chumash dialects to the north (Obispeño and Inezeño), and east (Ventureño) (Greenwood 1978; Grant 1978). In the archaeological record, the south coastal Chumash had a different subsistence emphasis from their cousins north of Point Concepcion and the Santa Ynez Mountains due to the unique regional climatic regimes and available maritime resources.

### **Chumash Ethnography**

The following summary discussion has been synthesized primarily from Dillon (1990), Bean and Smith (1978), Moratto (1984), and Grant (1978a, b). Specific citations are indicated, where appropriate.

Europeans first encountered the Chumash in 1542, when Cabrillo landed on the shores of Ventura. The Spanish later contacted the Chumash in 1602, when Vizcaíno entered the Santa Barbara Channel (Grant, 1978a: 505). The pre-European-contact Chumash probably had between 10,000 and 15,000 individuals. Anthropologists and linguists note that the Hokan language stock of the Chumash appears to be one of the oldest language groups in California, suggesting that Chumash ancestors must have been present in the area for at least several thousand years prior to European contact.

At the time of contact, the Chumash ranged from San Luis Obispo to Malibu Canyon along the coast, inland as far as the southwestern margin of the southern San Joaquin Valley, and out to the Channel Islands. There were at least six Chumash languages. The project area is located within the ethnographic boundaries of the coastal Barbareño Chumash. The Chumash were incorporated rather quickly into the Spanish Mission system. This precipitated the rapid demise of their native culture and language, enough so that by the time anthropologists were interviewing Chumash individuals, most of their culture had long since disappeared. By the early 1800s, nearly the entire Chumash population, except for individuals who had escaped to the interior, was incorporated into the mission system (Grant, 1978a: 505).

The early Spanish travelers provided valuable details concerning Chumash dwellings. The huts were described as hemispherical in shape, with many containing internal subdivisions, possibly for privacy. Some of the larger dwelling structures could house up to 70 people, and the Spanish noted that many villages also contained sweathouses.

The Chumash were comprised of patrilineal descent groups, with most villages having one “chief,” and three or four “captains” (Grant, 1978b: 510). Most Chumash marriages were monogamous, except for village chiefs. Puberty rites are not well known. Girls entering puberty were not allowed to eat meat and could not look into a burning fire. Boys were taken out at night and given a psychotropic concoction made from jimson weed (*Datura*) root to induce visions (Harrington, 1942: 36-37 in Grant, 1978b: 511).

The Chumash had a high level of material culture and craftsmanship, including intricate basketry, woodcarving, fine stone objects, well-developed rock art, and excellent ocean-going plank canoes (*tomol*) that highly impressed Spanish explorers. The Coastal Chumash had an extensive trading network that reached well beyond the Santa Barbara Channel region. Most Chumash lived in permanent villages, composed of large round houses up to 50 feet in diameter, which might be home to as many as 10 families. The dietary staple for all Chumash groups was the acorn, though the addition of pine nuts, soap root, berries, mushrooms, seeds, mollusks, fish, and game varied the diet.

Coastal Chumash village sites were often located at the mouths of creeks and rivers, usually on higher ground just above the shoreline (Grant, 1978b: 510). Smaller hunting camps and resource exploitation sites were located in smaller perennial creek areas, in the upper elevations, and in the immediate interior (Landberg, 1965: 89).

In 1775, Spaniard Pedro Fages commented that the Chumash were very inclined to trade, barter, and general commerce (Erlandson, 1994: 48-49). Johnson also notes that the Spanish observed persistent Chumash intervillage warfare (McLendon and Johnson, 1999: 29-39), possibly due to raids of neighboring groups’ stored resources (Landberg, 1965: 89).

The Chumash lived in and around the project area. According to Carmen Lodise’s (Research Assistant to UCSB cultural anthropology professor Leslie White) website, “Isla Vista: a citizen’s history”:

There was a major community of Chumash at the edge of Isla Vista around a large lagoon. This lagoon once covered what is now the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and stretched west almost to Storke Road and south across El Colegio Road. This lagoon was deep enough to be navigable by early Spanish and English schooners (*goletas* in Spanish). Many historians believe that Sir Francis Drake stopped here in 1579, losing an anchor that was found about 100 years ago, and perhaps even some cannons discovered more recently. Juan Cabrillo and Jasper de Portola were other early visitors to this lagoon.

