

## **5.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

### **5.6.1 BACKGROUND**

Cultural resources are remains and artifacts left from past human occupation, including food refuse, tools, ornaments, and utensils. Remains predating the Spanish occupation of California are classified as prehistoric, while those dating after that time are considered historic because the remains can be interpreted together with written records. Historic remains include standing architectural structures and features like walls, fences, or landscaping associated with a historic activity (Arthur D. Little 1996). Cultural resources also encompass the values placed on physical cultural remains by a community or ethnic group.

### **5.6.2 REGIONAL OVERVIEW**

Archaeological site records indicate that Native Americans have inhabited the Santa Barbara region for at least 9,500 years, and possibly for over 12,000 years. These prehistoric people were hunter-gatherers who occupied the coastline, adjacent interior, and offshore islands of California from Malibu to San Luis Obispo. A variety of prehistoric cultural resources are located in the project study area such as sites containing a variety of plant and animal remains and artifacts that reflect activities conducted through the year. The archaeological record from the time of settlement forward indicates a complex pattern of cultural change in settlement patterns, subsistence strategies, trade patterns, and population size (County of Santa Barbara, 1985).

The Study Area is also rich in historic cultural resources that represent various phases of its history and economic development. Resources representing the Mission Period (A.D. 1770 - 1830) include outlying buildings, livestock facilities, and mission ranch headquarters with housing, water conveyance systems, and outlying vineyards and gardens. Less visible today are the trade routes and roads linking the mission with similar mission system components to the north and south. Structures, sites, and features within the Study Area associated with the Rancho Period (A.D. 1830 - 1860) include building foundations, trash deposits, orchard remnants, trails, adobes, and livestock facilities (County of Santa Barbara, 1988). Following the admission of California as a state in 1848 and the gradual decline of the California Ranchos, the Spanish and Mexican interests were largely replaced by American homesteaders. Extensive trade and historic shipping points along the coast accompanied the American Period (1860 - 1900). More diversified agricultural pursuits, such as dairies and farming, were added to the established beef cattle operations. Typical cultural resources within the Study Area from this period would include wooden residences, schools, dairy facilities, bridges, wharfs, lighthouses, stage stops, rail facilities, and ranch equipment.

### **5.6.3 CONSTRAINTS**

#### **Prehistoric Resource Issues**

The archaeological remains of the native inhabitants of the central coast region comprise a rare cultural and scientific resource, representing an important hunting/gathering culture. The Chumash are considered one of the most advanced hunter-gatherer groups known to archaeologists (Spanne, 1990). Due to the

substantial losses that have already occurred to archaeological sites, the remaining sites are considered to be significant resources.

The Study Area is known to be archaeologically rich, and contains hundreds of documented sites. Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB) and Point Sal are thought to have the highest density of archaeological sites along California's mainland coast. Within the Study Area the rich intertidal zone, with its productive shellfish beds, was a significant attractant for prehistoric and early historic peoples. Cultural resources are higher along rocky beaches than along sandy beaches, which are generally less productive.

The Study Area has not been systematically surveyed in its entirety. Archaeological sites are most often found in areas with specific topographic and geographic characteristics that include proximity to water (i.e., rivers, creeks, lakes, or natural springs), fairly level slopes as on mesas or floodplains, the perimeters of marsh/wetland areas, and drainage confluences. The Study Area contains many such areas and therefore has a high probability of containing sensitive archaeological resources in addition to those already documented.

### **Historic Resource Issues**

Many structures and buildings left by American homesteaders and other early settlers still exist today and are considered to be either historic landmarks or places of historic merit. The County's Cultural Resource Guidelines Historical Resources Element (Santa Barbara County, 1993) defines a significant historical resource as one that: a) possesses integrity of location, design, workmanship, material, and/or setting; b) is at least 50 years old; and c) demonstrates one or more of the following characteristics:

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 style or building type important to the community, state, or nation;
4. Embodies elements demonstrating a) outstanding attention to design, detail, 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 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.

