

### 3.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section describes existing cultural resources on the project site and identifies potentially significant impacts that could occur to cultural resources from construction and operation of the proposed project.

This section is based on a cultural resources study of the project site and vicinity prepared by Tom Origer & Associates (*A Cultural Resources Survey for the Sutter Medical Center of Santa Rosa Luther Burbank Center for the Arts Master Plan, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, CA, 2008*). This study included archival research at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), Sonoma State University (NWIC File No. 05-444), examination of the library and files of Tom Origer & Associates, consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission and local Native American representatives, and field inspection of the project site. The study also based on a historic structures resource study conducted by JRP Historical Consulting (*Inventory and Evaluation, Sutter/LBMF Joint Master Plan, 2008*). Both the cultural resources study by Tom Origer & Associates (Beard 2008) and the historic structures resource study by JRP Historical Consulting (JRP 2008) are included as **Appendix E** in the Technical Appendices, Vol. 2 of this document.

The assessment of project impacts on cultural resources under CEQA (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15064.5) is a two-step process, as follows:

1. Determine whether the project site contains cultural resources (defined as prehistoric archaeological, historic archaeological, or historic architectural resources). If the site is found to contain a cultural resource, then
2. Determine whether the project would cause a substantial adverse change to the resource.

The setting discussion describes the existing properties identified within the project area and assesses whether the properties are historical resources as defined by CEQA. The impact discussion reviews the criteria for significant impacts on cultural resources and assesses the impact of the project on cultural resources. The setting, methods, and results are summarized from a report by Thomas Origer and Associates (Beard 2008) (Appendix E-1).

#### 3.6.1 Environmental Setting

The 53-acre project site is located about 4 miles north-northwest of downtown Santa Rosa, as shown on the Sebastopol and Santa Rosa, California 7.5-minute USGS topographic quadrangles. The project site is situated on the Santa Rosa Plain, about 0.5 mile southwest of Mark West Creek and about 1 mile from where the creek flows out of the hills.

Soils mapped for this location are clay loams of the Yolo soil series (Miller 1972: Sheet 74). Yolo soils are generally well-drained loams found on alluvial fans and flood plains. In a native state, they support the growth of annual and perennial grasses, forbs, small shrubs, wild berry vines, and scattered oak trees. Of note within the project site is the presence of dogbane, also known as Indian hemp. The fiber from this native plant was used to make ropes, nets, and clothing, and as thread.

The project area would have been marginally situated for prehistoric occupants of the region to live or gather resources. Its surroundings include nearby freshwater sources and well-drained soils that would have supported a variety of plants that in turn could have served as food and cover for animals. Research has shown that prehistoric sites are sometimes found in locations such as this.

Archaeological evidence indicates that human occupation of California began at least 12,000 years ago (Fredrickson 1984:506). Early occupants appear to have had an economy based largely on hunting, with limited exchange, and social structures based on the extended family unit. Later, milling technology and an inferred acorn economy were introduced. This diversification of economy appears to be coeval with the development of sedentism and population growth and expansion. Sociopolitical complexity and status distinctions based on wealth are also observable in the archaeological record, as evidenced by an increased range and distribution of trade goods (e.g., shell beads, obsidian tool stone), which are possible indicators of both status and increasingly complex exchange systems.

At the time of European settlement, the project area was part of an area controlled by the Southern Pomo (Barrett 1908; McLendon and Oswalt 1978). The Southern Pomo were hunter-gatherers who lived in rich environments that allowed for dense populations with complex social structures (Barrett 1908; Kroeber 1925). They settled in large, permanent villages about which were distributed seasonal camps and task-specific sites. Primary village sites were occupied continually throughout the year and other sites were visited to procure particular resources that were especially abundant or available only during certain seasons. Sites often were near freshwater sources and in ecotones where plant life and animal life were diverse and abundant. For more information about the Pomo, see Bean and Theodoratus (1978), Kniffen (1939), and Stewart (1943).

Historically, the project area is within Rancho San Miguel, a Mexican land grant made to Marcus West during the 1840s and confirmed to his widow and children in 1852. Later 19th century maps show that the project area was part of the J. McMinn estate, portions of which were then acquired by Thomas Forsyth, J. Clay, and J. Barndt (Bowers 1867; Thompson 1877). This area was predominantly used for fruit and nut production.