The Chumash community was centered on an island in the lagoon that at one time held over 100 homes and 800 inhabitants. There were several other villages around the edge of the lagoon and the Spanish called all of these "Mescalitan." Mescalitan Island was a prominent landmark until 1941 when the Army Corps of Engineers leveled it to provide fill for a Navy airport.

To the Chumash, "Anisq'Oyo" was an oak-covered, coastal mesa between the villages along the lagoon and the ocean, which is Isla Vista today, including the UC Santa Barbara campus. While they did not locate their huts in Anisq'Oyo, they did use the tar still found on its beaches as caulking for their ocean-going canoes.

Juan Crespi noted seven ethnohistoric villages in the general area of the Goleta Slough (Johnson, 1989: 2). However, only four ethnohistoric villages, *S'axpilil*, *heliyik*, *Helo'*, and *'Alkash*, are recorded in the Spanish mission documents (Grant, 1978b: 509, 510; Johnson, 1989: 4). Johnson notes that this is probably due to the existence of smaller (or satellite) communities that were grouped together under a higher village identity (1989: 4). Of these villages, *Helo'*, which was located on Mescalitan Island (CA-SBA-45), was the largest. There, Crespi observed (probably generously) approximately 100 houses and between 600-800 residents. On the north side of the lagoon, north of the present Santa Barbara Airport, was the village of *S'axpilil*. This village site (CA-SBA-60) was located near the present intersection of Hollister and Fairview Avenue. Johnson also notes that more inhabitants were baptized from *S'axpilil* than any other Chumash village except *Mikiw*, situated at Dos Pueblos Creek (*ibid.*). In general, the Goleta Slough villages probably had at least 2,000 inhabitants, over 100 houses, and more than 16 plank canoes (Grant, 1978b: 510). Twin villages named *Kuyamu* and *Mikiw* (CA-SBA-78 and -79) occupied the banks of Dos Pueblos Creek at its confluence with the Pacific, giving the creek its name. Crespi gives the population of the two villages together at 1,100, with 120 houses and 10 plank canoes (Grant, 1978b: 510).

### **Previously Recorded Prehistoric Cultural Resources in the Project Area**

A file and records search for the project area was conducted at the Central Coastal Information Center (CCIC) at UCSB. The mapped locations of previous cultural resource surveys are on file at the CCIC and at the County Mapping and Graphics Division of P&D. This search reveals one previously recorded cultural resource in the project area. This site is designated as CA-SBA-51 and is located in an open space area in which no plans future development is planned under the IVMP. The files and records search also notes two field surveys previously conducted in the area.

### **Historic Background**

The first known European entry into the area was the expedition of Juan Cabrillo who sailed north up the California coast from Mexico in 1542. His two ships reached the Santa Barbara Channel in October 1542 and after several tries, were able to round Point Conception and sail as far north as San Francisco Bay (Chesnut, 1993).

A second Spanish expedition arrived in the area in 1602, which consisted of two ships under the command of Sebastian Vizcaino. His aim was to follow Cabrillo's route and reassert Spanish claims to the area. Naming local landmarks after saints' days on which they were discovered, he named the harbor of Santa Barbara on St. Barbara's feast day (December 4), and Point Conception on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception (December 8). Vizcaino sailed as far north as Monterey Bay, eventually returning to Acapulco.

In the 1760s, the Spanish government decided to establish a series of military establishments called presidios and missions along the California coast between the two great natural harbors of San Diego and San Francisco (Weber, 1982, 1992). These establishments countered against feared occupation of the coast by Russian or English forces.

As a function of this effort by the Spanish government to establish military presence on the West Coast, an expedition left the colony at San Diego in the summer of 1769 under the command of Don Gaspar de Portola, the governor of Baja, California. The objective was to locate an overland route to Monterey Bay and prospect for presidio locations along the route. Portola's expedition passed through the area on its return to San Diego (Chesnut, 1993).