## Summary of Cultural Resource Issues

Table 5.6-1 on the following page is adapted from a Master Environmental Assessment conducted to address the environmental sensitivity of the oil fields within the County. Due to their history of oil-related uses, existing oil fields are candidates for siting additional oil processing facilities.

The primary impacts that development can have on prehistoric cultural resources include the following:

1. Potential loss or disturbance of physical cultural resources;
2. Potential impacts on Native American cultural values;
3. Unauthorized collection of artifacts; and
4. Cumulative effects on cultural resources.

### 5.6.4 POLICIES

The following policies were adopted by the County to protect cultural resources.

#### Historical and Archaeological Sites Policies

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.

#### Coastal Plan Policies

##### ***Coastal Plan 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.

##### ***Coastal Plan 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.

##### ***Coastal Plan 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.

**Table 5.6-1**

**Santa Barbara County Oil and Gas Fields**

**Number of Known Cultural Resources Sites  
 And Estimated Sensitivity to Disturbance**

Oil Field	Prehistoric		Historic	
	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Number of Known Sites	Sensitivity	Number of Known Sites
Guadalupe	L	0	L	0
Santa Maria Valley	H	11	H	0
Casmalia	H	4	H	0
Orcutt/Four Deer/Careaga	U	0	M	2
Jesus Maria	H	22	L	2
Cat Canyon	U	0	U	0
Lompoc	H	4	M	2
Los Alamos/Barham Ranch	U	0	U	0
Zaca Creek	U	0	U	0
Refugio	H	3	H	0
Capitan	H	8	M	2
Ellwood	H	17	M	0
La Goleta	H	12	M	0
Russel Ranch/South Cuyama	U	0	U	0

<sup>1</sup> L, H, and U indicate low, high, and unknown sensitivity.  
 (County of Santa Barbara, 1991)

**Policy 10-5:**

Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.

**Coastal Plan Policies Regarding Industrial and Energy Development**

**Policy 6-2:**

The Development Plan shall consist of the following:

- b. A map (1" = 50') showing relationship of proposed facilities to other buildings, structures, and/or natural or artificial features, including habitats, prime agricultural land, recreational areas, scenic resources, and archaeological sites within 1,000 feet of the well(s).
- c. A plan for eliminating or substantially mitigating adverse impacts on habitat areas, prime agricultural lands, recreational areas, scenic resources, and archaeological sites due to siting, construction, or operation of facilities.

**Policy 6-13C:**

The oil storage facility site shall further meet or exceed each of the environmental goals described below. Where the best available siting and project design alternatives do not meet these goals, compensating offsite mitigation may be allowed except for on-site factors directly affecting public health and safety. Sites and facilities which do not require offsite mitigation are preferred to those that do, except in those cases in which an offsite mitigation program in combination with the proposed facility configuration is more environmentally preferable than reasonable alternatives.

Oil Storage Facility Environmental Goals:

- 5). No significant cultural resources shall be adversely affected.

**Policy 6-17:**

When feasible, pipelines shall be routed to avoid important coastal resources, including recreation, habitat, and archaeological areas.

**Policy 6-18:**

For pipeline segments passing through important coastal resource areas, including recreation, habitat, and archaeological areas, the segment, in the case of a break, shall be isolated by automatic shutoff valves.

**Policy 6-19:**

Unavoidable routing through recreation, habitat, or archaeological areas, or other areas of significant coastal resource value, shall be done in a manner that minimizes the impacts of a spill, should it occur, by considering spill volumes, durations, and trajectory. Appropriate measures for cleanup or structures such as catch basins to contain a spill shall be included as part of an oil spill contingency plan.

**Policy 6-20:**

Transmission line rights-of-way shall be routed to minimize impacts on the viewshed in the coastal zone, especially in scenic rural areas, and to avoid locations which are on or near habitat, recreational, or archaeological resources, whenever feasible. Scarring, grading, or other vegetative removal shall be repaired, and the affected areas revegetated with plants similar to those in the area to the extent safety and economic considerations allow.