The project area encompasses land west of Fulton and north of Santa Rosa just south of the early settlement of Mark West. The former Rancho San Miguel was divided into large holdings by 1877. Initially large holdings focused on the production of cattle and grains. By the 1880s new crops suitable for smaller farms were gaining prominence, including hops, stone fruit, and vineyards. In the early 20th century, many large holdings were divided into smaller farms suitable for these crops. The establishment of the railroad through the Petaluma Valley aided the shift in agriculture. The project area was within a mile of the railroad station in Fulton, and the small community of Mark West.

A more detailed historical context is provided in *Inventory and Evaluation, Sutter/LBMF Joint Master Plan* (JRP Historical Consulting [JRP] 2008) (Appendix E-2).

### 3.6.2 Regulatory Setting

#### *State*

The following California statutes apply:

- CEQA: California Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1, 5024.1, 21083.2, 21084.1, *et seq.*; – require analysis of potential environmental impacts of proposed projects and application of feasible mitigation measures.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5020.1 – defines several terms, including the following: (f) “DPR Form 523” means the Department of Parks and Recreation Historic Resources Inventory Form; (i) “historical resource” includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California; (j) “local register of historical resources” means a list of properties officially designated or recognized as historically significant by a local government pursuant to a local ordinance or resolution; (l) “National Register of Historic Places” (NRHP) means the official federal list of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture as authorized by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Title 16 United States Code Section 470 *et seq.*); (q) “substantial adverse change” means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 – establishes a California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); sets forth criteria to determine significance; defines eligible properties; lists nomination procedures.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 – prohibits obtaining or possessing Native American artifacts or human remains taken from a grave or cairn; sets penalties.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 – the lead agency determines whether a project may have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources. If a potential for damage to unique archaeological resources can be demonstrated, such resources must be avoided; if they can’t be avoided, mitigation measures shall be required; discusses excavation as mitigation; discusses cost of mitigation for several types of projects; sets time frame for excavation; defines “unique and non-unique archaeological resources”; provides for mitigation of unexpected resources; sets limitation for this section.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 – indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it causes a substantial change in the significance of a historic resource; the section further describes what constitutes an historic resource and a significant historic resource.
- *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5 – specifically addresses effects on historic and prehistoric archaeological resources, in response to problems that have arisen in the application of CEQA to these resources.

- *CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15000, *et seq.*, Appendix G (j), – specifically defines a potentially significant environmental effect as occurring when the Proposed Project will “...disrupt or adversely affect...an archeological site, except as part of a scientific study.”
- City, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof.

CEQA requires that public or private projects financed or approved by public agencies must assess the effects of the project on unique or significant historical resources. Historical resources are defined as buildings, sites, structures, objects or districts, each of which may have historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific significance (California Public Resources Code 21083.2; *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5).

Archaeological resources that are not “historical resources” according to the above definitions may be “unique archaeological resources” as defined in Public Resources Code section 21083.2, which also generally provides that “nonunique archaeological resources” do not receive any protection under CEQA. If an archaeological resource is neither a “unique archaeological” nor an “historical resource,” the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on it are noted in the EIR, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

CEQA requires that if a project results in an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, then alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered; however, only significant historical resources need to be addressed.

Therefore, prior to the assessment of effects or the development of mitigation measures, the significance of cultural resources must first be determined. The steps that are normally taken in a cultural resources investigation for CEQA compliance are as follows:

- Identify potential historical resources
- Evaluate the eligibility of potential historical resources
- Evaluate the effects of a project on all historical resources

### *Local*

The Sonoma County General Plan Open Space Element contains the following goal and objectives regarding cultural resources:

**Goal OS-9:** Preserve significant archaeological and historical sites which represent the ethnic, cultural, and economic groups that have lived and worked in Sonoma County.

**Objective OS-9.1:** Encourage the preservation and conservation of historic structures by promoting their rehabilitation or adaptation to new uses.