Following Portola's expedition, Spanish visits and activity increased. An expedition led by Juan Bautista de Anza passed through the area in spring of 1776. A presidio was established at Santa Barbara in 1782 to fill the gap between the previously established presidios in Monterey and San Diego. This established a permanent European presence in the area, and was shortly followed by the establishment of the Mission at Santa Barbara in 1786. This mission had a strong effect on the Chumash in the general project area. It seems certain that a number of the Chumash left for the missions, though chapels were built for those remaining in rancherias in the Goleta area including one along Modoc Road at the village of *Cieneguitas*. The Chumash who did move to the missions worked in agriculture or herding, and steps were taken to assimilate them to European styles of life. This also proved to be dangerous to the health of the Chumash populations, as they were exposed to European diseases to which they had no immunity. Chumash populations went into a steep decline.

When Mexico gained its independence from Spain in 1821, Alta California became part of the new country. Approaches to church control changed as government control devolved to Mexico City and to the Mexican territorial and state governors. It had never been the intention of the Spanish and the successor Mexican government that the missions would remain as permanent entities controlling the economy of the frontier areas (Weber, 1982). With independence, the Mexican government began a process of secularization of mission properties that was concluded in 1833. Missions were turned into parish churches and regional commissions were established to dispose of the properties and resettle the Indians affiliated with the missions. Mexican government policy was to give mission properties and other unclaimed land to prominent citizens who would be required to build homes and facilities and develop the properties. The period of California history known as the Rancho Period began as a class of wealthy landowners known as 'rancheros' controlled the state. They built large ranches based on cattle hide and tallow production.

Approximately 40 of these land grants were made in Santa Barbara County during this period (Avina, 1973 Chesnut, 1993; Tompkins, 1976, 1987). The project area was originally located within the Rancho De Los Dos Pueblos grant. The grant was made to Nicolas A. Den, a native Irishman, in 1842.

The United States and Mexico went to war in 1846 over the annexation of Texas. With the end of the war in 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (Weber, 1982) ceded California to

the United States. The annexation of California dislocated the dominant Hispanic culture due to the change in government control and the influx of large numbers of Anglo-Americans. Land titles were a major source of conflict between the two cultures. In 1851, a land act was passed that required the Mexican and American courts to confirm Spanish land grants. Many of the ranchos were broken up, as owners were unable to produce sufficient documentation to satisfy the courts.

The Den family claim to Rancho De Los Dos Pueblos was confirmed, and it remained in their control until Nicholas Den's death in 1862. Thereafter, it was subdivided into a number of different ranches, two of which were owned by his sons Alphonse and August. Most prominent among these subsequent owners was William W. Hollister, after whom Hollister Avenue is named. The properties passed through several hands through the balance of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. In 1919, a retired British army officer, Colin Campbell, purchased the majority of the property near Coal Oil Point to develop a major country estate. Ruins of the Campbell estate can still be found just west of the Devereux Slough and portions of the estate's bathhouse remain on the beach just east of Coal Oil Point.

In 1915 John and Pauline Ilharreguy purchased 157 acres of the former rancho, and ten years later laid out a subdivision on part of it along the bluffs. It was composed of 25-foot wide lots, which they called Isla Vista. In 1926, other investors laid out two more subdivisions, Ocean Terrace to the east and Orilla Del Mar to the west. The three side-by-side tracts collectively came to be known as Isla Vista. Aside from a few pioneering individuals, however, very few of Isla Vista's lots were sold during the next thirty years. Many streets, including Del Playa Drive, Sabado Tarde, Trigo Road, Pasado Road, Embarcadero Del Mar, and Embarcadero Del Norte remained unpaved or existed only on paper. During this era, Isla Vista was the refuge of solitary beach lovers, small bean farmers, and speculating oil companies (Strand 1987).

Major changes to Isla Vista would soon occur following the designation of the former Marine Corps base located on the eastern boundary of Isla Vista as the site of a University of California campus in 1948. The campus opened for classes in 1954, and by the early 1960s, the combined effects of student population growth and the availability of water from Cachuma Dam launched a furious building boom in Isla Vista (Olson 1979).

What began in 1954 as a sparsely settled community of perhaps 50 to 100 residents grew rapidly to about 4,000 students by 1963. By 1978, Isla Vista contained about 15,500 residents, residing in 6,000 student apartments and single-family dwellings (Olson 1979).

