4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This chapter of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) describes the potential impacts to cultural resources associated with the adoption and implementation of the proposed project. This chapter describes the regulatory framework and existing conditions, identifies criteria used to determine impact significance, provides an analysis of the potential impacts to cultural resources, and identifies proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions that would minimize any potentially significant impacts. See Chapter 4.16, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, of this Draft EIR, for a discussion of tribal cultural resources.

4.5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

4.5.1.1 TERMINOLOGY

The following terms are recurring and referenced throughout this chapter.

- Cultural Resource. This term is used to describe several different types of properties: pre-contact (prehistoric) and historic archaeological sites, buildings, objects, structures, and districts or any other physical evidence associated with human activity considered important to a culture or a community for scientific, traditional, or religious reasons.
- Historic Property. Federal regulations (36 Code of Federal Regulations 800) define a historic property as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term also includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to Native American tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations and that meet National Register criteria.
- Historical Resource. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) define a historical resource as a resource listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register by the State Historical Resources Commission, a resource included in a local register of Historical Resources, or identified as significant in a Historical Resource survey meeting the requirements of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1(g), or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that 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.
- Unique Archaeological Resource. CEQA defines this term as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:
 - Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
 - Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
 - Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

4.5.1.2 **REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

Federal Regulations

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 defines the responsibilities of federal agencies to protect and preserve historic properties and established the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) as the official designation of historical resources, including districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects. Sites less than 50 years in age, unless of exceptional importance, are not eligible for the National Register. Listing in the National Register does not entail specific protection for a property, but project effects on properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register, it must be evaluated under CEQA. For a property to be eligible for listing in the National Register, it must be significant and possess integrity. According to the National Register criteria for evaluation,¹ a property is significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture if it:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (United States Code [USC], Title 16, Sections 470aa–mm) became law on October 31, 1979, and has been amended four times. It regulates the protection of archaeological resources and sites that are on federal and Native American lands.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (USC, Title 25, Sections 3001 et seq.) protects Native American remains, including Native American graves on federal and tribal lands, and recognizes tribal authority over the treatment of unmarked graves. This act prohibits the selling of Native American remains and provides guidelines for the return of Native American human remains and cultural objects from any collection receiving federal funding, such as museums, universities, or governments. Noncompliance with this act can result in civil and criminal penalties.

¹ Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 60.4.

State Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines define four ways that a property can qualify as a historical resource for purposes of CEQA compliance:

- The resource is listed in or determined eligible for listing in the California Register, as determined by the State Historical Resources Commission.
- The resource is included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k), or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- The lead agency determines the resource to be significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, as supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.
- The lead agency determines that the resource may be a historical resource, as defined in PRC Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5), which means, in part, that it may be eligible for the California Register.

In addition, CEQA Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 specify lead agency responsibilities in determining whether a project may have a significant effect on archaeological resources. If it can be demonstrated that a project will damage a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts for the resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. Preservation in place is the preferred approach to mitigation. The PRC also details required mitigation if unique archaeological resources are not preserved in place.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) requires that excavation activities stop whenever human remains are uncovered during a project or activity, and that the county coroner be called in to assess the remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted within 24 hours. At that time, the lead agency must consult with the appropriate Native American descendants, if any, as identified by the NAHC. Under certain circumstances, the lead agency (or applicant), is required to develop an agreement with the Native American descendants for the treatment and disposition of the remains. In addition to the mitigating provisions pertaining to accidental discovery of human remains, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) also requires that a lead agency make provisions for the accidental discovery of historical or archaeological resources. These provisions should include an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be a Historical Resource or Unique Archaeological Resource, avoidance measures should be implemented, or appropriate mitigation should be available.

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historic Resources (California Register) establishes a list of properties to be protected from substantial adverse change (PRC Section 5024.1). A historical resource may be listed in the California Register if it is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, or cultural annals of California, and meets any of the following criteria:

- It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
- It is associated with the lives of persons important in California's past.
- It 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 value.
- It has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The California Register includes properties that are listed or have been formally determined eligible for listing in the National Register, State Historical Landmarks, and eligible Points of Historical Interest. Other potential resources require nomination for inclusion in the California Register.