**Objective OS-9.2:** Encourage preservation of historic building or cemeteries by maintaining a Landmarks Commission to review projects which may affect historic structures or other cultural resources.

**Objective OS-9.3:** Encourage preservation of archaeological resources by reviewing all development projects in archaeologically sensitive areas.

### 3.6.3 Impact Analysis

An investigation by Beard (2008) (Appendix E-1) was used as the primary source for discussing the potential impacts to cultural resources posed by the proposed project. In addition, an evaluation of the built environment within the project area was conducted by JRP (2008) (Appendix E-2). The following summarizes the methods from the above reports to identify cultural resources within the project area.

#### 3.6.3.1 Approach and Methodology

##### *Data Collection*

**Archival Study Procedures.** Archival research included examination of the library and project files at Tom Origer & Associates. Review (NWIC File Nos. 04-192 and 04-282) was completed of the archaeological site base maps and records, survey reports, and other materials on file at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park. Sources of information included but were not limited to the current listings of properties on the NRHP, California Historical Landmarks, CRHR, and California Points of Historical Interest as listed in the Office of Historic Preservation's Historic Property Directory (OHP 2004).

The Office of Historic Preservation has determined that structures in excess of 45 years of age should be considered potentially important historical resources, and former building and structure locations could be potentially important historic archaeological sites. Archival research included an examination of historical maps to gain insight into the nature and extent of historical development in the general vicinity, and especially within the project area. Maps ranged from hand-drawn maps of the 1800s (e.g., GLO) to topographic maps issued by the United States Geological Survey (USGS).

In addition, ethnographic literature that describes appropriate Native American groups, county histories, and other primary and secondary sources were reviewed.

**Native American Consultation.** Letters describing the project were sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local Native American groups. Follow-up telephone calls were made, as needed, to ensure that the letters were received and to discuss the project.

The NAHC responded with a letter dated September 10, 2004. They have no record of Native American cultural resources in the immediate vicinity of the project area. No other responses have been received to date.

**Field Survey Procedures – Archaeology.** An intensive field survey of the project site was completed by Vicki Beard of Thomas Origer & Associates in September 2004. The project site was examined by walking in a zigzag fashion within corridors about 10 meters wide except where vineyards were planted. Vineyards were surveyed by walking at least every eighth row. The parcel that includes the vineyards is no longer part of the project site. Visibility ranged from good to poor, with vegetation and sealed parking areas being the chief hindrances. A hoe was used as necessary to clear small patches of vegetation so that the soil could be inspected, and the periphery of all paved areas was checked for native soils.

Based on the results of the pre-field research, it was anticipated that prehistoric cultural resources might be found within the project site. Prehistoric archaeological site indicators expected to be

found in the region include but are not limited to obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements such as slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles; and locally darkened midden soils containing some of the previously listed items plus fragments of bone, shellfish, and fire-affected stones. Historic period resources were considered more likely. In addition to standing structures, historic-period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps).

**Field Survey Procedures – Architectural History.** JRP conducted fieldwork at the project site on June 18, 2008, and recorded the historic era properties on DPR 523 forms. JRP conducted research at a variety of libraries and repositories including: California State Library, Sacramento; Shields Library, University of California, Davis; Sonoma County Library, Santa Rosa; Sonoma County Assessor’s Office, Santa Rosa; Sonoma County Recorder’s Office, Santa Rosa; and the Sonoma County Permits and Resource Management Department, Santa Rosa.

JRP then prepared a historic context to address pertinent themes of agricultural history in Sonoma County and evaluated the properties under CRHR criteria on the DPR 523 form.

### *Results*

**Archival Study Findings.** Archival research indicated that there are no recorded cultural resources within the project site; however, most of the project site had not been the subject of prior cultural resources investigation and there are recorded prehistoric and historic-period resources nearby. Péron (1993) surveyed about 40 acres of the project site and found no cultural resources. He noted that most of his survey area was “covered by dense stands of wild oats, vetch, wild anise, California teasel, California poppy, and other mixed grasses” (Péron 1993:2). Since the 1993 survey, that part of the project site has been planted as vineyard, where surface visibility is typically good, so the decision was made to resurvey the area.