Beginning in the late 1950s, commercial development, businesses, and other services were established on the downtown loop, which had been designated to cater to resident needs. Businesses included gas stations, markets, restaurants, laundry facilities, bike shops, banks, offices, and medical clinics (Olson 1979). According to County records, a few of the buildings within the Isla Vista downtown area were built in the in the 1950's, most were constructed in the 1960's, and some more recently.

Within a few years of the initial building boom, Isla Vista reached its present density, characterized by multiple-story apartment buildings and a concentration of single-family dwellings in the western portion. As an unincorporated community with unique needs, residents worked with the County to create social institutions to address ongoing concerns. The first of these institutions was the IV Improvement Association, followed by the IV Community Council, the IV Foot Patrol (a unit of the County Sheriff's Department), and the IV Recreation and Park District. Today Isla Vista has a population of about 20,000 residents, and continues to be student-oriented, although about 7,000 of the total residents are non-students (Ziegler-McPherson, 1998).

A field inventory focusing on the downtown, Estero Park, and residential plan areas was conducted by County-qualified architectural historian Ronald Nye on June 1, 2004. No structures were identified within the downtown plan area that were determined as a result of their architectural style, design, or materials to be 50 years or older. Additionally, no structures appeared to be representative of a particular architectural style, or contained unique or conspicuous design, detail, or craftsmanship, outstanding use of a particular structural material, surface material, or method of construction or technology.

One of these buildings closest to 50 years old is the commercial building at, 955 Embarcadero Del Mar, built between 1957 and 1961. The build-out of downtown under the Master Plan including possible renovations of 955 Embarcadero Del Mar would be reasonably expected to occur over an extended period of time rather than within the next several years. As a result, the structure, as well as others constructed in the 1960s, would likely be 50 years or older when a project application would be submitted. In this event, these structure's ages at that time would potentially qualify as a historic resource under CEQA Section 15064.5 criteria (see section 4.5.3 Thresholds of Significance below).

The only known structure older than 50 years within the Estero Park plan area is commonly referred to as the Red Barn. Based on a review of aerial photos maintained at Santa Barbara County Planning & Development, the barn appears to have been located at its present site between 1938 and 1950. The presence of a concrete foundation underneath the structure is not common in vernacular barns constructed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (Noble and Cleek, 1995). Though there is some unrecorded evidence to suggest that it was moved to its present location, it is unlikely that it would have been moved from outside Isla Vista, as it would not have been cost effective to do so, particularly given the relatively small size of the barn. The barn is the only structure of its kind in the plan area, and has been at this same location for over 50 years.

The structure is small, with single-wall board and batten siding and a gambrel roof covered by composition shingles. A wagon entrance with a sliding door is found on its east elevation, and a wood double-door entrance is located on the west elevation. Smaller double-door loft openings are featured below the gables on the north and south elevations.

The barn's material integrity was compromised as a result of a fire in 1991, requiring the replacement of a significant amount of lumber and the installation of bracing beams throughout the interior (personal communication, Roger Lagerquist, 2004). Knee braces are



located below the overhanging eaves on the north and south elevations, and exposed rafter tails below the slightly flared eaves on the sides. A visual inspection of the interior revealed that all materials had been replaced on the entire south elevation within the last ten years, along with all of the roof and main beams and supports. In addition, 4 X 6 inch lumber braces had been installed in all four corners.

Despite the impacts on the barn's integrity, the barn appears structurally sound. It has provided a variety of functions by the Isla Vista Park and Recreation District, including community gatherings, concerts, and as a shelter (Ziegler-McPherson, 1998).

Though the structure may have been moved from its original location and its integrity has been affected by fire damage repair and interior redesign, it is the only building of its type in Isla Vista. It may have been moved to its current cement pad, but it has been at the same site for over 50 years. As a result, the barn meets Significance Criterion C for its distinctive type of architecture, which is rare in Isla Vista, and may be considered eligible for listing as a historical resource.

Older single-family residences remain throughout streets closest to the Pacific Ocean, including Del Playa Drive, Sabado Tarde, Trigo Road, and Pasado Road. An informal survey of these structures indicate that up to 35 structures may date to the earliest period of Isla Vista development between the 1920s and 1930s, based on their architectural style and building materials (e.g., simple one-story, wood, board and batten construction). These homes were likely constructed as beach houses, farm worker residences, or possibly associated with oil company speculation investment. The specific details of who designed and built these homes, or who lived in them, is unknown. There is the potential, however, that these residences were used by prominent individuals. Though the significance of these structures has not been evaluated, it is possible that any one of these could be "associated with the lives of persons important in our past" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 Significance Criterion B).