For a property to be eligible for listing in the California Register, it must possess integrity as well as be significant. Integrity is the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic or prehistoric period. Loss of integrity, if sufficiently great, will render a resource ineligible for the California Register. Integrity is determined through application of seven factors:

- Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
- Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- **Setting** is the physical environment of the historic property.
- Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration form a historic property.
- Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

Health and Safety Code Sections 7052 and 7050.5

Health and Safety Code Section 7052 states that the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony. Section 7050.5(b) of the Health and Safety Code specifies protocol when human remains are discovered during activities involving ground disturbance. If human remains are discovered or identified in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there should be no further disturbance or excavation nearby until the county coroner has determined the area is not a crime scene that warrants further investigation into the cause of death and made recommendations to the persons responsible for the work in the manner provided in PRC Section 5097.98 (the California Native American Historical, Cultural, and

Sacred Sites Act). This section, which applies to both State and private lands, provides guidance for proceeding when human remains associated with Native American burials and associated items are encountered. This act stipulates the procedures the descendants may follow for treating or disposing of the remains and associated grave goods.

Public Resources Code Section 5097

PRC Section 5097.5(a) specifies that a person shall not knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure, or deface any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, or archaeological sites, which can include fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, rock art, or any other archaeological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over the lands. As used in this section, "public lands" means lands owned by, or under the jurisdiction of, the state, or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof. County and city lands are exempt from this provision, except for parklands larger than 100 acres.

California Code of Regulations

Archaeological resources, on lands administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation, are addressed in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Division 3, Chapter 1. Section 4308 of this chapter addresses archaeological features and states that no person shall remove, injure, disfigure, deface, or destroy any object of archaeological or historical interest or value.

Historical Building Code

The California Historical Building Code (CCR Title 24, Part 8) provides regulations for permitting repairs, alterations, and additions for the preservation, rehabilitation, relocation, reconstruction, change of use, or continued use of historical buildings, structures, and properties determined by any level of government as qualifying as a historical resource. A historical resource is defined in Sections 18950 to 18961 of Division 13, Part 2.7 of the Health and Safety Code, and subject to rules and regulations in the California Historical Building Code.

Government Code Section 65352.3-5 (Senate Bill 18)

California Government Code Section 65352.3-5, commonly known by its legislative bill number, Senate Bill (SB) 18, states that prior to the adoption or amendment of a city or county's general plan, or specific plans, the city or county shall consult with California Native American tribes that are on the contact list maintained by the NAHC. The intent of this legislation is to preserve or mitigate impacts on places, features, and objects, as defined in PRC Section 5097.9 and PRC Section 5097.993, that are within the city or county's jurisdiction. Government Code Section 65362.3-5 also states that the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of those places, features, and objects identified by Native American consultation. Government Code Section 65362.3-5 applies to all general and specific plans and amendments proposed after March 1, 2005.

Local Regulations

Santa Rosa City Code

The Santa Rosa City Code (SRCC) includes various directives to minimize adverse impacts to cultural resources in Santa Rosa. The SRCC is organized by title, chapter, and section, and in some cases, articles. Most provisions related to cultural resources are in Title 17, *Environmental Protection*; Title 18, *Buildings and Construction*; and Title 20, *Zoning*, as follows:

- Chapter 20-58, *Historic and Cultural Preservation*. This chapter provides procedures for the identification, protection, alteration and construction of buildings, structures, signs, neighborhoods, and districts that have special historical, archaeological, cultural, or architectural value in the city. The purpose of this chapter is to allow development to proceed while maintaining historic resources.
- Chapter 18-04, General Provisions. The City's building regulations describe specific building standards in the city and prescribe the development standards and specifications that apply to each building in its given district, such as permit fees and improvement standards. The City has adopted the 2019 version of the California Historical Building Code, which provides regulations for the preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, relocation, or reconstruction of qualified historical buildings or properties.
- Chapter 20-28, Combining District. Subsequent to the adoption of the Historic and Cultural Preservation Ordinance, the City adopted the Historic (-H) combining district into the City's Zoning Code. The purpose of this code is to recognize, preserve, and enhance the city's locally recognized built environment. The-H combining district applies to all properties in a historical district and outlines the standards for the planning and development of sites in these districts.