*1991 Gas Processing Facility Screening and Siting Criteria  
Cultural Resources*

*Siting Criteria:*

- 1. Avoid sites with topographic characteristics that suggest a reasonable likelihood of clusters of cultural resources (e.g., ridgelines, confluence of streams, etc.).*
- 2. Avoid sites with known concentrations of Native American sensitive resources to the maximum extent feasible.*
- 3. Avoid sites near a "unique" archaeological or cultural resource.*

**5.6.5 DISCUSSION**

Excavation activities in previously undisturbed soils would likely be necessary for the construction of either a new or an expanded onshore oil and gas processing facility. Such activities would trigger the potential to impact significant cultural resources. In general, preferable sites for future development would include those where cultural resources are absent. Secondly, sites that have been previously disturbed or have already been studied and determined to be culturally insignificant could be considered for development. Many of the rural lands within the study area include properties containing the geographic and physical qualities that would be suitable for prehistoric settlement. Therefore, sites with topographic characteristics that suggest a reasonable likelihood of a cultural resource should also be avoided. Archaeological sites are most often found in areas with specific topographic and geographic characteristics that include proximity to water (i.e., rivers, creeks, lakes, or natural springs), fairly level slopes as on mesas or floodplains, the perimeters of marsh/wetland areas, and drainage confluences.

To the extent possible, the cultural resources constraints of the Study Area have been summarized in this report and have been taken into account in the identification of possible sites for future development. In order to protect significant cultural resources sites, however, these resources are not depicted on maps within this report.

Neither a detailed records review or field surveys have been conducted for the entire study area. The lack of thorough site data for the Study Area constitutes a limitation to the data presented in this report. Additional analysis of cultural resources must be conducted for any specific location that qualifies as a potential site for new development. Any future development proposals must undergo full environmental review to determine site-specific and cumulative effects, and to identify maximum feasible mitigation for those effects. Although it may be difficult to site pipeline corridors without impacting cultural resources, future pipeline siting decisions should attempt to avoid cultural resources, or to mitigate cultural resources impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

#### 5.6.6 REFERENCES

- Arthur D. Little. November, 1984. (84-EIR-16). Point Arguello Field and Gaviota Processing Facility Area Study and Chevron/Texaco Development plans EIR/EIS. Prepared for the County of Santa Barbara, U.S. Minerals Management Service, California State Lands Commission, California Coastal Commission, and the California Secretary of Environmental Affairs.
- Arthur D. Little, Inc. 1996. *UNOCAL Point Pedernales Project: Addendum to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared for Santa Barbara County Department of Planning and Development, Energy Division.
- County of Santa Barbara. March 1985. *Union Oil Project/Exxon Project, EIR, Appendix G*.
- County of Santa Barbara. August 1988. *Shell Hercules Draft EIR/EIS, Appendix G*.
- County of Santa Barbara. 1991. *Master Environmental Assessment for Onshore Oil Fields*.
- County of Santa Barbara. 1993. *Cultural Resource Guidelines Historical Resources Element*.
- County of Santa Barbara. 1999. *Point Arguello Project Condition R-1 Draft PEIR*.
- Spanne, Laurence W. 1990. *Phase I Archaeological Survey Report and Cultural Resources Assessment, Point Sal, California*.



## North County Siting Study

---

### Index

- [Cover and Table of Contents](#)
- [1.0 - Executive Summary](#)
- [2.0 - Introduction](#)
- [3.0 - Potential Future Development](#)
- [4.0 - Existing Facility Infrastructure](#)
- [5.0 - Environmental Constraints Analysis](#)
  - [5.1 - Public Safety and Hazardous Materials](#)
  - [5.2 - Geology and Hydrology](#)
  - [5.3 - Agricultural Resources](#)
  - [5.4 - Biological Resources](#)
  - [5.5 - Visual Resources](#)
  - [5.6 - Cultural Resources](#)
  - [5.7 - Land Use](#)
  - [5.8 - Public Services](#)
  - [5.9 - Noise](#)
  - [5.10 - Circulation](#)
  - [5.11 - Air quality](#)
- [6.0 - Site Analysis](#)
- [7.0 - Conclusions and Recommendations](#)
- [8.0 - Limitations of the Study](#)
- [9.0 - List of Preparers](#)
- [10.0 - Acronyms](#)