### **3.6.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

#### ***Santa Barbara County Local Coastal Program***

The Local Coastal Program (LCP) contains the principal land use policies for development within Santa Barbara County's Coastal Zone. This program, pursuant to requirements of the California Coastal Act (Section 30108.5), contains the relevant portion of a local government's general plan, or local coastal element, which indicates the kinds, location, and intensity of land uses, the applicable resource protection and development policies and a listing of implementing actions. The County's LCP first came into effect in 1982, and has been revised periodically to update policies. The Coastal Land Use Plan (CLUP) represents one component of the LCP, which also includes the Land Use Maps of the Coastal Zone, the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (codified as Article II of Chapter 35 in the Santa Barbara County Code), and the Coastal Zoning Maps.

Santa Barbara County has incorporated numerous cultural/historical resource goals and policies into the LCP in order to ensure conformance with California Coastal Act. These policies include:

- **CLUP 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.
- **CLUP 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.
- **CLUP 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 Native American Heritage Commission.
- **CLUP 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.
- **CLUP Policy 10-5:** Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.
- **CLUP Policy 2-17(b):** Use of flexible design concepts, including clustering of units, mixture of dwelling types, etc., shall be required to accomplish as much as possible all of the following goals:
  - a. protection of the scenic qualities of the site;
  - b. protection of coastal resources, i.e., habitat areas, archaeological sites, etc.;
  - c. avoidance of siting of structures on hazardous areas;
  - d. provision of public open space, recreation, and/or beach access;
  - e. preservation of existing healthy trees; and
  - f. provision of low and moderate housing opportunities.

***Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan/Goleta Community Plan (GCP)***

The GCP was adopted by the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors in July of 1993 as the focused policy document for the unincorporated areas of Goleta. Because the area is within the coastal zone, County policies for the area were reviewed and certified by the California Coastal Commission.

Avoidance of adverse impacts on cultural/historic resources was not considered to be feasible in all cases. Therefore, build-out under the Goleta Community Plan was found to result in potentially *significant, unavoidable impacts* (Class I) on cultural/historical resources. The Board of Supervisors identified the following GCP policies and development standards relevant to the proposed project, to address this significant and unavoidable impact:

- **Policy HA-GV-1:** Significant cultural, archaeological and historical resources in the Goleta area shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible;
- **DevStd HA-GV-1.3:** Any archaeological site and 50-foot buffer area shall be temporarily fenced with chain link or other structurally sound material in the event of proposed construction within 100 feet of a sensitive area.
- **Program HA-GV-1.4:** The County shall consider developing a program for acquiring protective easements, or purchase of development rights to maintain rural landscapes, such as clusters of farmhouses, outbuildings, and plantings;
- **DevStd HA-GV-1.5:** In the event that archaeological or paleontological remains are uncovered during construction, excavation shall be temporarily suspended and redirected until the provisions of Public Resources Code section 5097.5, 5097.9 et seq. are satisfied.
- **Program HA-GV-1.7:** When funding is available, the County shall consider developing a historic overlay to protect potentially significant historic structures from impacts of demolition or construction. The County shall review all permit applications within the historic overlay district, determining the level of significance through a Phase 2 historical study performed by an architectural historian according to the County regulations governing heritage resource studies. The conclusions of the report shall be reviewed by the County Landmarks Advisory Committee for comments and findings of completeness; and,
- **Policy HA-GV-2:** All development resulting in increased building size or demolition of structures included in the list of historic resources included in the GCP shall be reviewed for consistency with historic resource preservation policies by RMD.

### 3.6.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

**CEQA, Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.** The basic goal of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is to develop and maintain a high-quality environment now and in the future. The CEQA Guidelines provide a framework for the analysis of impacts to cultural resources.