No ethnographic villages or camps are reported within or near the project site (Barrett 1908; McLendon and Oswalt 1978).

There are no local, state, or federally recognized historic properties within or near the project site (OHP 2004; Sonoma County Planning Department 1984; State of California Department of Parks and Recreation 1976).

Review of historical maps found no buildings, structures, or other historical features on this property prior to the 1922 United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) map for which the field survey was completed in 1915 (Bell and Heymans 1888; Bowers 1867; General Land Office 1852; McIntyre and Lewis 1908; Reynolds and Proctor 1898; Thompson 1877; USACE 1922; USGS 1916).

### *Field Survey Findings*

No prehistoric archaeological sites were found within the project site. One obsidian flake and two pieces of naturally occurring obsidian were noted, but were considered isolates and therefore not historical resources or unique archaeological resources.

No historic-period archaeological sites were identified within the project site. Several fragments of non-diagnostic ceramic shards were noted in the gravel driveway of an early 20th century

farm complex (see below). These items were widely dispersed and in a disturbed context. They were not considered historical resources or unique archaeological resources.

Two properties from the early 20th century were identified within the project area: a farmstead at 100 Mark West Springs Road built between 1901 and 1910, and a residence at 18 Fulton Road built in 1928. The farmstead at 100 Mark West Springs Road originally contained a residence and four other structures. Only one structure, a barn that is being used as a maintenance facility for the LBMF, remains. The residence at 18 Fulton Road is on a parcel that is no longer part of the project site, although this property was evaluated and found not to be a historical resource under CEQA (JRP 2008) (Appendix E-2).

### 3.6.3.2 *Thresholds of Significance*

According to Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project could have a significant impact on cultural resources if it would result in any of the following:

- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource that is either listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP, the CRHR, or a local register of historic resources;
- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource;
- Disturbance or destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site or a unique geologic feature; or
- Disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

### 3.6.3.3 *Less Than Significant Impacts Not Requiring Further Analysis*

All potential impacts to cultural resources are addressed in this Draft EIR.

### 3.6.3.4 *Impacts and Mitigation*

**Impact CUL-1:** The project would demolish a barn at 100 Mark West Springs  
**Permanent Change to a** Road, a potentially historic resource.  
**Potentially Historic**  
**Resource**

**Significance:** Less than significant

**Discussion:**

The farmstead at 100 Mark West Springs Road was evaluated by JRP in June 2008. The farmstead contained a main house, a secondary house, two outbuildings, and a barn. All structures except the barn have since been demolished. The barn, which serves as a maintenance facility for the LBMF, would be demolished as part of Phase I of the proposed project.

The JRP evaluation concluded that the farmstead did not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the CRHR and thus did not qualify as historical resources for the purposes of CEQA (JRP 2008) (Appendix E-2). While this rural household had its origins in the first half of the 20th century, it was not importantly associated with the development of agriculture in Sonoma County (Criterion 1 or A). Like many other farms in the area, the farmstead at 100 Mark

West Springs Road appears to have been constructed and planted with prunes between 1901 and 1910.

Under Criterion 2 or B, the historical record did not suggest that this agricultural property was associated with any historically significant people.

Under Criterion 3 or C, the farmstead at 100 Mark West Springs Road did not possess any distinctive characteristics or high artistic value that would render it eligible under this criterion. The residence was a modest example of Minimal Traditional architecture, a popular style of architecture used in the mid-20th century.

In general, CRHR Criterion 4 (NRHP Criterion D) is used to evaluate historic sites and archaeological resources. Although buildings and structures can occasionally be recognized for the important information they might yield regarding historic construction or technologies, the properties within the project site were building types that are well documented. Thus, this property is not a principal source of important information in this regard.

The barn is a transverse crib barn, a style common in California and other western states. While well-maintained, the building has had alterations to its fenestration, which has diminished the integrity of workmanship and materials (JRP 2008) (Appendix E-2). Because this potentially historic resource is not considered significant, demolishing the barn that remains on the property would result in a less-than-significant impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation required

**Impact CUL -2: Potential Construction Impacts to Undiscovered Unique Archaeological Resources** Project construction could adversely affect undiscovered unique archaeological resources, if present.