Santa Rosa Design Guidelines

The Santa Rosa Design Guidelines (Design Guidelines), adopted in 2002, supplement and enhance design concepts that promote "superior design" by exhibiting thoughtful relationships in the natural and built environment with respect to architecture, landscaping, placemaking and livability, and sustainability. The Design Guidelines provide a clear set of design policies to project sponsors such as developers, property owners, architects, designers, and public agencies and establish criteria for project review. The Design Guidelines apply to all projects that require design review, including most new buildings, subdivisions, infill development, and public improvements.

Chapter 4.7, *Historic Districts*, provides general design guidelines that apply to all historic structures and neighborhoods that have been adopted by the City. The goals of this chapter of the Design Guidelines are to preserve Santa Rosa's historic heritage, encourage maintenance and retention of historic structures and districts, ensure that alterations to historic buildings are compatible with the character of the structure and the neighborhood, discourage the demolition of significant historic structures, and assist property owners and designers in developing plans for historic properties and to encourage the compatibility of new structures in historic districts, and having those plans approved by the City.

Processing Review Procedures for Owners of Historic Properties

Adopted in 2001, the *Processing Review Procedures for Owners of Historic Properties* assists owners, designers, and citizens in the preservation of Santa Rosa's historic resources. These procedures are referenced in the Design Guidelines and apply to all historic properties in the city. The report includes background on design review, including historic preservation and landmarks, CEQA compliance, and the step-by-step procedures applicants need to follow in preparing and submitting their applications for design review.² It also provides the design guidelines and review procedures for historic properties.

4.5.1.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Information in this section was obtained from the California Historical Resources Information System's Northwest Information Center in Rohnert Park and the files of the City of Santa Rosa by Tom Origer and Associates for the preparation of this Draft EIR. Significant cultural resources include structures that may be eligible for the National Register, the California Register, or otherwise identified in the City of Santa Rosa's Preservation Districts and inventory of landmark properties. Please see Chapter 4.16, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, of this Draft EIR, for additional information on Native American resources and consultation pursuant to the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act.³

Ethnographic Setting

Linguists and ethnographers tracing the evolution of languages have found that most of the indigenous languages of the California region belong to one of five widespread North American language groups (the Hokan and Penutian phyla, and the Uto-Aztecan, Algic, and Athabaskan language families). The distribution and internal diversity of four of these groups suggest that their original centers of dispersal were outside, or peripheral to, the core territory of California, that is, the Central Valley, the Sierra Nevada, the Coast Range from Cape Mendocino to Point Conception, and the Southern California coast and islands. Only languages of the Hokan phylum can plausibly be traced back to populations inhabiting parts of this core region during the Archaic period, and there are hints of connections between certain branches of Hokan, such as that between Salinan and Seri, that suggest that at least some of the Hokan languages could have been brought into California by later immigrants, primarily from the Southwest and northwestern Mexico.⁴

At the time of Euroamerican settlement, people inhabiting this area spoke Southern Pomo, one of seven mutually unintelligible Pomoan languages belonging to the Hokan language stock. The Southern Pomo's aboriginal territory falls within present-day Sonoma County. To the north, it reaches the divide between Rock Pile Creek and the Gualala River, and to the south it extends to near the town of Cotati. The eastern

² Santa Rosa Cultural Heritage Board, 2001, Processing Review Procedures,

https://www.srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/3259/Processing-Review-Procedures-for-Owners-of-Historic-Properties----PDF?bidId=, accessed on May 30, 2023.

³ The Native American Historic Resource Protection Act, commonly referred to as it's legislative bill number Assembly Bill (AB) 52, passed in 2014 and amended CEQA to address California Native American tribal concerns regarding how cultural resources of importance to tribes are treated under CEQA and created a new tribal cultural resources (TCR) category.

⁴ V. Golla, 2011, *California Indian Languages*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

boundary primarily runs along the western flanks of Sonoma Mountain until it reaches Healdsburg, where it crosses to the west side of the Russian River. Within the larger area that constitutes the Southern Pomo homelands, some bands or tribelets occupied distinct areas.

The Bitagomtara were a triblet of the Southern Pomo and they occupied the lands south of Mark West Creek, north of Cotati and the boundary of the Coast Miwok, east of the Laguna de Santa Rosa, and west of Sonoma Canyon.^{5, 6} Primary village sites of the Southern Pomo were occupied continually, while temporary sites were visited to procure resources that were especially abundant or available only during certain seasons. Sites often were situated near freshwater sources and in ecotones where plant life and animal life were diverse and abundant.