#### Prehistoric Resources

Where a project may adversely affect a unique cultural resource, Section 21083.2 of CEQA requires that the Lead Agency (i.e., Santa Barbara County) treat that effect as a significant environmental effect. When a cultural resource is listed in or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, Section 21084.1 of CEQA requires that any substantial adverse effect to that resource be considered a significant environmental effect.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and 15126.4 define a significant cultural resource, either prehistoric or historic, as a “historical resource.” A historical resource is defined as:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, §4852). The Public Resources Code §5024.1 states that the Significance Criterion A resource may be listed as an historical resource in the California Register if it meets any of the following National Register of Historic Places criteria:
  - A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
  - B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
  - C. 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
  - D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1[k] of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1[g] of the Public Resources Code) 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 5024.1.

### **Historic Resources**

Criteria for assessing what types of activities would constitute an adverse effect on significant historical resources are identified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. A significant impact on historical resources would occur if the proposed project would cause demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the character-defining features of a significant historical resource. In practice, actions that would cause the loss of integrity, causing a historical resource to lose its significance, would be considered adverse. Criteria for evaluating whether a building is significant are spelled out in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. An historical resource as stated in §15064.5 is one that is, but not limited to, "any object, building, structure, site, area, place, records, or manuscript which is historically ... significant or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. An historical resource may be

significant if it is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage; is associated with 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."

Historically significant resources include those listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; those included in a local register of historical resources; or those identified as significant in an historical resource survey. The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, 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.

For these properties not formally on one of the above lists, the agency is to evaluate significance according to "recognized criteria," in this case the significance criteria developed for the County of Santa Barbara which are found in the "County of Santa Barbara Resource Management Department Cultural Resource Guidelines Historic Resources Element" (rev. 1993). To be considered significant, a resource must possess integrity of location, design, workmanship, material, and/or setting, and be at least 50 years old or if not, be unique and in possession of extraordinary elements of integrity, design, construction or association.

In addition it must demonstrate one or more of the following:

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, artist, 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 important to the community, state, or nation;
4. Embodies elements demonstrating (a) outstanding attention to design, detail, or craftsmanship, or (b) 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 conveys 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 scholarly studies in the humanities and social sciences.

To evaluate a resource, each of the above elements is assessed and given a ranking, from 1 through E, corresponding to the terms little, good, high, and exceptional. Each element is ranked separately. The overall level or threshold of significance is determined by the sum of its individual rankings.

Structures that appear to be 50 years or older are considered to have the potential to be eligible as an historic resource and listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. Therefore, existing Planning & Development procedures include requesting an historical assessment of any structure 50 years or older by a County-qualified historian as part of all land use permit or coastal development permits.

### 3.6.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### **IMPACT CH-1: Development of the proposed project may cause damage and destruction to unknown resources.**

There are significant archeological sites neighboring the project area on all sides, suggesting the possibility of sites of archeological significance to be present on land in the project area that is currently developed. The majority of Isla Vista has not been professionally surveyed. One cultural resource site has been identified in the project area, CA-SBA-51. This site is located in an open space area which will undergo no development, and therefore, will experience no disturbance as a result of the IVMP.

Direct impacts are typically associated with construction activity and have the potential to alter and/or diminish all or part of the character and quality of historic and archaeological resources. The planning area is a dense, urban community with few undeveloped parcels. Development under the IVMP would not likely disturb soils that have not been previously disturbed. Therefore, there are no anticipated direct impacts on *known* cultural resources.

Build-out and redevelopment under the IVMP (associated with Catalyst site development, public improvements, and land use/zone changes) could result in accidental discovery of a previously unknown archeological site of significance that had not been discovered during original development. This could potentially result in damage to *unknown*, buried archaeological resources during surface and subsurface grading. This would be a *potentially significant* impact to archeological resources.

**Mitigation Measure CH-1.1:** In the event archeological remains are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until a P&D qualified archeologist and Native American representative are retained by the applicant to evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigations of the County Archeological Guidelines. If remains are found to be significant, they shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with County Archeological Guidelines and funded by the applicant. This

mitigation measure will prevent the destruction of unknown, buried archeological resources during grading activities.

**Residual Impacts:** Adherence to policies in the GCP and implementation of Mitigation Measure CH-1.1 would reduce potential impacts to *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.