**Significance:** Potentially significant

**Discussion:**

No previously recorded archaeological sites exist within the project site, and none were identified through surface surveys (Beard 2008) (Appendix E-1). However, extensive subsurface excavation activities would occur during construction, so there is a possibility that previously unknown archaeological sites, such as shell midden soils, stone artifacts, and historic trash scatters, may occur within the project site. Inadvertent damage to unique buried archaeological deposits during construction would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation CUL-2 would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation CUL-2: Work Stoppage and Resource Evaluation in the Event of a Subsurface Prehistoric or Historic Resource Find** If any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the find according to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives from the

county and the archaeologist will meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be, as necessary and at the discretion of the consulting archaeologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards.

In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the consulting archaeologist to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the county will determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) will be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is being carried out.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than significant

**Impact CUL-3: Potential Construction Impacts to Undiscovered Unique Paleontological Resources**

Although site soils have a very low potential to yield paleontological resources, project construction could adversely affect undiscovered unique paleontological resources, if present.

**Significance:**

Potentially significant

**Discussion:**

Paleontological resources are the fossilized evidence of past life found in the geologic record. Despite the tremendous volume of sedimentary rock deposits preserved worldwide and the enormous number of organisms that have lived through time, preservation of plant or animal remains as fossils is an extremely rare occurrence. Because of the infrequency of fossil preservation, fossils—particularly vertebrate fossils—are considered to be nonrenewable resources. Because of their rarity and the scientific information they can provide, fossils are highly significant records of ancient life.

The project site is underlain by alluvial soils that have a very low potential for yielding paleontological resources.

While fossils are not expected to be discovered during project construction, significant fossils could be discovered during excavation activities, even in areas with a low likelihood of occurrence. Fossils encountered during excavation could be inadvertently damaged. If a unique paleontological resource is discovered, the impact to the resource could be substantial. However, implementation of Mitigation CUL-3 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation CUL-3: Work Stoppage and Resource Evaluation in the Event of a Paleontological Resources Find**

In the event that fossils or fossil-bearing deposits are discovered during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. The contractor shall notify a qualified paleontologist to examine the discovery. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed (in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the project proponent determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the project on the qualities that make the resource important. The plan shall be submitted to PRMD for review and approval prior to implementation.

**Significance after Mitigation** Less than significant

**Impact CUL-4: Potential Construction Impacts to Undiscovered Human Remains**

Undiscovered human remains could be affected by excavation activities during project construction.

**Significance:** Potentially significant

**Discussion:**

There is no indication that any particular area in the project site has been used for human burial purposes in the recent or distant past. It is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during construction of the proposed project. However, in the unlikely event that human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, are discovered during subsurface activities, the human remains could be inadvertently damaged. This could be a significant impact. The impact would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation CUL-4.

**Mitigation CUL-4: Work Stoppage and Resource Evaluation in the Event Human Remains Are Encountered**

If human skeletal remains are uncovered during project construction, the contractor (depending on the project component) will immediately halt work, contact the Sonoma County coroner to evaluate the remains, and follow the procedures and protocols set forth in Section 15064.5(e)(1) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. If the county coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the project proponent will contact the NAHC, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, subdivision (c), and Public Resources Code

5097.98 (as amended by AB 2641). Per Public Resources Code 5097.98, the contractor shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the contractor has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in this section (California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98), with the most likely descendents regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant

**Impact CUL-5: Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts** Implementation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative cultural resources impacts.

**Significance:** Less than significant

**Discussion:** The Sonoma County General Plan 2020 EIR determined that development and land use activities consistent with that plan could result in a cumulative impact to cultural resources. This determination was based, in large part, on the fact that a large proportion of future development activities in the County will be ministerial and thereby not subject to discretionary review, thus avoiding environmental review pursuant to CEQA which could avoid or minimize impacts to cultural resources. The proposed project, in contrast, is subject to discretionary review and is fully assessed in this EIR. Further, this EIR has determined that the project site has no known cultural resources and the proposed project was found not to result in significant impacts to cultural resources with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a considerable contribution to a cultural resources cumulative impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation required