Primary village sites of the Southern Pomo were occupied continually, while temporary sites were visited to procure resources that were especially abundant or available only during certain seasons. Sites often were situated near freshwater sources and in ecotones where plant life and animal life were diverse and abundant. There are several ethnographic villages in the EIR Study Area.⁷

The Southern Pomo population was decimated early in the historic period, especially in the southern part of their territory. Ethnic identity was severely impacted in the region of Santa Rosa and Sebastopol; McLendon and Oswalt reported that the few Southern Pomo speakers remaining in 1976 were from north of Healdsburg.⁸ In 1992, the Southern Pomo and Coast Miwok established the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and were federally recognized in 2000.

Historic Setting

Much of Santa Rosa lies within the Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa, an 8,885-acre grant made to María Ignacia López de Carrillo, the mother-in-law of General Mariano Vallejo. Traveling from San Diego in 1837, she brought seven of her children to settle on the rancho and built the first European dwelling in the Santa Rosa area.⁹ After Señora Carrillo's death in 1849, the rancho was divided among seven claimants. As originally platted, the town of Santa Rosa included the blocks between 1st and 5th Streets and between present-day Morgan Street on the west and just beyond E Street to the east.¹⁰ Green's Addition was the first expansion of the town, moving the limits northward. Outlying parcels varied in size, tending to increase in acreage as they got further from the town center.

⁵ R. Milliken, 1995, A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1769-1810, Menlo Park, CA: Ballena Press.

⁶ O. Stewart, 1943, "Notes on Pomo Ethnogeography", University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 40, no. 2, pp.29–62.

⁷ S. Barrett, 1908, *The Ethno-Geography of the Pomo and Neighboring Indians,* University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 6, no. 1, Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

⁸ S. McLendon and R. Oswalt, 1978, "Pomo," In *California*, edited by R. Heizer, pp. 274–288, *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8, W. Sturtevant, general editor, Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

⁹ M. Hoover, H. Rensch, E. Rensch, W. Abeloe, and D. Kyle, 2002, *Historic Spots in California*, 5th edition, Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Press.

¹⁰ Brewster, J., 1854, Santa Rosa, California. Surveyor's original map folder #12, Sonoma County Recorder's Office.

With the end of World War II, Santa Rosa experienced a population boom, much like the rest of the nation. Census data show that the city had 12,605 people enumerated in 1940, and over the next 10 years, the number rose to 17,902.¹¹ By 1960, Santa Rosa boasted a population of just over 31,000 people, nearly tripling in size in just 20 years. To accommodate this growth, entire neighborhoods were erected in short order, and the outward movement of families to the suburbs, begun during the late nineteenth century, recommenced with due speed. Much of this growth was bolstered by benefits extended to returning service members and their families. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (also known as the G.I. Bill of Rights) included several programs to ease World War II veterans back into the local economy while avoiding a return to the pre-war depression. Among those benefits was a military loan guarantee program to help purchase homes. In 1950, homeownership in California had risen 11 percent over the proceeding decade and was at an all-time high of 58 percent by 1960.

The years following World War II brought unprecedented well-being to Americans, and commerce flourished as people grew more comfortable with spending. Immediately after World War II, new commercial buildings generally were in downtown areas and other existing commercial centers. Bolstered by post-war consumer confidence, new housing developments appeared, and with them the need for more schools, new churches, and new commercial enterprises. By the end of the 1950s, new commercial construction was usually located in the new suburbs at the edge of town. In Santa Rosa, Hugh Codding led the way with several housing and commercial developments, including Brookwood Terrace, Town & Country Village, and Montgomery Village. These subdivisions tended to have their own commercial areas, and often social features as well.

Historic Resources of the Built Environment

In 1977 and 1989, architectural surveys of the city were completed by Dan Peterson and Anne Bloomfield, respectively, as well as numerous volunteers. Largely focused on the original core downtown and its immediate surroundings, these surveys identified several buildings and districts containing historical buildings. Though these surveys have been immensely helpful, they are over 30 years old and would not meet CEQA requirements by current standards. Based on the analysis of the Built Environment Resource Directory of the California Historical Resources Information System by Tom Origer and Associates for the preparation of this Draft EIR, over 900 buildings and structures have been subjected to some level of historical analysis in the EIR Study Area. The range of analysis includes buildings that have been listed on the National Register to those that have been formally evaluated and found ineligible for listing on any level (national, state, or local), and those identified as potentially important but not yet formally evaluated or listed on a register.