**IMPACT CH-2: Master Plan build-out would potentially demolish residential structures over 50 years old located throughout Isla Vista, outside of the downtown and Estero Park plan areas.**

Increased residential densities allowed under the Master Plan would provide incentives to individual property owners to increase the number of units within their holdings. This could in cases result in the modification or removal of existing single-family structures and replacement with more substantial multi-family units. The single-family structures over 50 years old are located adjacent to or within lot boundaries that could feasibly be impacted by Master Plan build-out. A windshield survey of Isla Vista revealed that there are approximately 35 structures over 50 years of age. The structures would likely not relate to an important event that has made “a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage,” (significance Criterion A) as they were built for primarily secondary use (summer or weekend homes), or for farm worker occupation. It is possible, however, that “individual persons important in our past” (significance Criterion B) may have lived in some of these structures. If so, the structure where this occurred would possibly have some historic importance under significance Criterion B. It is not likely, based on the informal historical survey, that the structures embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values (significance Criterion C), nor due to their age (less than 100 years) would they “likely yield, or be likely to yield, information important in history” (significance Criterion D).

GCP Policy HA-GV-1 directs that significant cultural, archaeological and historical resources in the Goleta area shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible. When an individual application is received, staff will analyze on a case-by-case basis to determine whether additional historical analysis is necessary. Adherence to GCP policies, along with CEAQ guidelines would result in *adverse, yet less than significant impacts (Class III)* to historic resources.

The following recommended mitigation measure will assist in age and integrity determination for structures that appear potentially historic.

**Recommended Mitigation Measure CH-2.1:** The age and integrity of structures proposed for modification or demolition shall be determined as a result of individual application review. Age shall be determined by reviewing existing building materials (e.g., absence of substantial use of modern materials including aluminum, plastic, vinyl, etc.) and style (single vs. two-story, vernacular vs. contemporary, etc.). Structural integrity shall be based on the

presence of original exterior building materials and the absence of substantial structural additions that eliminate the ability to recognize the original age, design, and style, in compliance with CEQA guidelines. Structures over 50 years of age and retaining their exterior structural integrity (interior structural modifications shall not be considered) shall be the subject of a Phase 1 Historic Resources Significance Assessment by a County-qualified architectural historian funded by the project applicant to determine if the structure is related to individual persons important in our past. In the event the structure is found to be potentially significant, recommendations consistent with CEQA Section 15064.5 shall be undertaken. This could include measures to guide structural rehabilitation and reconstruction, and/or historical documentation (e.g., photographing and recordation).

**Residual Impacts:** Implementation of existing County procedures for evaluating potential impacts on structures over 50 years of age, together with the recommended measure CH-2.1, would ensure that impacts on historic resources would result in *adverse, yet less than significant impacts* (Class III) to historic resources.

### 3.6.5 Cumulative Impacts

Build out of the IVMP, together with the pending and approved projects identified in chapter 3, will result in cumulative impacts to cultural and historical resources. Together, these cumulative projects will ultimately generate 3,352,973 sq. ft. of commercial and industrial development and 3,313 new residential units throughout the Goleta Valley, UCSB and Isla Vista area. This will result in a cumulatively significant amount of grading and ground disturbance that has the potential to affect archeological and historic sites.

Total avoidance of impacts is difficult. Increased human activity in the vicinity of cultural resources leads to greater exposure and potential for illicit artifact collection and accidental disturbance during construction. In many cases, these impacts can be minimized by site redesign or use of fill. These impacts would be addressed on a case-by-case basis, and implementation of existing County historical review procedures would ensure that the significance of archaeological resources is properly assessed and addressed as development occurs.

Additionally, cumulative development could have a significant impact on the remaining approximately 35 structures over 50 years old in the region, and many that become over 50 years during the 20-year Master Plan build-out. This could happen through demolition or alteration of existing structures or during construction of new structures, roads, paths, trails, and public infrastructures such as utility pipelines. Although a detailed assessment of the total number and location of historic architectural resources throughout the entire plan area has not been completed, it is unlikely (though possible) for significant unavoidable impacts on unknown historic resources to occur. These impacts would be addressed on a case-by-case basis, and implementation of existing County historical review procedures would ensure that the significance of historic resources is properly assessed and addressed as development occurs.



The IVMP will contribute a significant amount of this cumulative growth to the area (1,447 housing units and 51,485 sq. ft. of commercial development). As a result, the project's contribution to cumulative cultural and historic impacts are significant and unavoidable (Class I), consistent with the Goleta Community Plan findings.

This page left intentionally blank