Historic resources include sites, structures, districts, landmarks, or other physical evidence of past human activity generally greater than 50 years old. Table 4.5-1, *Historical Resources in the EIR Study Area*, shows the 34 national- and state-listed historical resources found in the EIR Study Area. Table 4.5-2, *Buildings Classified as Locally Important in the EIR Study Area*, lists the 54 resources classified as locally important.

¹¹ State of California Department of Finance, 2011, Historical Census Populations of Counties and Incorporated Cities in California, 1850–2010, http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/state_census_data_center/historical_census_1850-2010/.

Name	Address	Listing
Cnopius House	726 College Avenue	National Register
Comstock House	767 Mendocino Avenue	National Register
De Turk Round Barn	819 Donahue Street	National Register
Flamingo Hotel	2777 4th Street	National Register
William Hood House	7501 Sonoma Highway	National Register; California Historical Landmark
Hotel La Rose	308 Wilson Street	National Register
W. H. Lumsden House	727 Mendocino Avenue	National Register
Luther Burbank House and Garden	200 Santa Rosa Avenue	National Register; California Historical Landmark
McDonald Mansion	1015 McDonald Avenue	National Register
Old Post Office	425 7th Street	National Register, California Register
Park Apartments	300 Santa Rosa Avenue	National Register
Railroad Square District	Downtown Santa Rosa	National Register
Rosenberg's Department Store	700 Fourth Street	National Register; California Register
Sweet House	607 Cherry Street	National Register
Wasserman House	930 Mendocino Avenue	National Register
Pygmailon B&B Briggs House	331 Orange Street	California Register (listed individually and as a contributor to the Olive Park Historic District)
Olive Park Historic District Ludwig's Addition		National Register; Locally recognized as a Historic Preservation District
Rosenberg Building	306 Mendocino Avenue	California Register
South Saint Rose Historic District		California Register (overlaps with the boundary of the local St. Rose Historic Preservation District
120 7th Street	120 7th Street	California Register
133 7th Street	133 7th Street	California Register
Old Rose Street School	560 9th Street	California Register (St. Rose Historic Preservation District)
515 Davis Street	515 Davis Street	California Register
Junius Botts Residence	433 Olive Street	California Register
Burbank School	203 South A Street	California Register
Pacific Tire Sales Palin Brothers Sales Room	35 Sebastopol Avenue	California Register
Lincoln School	709 Davis Street	California Register
Elmer Olsen House	400 Lincoln Street	California Register (St. Rose Historic Preservation District)
Healey Residence	806 McDonald Avenue	California Register (McDonald Historic Preservation District
1005 Cleveland Avenue	1005 Cleveland Avenue	California Register
A. H. Johnson	1591 Sebastopol Road	California Register
L W Burris Distillery Cold Storage Plant	700 Donahue Street	California Register (West End Historic Preservation District)
Santa Rosa Wine Cellar De Turks Winery	722 Donahue Street	California Register (West End Historic Preservation District)
Twentieth Century Folk Ard Environments (Thematic) – John	5000 Medica Road	California Historical Landmark
Winery Twentieth Century Folk Ard		

TABLE 4.5-1 HISTORICAL RESOURCES IN THE EIR STUDY AREA

Source: Tom Origer and Associates, 2023.

ADDRESS	ADDRESS
868 2 nd Street	801 Humboldt Street (Summerfield House/Thurston House)
819 3 rd Street	912 Humboldt Street
827 3 rd Street	931 Humboldt Street
834 3 rd Street	1011 Humboldt Street
850 3 rd Street (Lafferty Residence)	1200 Humboldt Street
613 4 th Street (Kress Building)	100 Junior Street
909 4 th Street	622 King Street
1023 4 th Street (Hiram and Mary Tripp Residence)	318 Mendocino Avenue (Title Insurance Building)
1032 4 th Street	920 Mendocino Avenue
1040 4 th Street	762 Orchard Street (The Redwoods)
1069 4 th Street (E. A. Wilson Residence)	801 Orchard Street
840 5 th Street	807 Orchard Street
710 7 th Street (Patricia Geraghty Residence)	302 South E Street
120 10 th Street	412 South E Street
722 Beaver Street	716 Slater Street
742 Beaver Street	826 Slater Street (Thompson Home)
881 Carr Avenue (Residential Rehabilitation)	467 Sonoma Avenue
934 Clark Street	473 Sonoma Avenue
446 College Avenue	1103 Sonoma Avenue
600 College Avenue	1145 Sonoma Avenue
705 College Avenue	522 Spencer Street
715College Avenue	602 Spencer Street
807 College Avenue	103 Stanford Street
812 College Avenue	117 Stanford Street
441 Denton Way	622 Wright Street
1324 Fair Oaks Avenue (Stewart Residence/Trussel Residence)	729 Wright Street
716 Howard Street	909 Wright Street

TABLE 4.5-2 BUILDINGS CLASSIFIED AS LOCALLY IMPORTANT IN THE EIR STUDY AREA

Note: Buildings at 0 A Street (Kessings Bayler & Menheim & Klutes Additions), 17 Davis Street, 550 Elliott Avenue, 712 Elliott Avenue, 800 Sonoma Avenue, and 825 Sonoma Avenue no longer exist and therefore are not listed in this table.

Source: Tom Origer and Associates, 2023.

In addition to the resources listed in Tables 4.5-1 and 4.5-2, there are eight historic preservation districts in the city of Santa Rosa. The SRCC-H combining district zoning designation applies to all parcels in the listed designated preservation districts. Note that the boundaries of the Railroad Square and St. Rose districts overlap with the boundaries of the National Register district and the California Register district respectively.

- Burbank Gardens Historic Preservation District
- Cherry Street Historic Preservation District
- McDonald Historic Preservation District
- н. Olive Park Historic Preservation District
- Railroad Square Historic Preservation District
- Ridgway Historic Preservation District
- St. Rose Historic Preservation District
- West End Historic Preservation District н.

Archaeological Resources

Beginning in the early twentieth century, avocational archaeologist Jesse Peter traversed the Santa Rosa area and documented over 100 Native American archaeological sites. Since the enactment of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 and the CEQA of 1970, hundreds of surveys have been conducted in the EIR Study Area, which has resulted in the documentation of over 1,000 cultural resources ranging from prehistoric habitation sites to mid-twentieth century developments. Remnants of Native American civilization have been discovered along Santa Rosa Creek and its tributaries, in the adjacent alluvial valleys and surrounding plains, in the hills, in the Trione-Annadel State Park area, in the Laguna de Santa Rosa, and in the Windsor area. The remains of entire settlements, including three former villages, were found in northern Santa Rosa. Given the environmental setting, the archaeologically rich nature of the Santa Rosa area, and the fact that the EIR Study Area has not been entirely surveyed, there is a high potential for finding additional Native American sites in Santa Rosa.

Native American Resources and Consultation

Native American Resources

Santa Rosa was a site of Native American habitation beginning approximately 7,000 years ago, and Santa Rosa contains approximately 190 recorded Native American resources.¹² The Santa Rosa Basin, encompassing the EIR Study Area, contains six major drainages: Santa Rosa, Matanzas, Piner, Rincon, Austin, and Brush Creeks. These creeks may hold prehistoric resources because Native American archaeological sites tend to be near waterways as well as along ridge tops, mid-slope terraces, alluvial flats, the base of hills, and near vegetation ecotones.¹³ Trione-Annadel State Park, in the southeast corner of the EIR Study Area, was an important obsidian source for Native American tools. Resources may include chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, pestles, dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials.

Native American Consultation: Senate Bill 18

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65352.3-5 (SB 18), a request was sent to the NAHC for a Tribal Consultation List in April 2019 and due to the ongoing nature of the proposed project a new request was sent in August 2024. The NAHC identified 36 local Native American representatives from the following 25 tribes as potentially having local knowledge of Native American places, features, and objects, as defined in PRC Section 5097.99 and PRC Section 5097.993, that are within the EIR Study Area. Tribes denoted with an asterisk (*) were included on the list from the NAHC in 2019 and 2024.

 ¹² Based on a 2001 review of records and literature on file with the California Historical Resources Information System.
¹³ Vegetation ecotones are transition areas between different plant communities.

- Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Big Valley Rancheria
- Cahto Tribe
- Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians*
- Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians
- Dry Creek Rancheria of Pomo Indians*
- Elem Indian Colony Pomo Tribe
- Estom Yumeka Maidu Tribe of the Enterprise Rancheria
- Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria*
- Guidiville Rancheria of California
- Hopland Band of Pomo Indians
- Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria*
- Koi Nation of Northern California
- Lytton Rancheria*

- Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria
- Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California*
- Mishewal-Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley*
- Noyo River Indian Community
- Pinoleville Pomo Nation
- Potter Valley Tribe
- Redwood Valley or Little River Band of Pomo Indians
- Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians
- Round Valley Reservation/ Covelo Indian Community
- Scotts Valley Band of Pomo
- Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo
- Yokayo Tribe

The City notified the tribal representatives for each of the seven tribes denoted with an asterisk (*) about the proposed project on July 26, 2021 and requested information regarding potential resources at or near the EIR Study Area. While not on the 2019 NAHC list, the City also reached out to Pinoleville Pomo Nation and Tomaras & Ogas, LLP on behalf of the Lytton Rancheria. Anthony Macias, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer of the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians, responded to the City on August 10, 2021 that the city is out of the Aboriginal Territory of the Stewarts Point Rancheria Kashia Band of Pomo Indians, and they had no comments or concerns. Additionally, the City received requests for consultation from the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and Lytton Rancheria. The City met with representatives of Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and with representatives from the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and by the city from the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and Lytton Rancheria. In addition, the City maintained ongoing communication with representatives from the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and Lytton Rancheria to date (October 2024), only the listed requests have been made. A description of how the City has responded to each of these requests is provided in Section 4.16.3, *Impact Discussion*, under impact discussion TCR-1, in Chapter 4.16, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, of this Draft EIR.

- Work to develop a better communication system for the required SB 18 and AB 52 consultation between City staff and tribes.¹⁴
- Tribal acknowledgment to be added to the Housing Element and to be carried forward in the comprehensive General Plan.
- Consider Phase 1 archaeological survey for all projects that involve ground disturbance: allowing potential exceptions where the ground has already been disturbed.
- Develop a threshold for when ministerial projects with ground disturbance can include consultation.
- Expand consideration of projects along waterways to include historical locations and trajectories.
- Ensure the plan includes adequate goals, policies, and actions related to resilience.

¹⁴ AB 52 stands for Assembly Bill 52 which was the legislation that enacted the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act. A detailed discussion of this Act is provided in Chapter 4.16, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, of this Draft EIR.

As stated, due to the ongoing nature of the project, the City notified the tribal representatives for each of the 25 tribes about the proposed project on September 11, 2024 and requested information regarding potential resources at or near the EIR Study Area.

Sacred Lands File Search

Concurrently with the request for the Tribal Consultation List in August 2024, a request was sent to the NAHC for a Sacred Lands File search. The NAHC reported on August 30, 2024 that the result of the Sacred Lands File search was negative.

4.5.2 STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant impacts to cultural resources if it would:

- 1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5.
- 2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- 3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.
- 4. In combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, result in a cumulative impact with respect to cultural resources.

4.5.3 IMPACT DISCUSSION

As described in Chapter 4.0, *Environmental Analysis*, of this Draft EIR, some proposed General Plan 2050 policies and actions are required as a means to mitigate environmental impacts under CEQA. These policies and actions are fully enforceable at the discretion of the decision maker through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments. These mitigating policies and actions use the imperative "shall," include performance criteria, and are marked with an asterisk (*). Note that all actions are required to be implemented by the City and therefore the imperative "shall," if not explicitly stated, is implied.

CUL-1 Implementation of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

The types of cultural resources that meet the definition of historical resources under CEQA Section 21084.1 generally consist of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant for their traditional, cultural, and/or historical associations. Under CEQA, both prehistoric and historic-period archaeological sites may qualify based on historical associations. As such, the two main historical resources that are subject to impact, and that may be impacted by implementation of the proposed project, are historical archaeological deposits and historical architectural resources. Impacts to

archaeological resources are described under impact discussion CUL-2, and human remains are addressed under impact discussion CUL-3.

As discussed under Section 4.5.1.3, *Existing Conditions*, several historical resources exist in the EIR Study Area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project could have the potential to directly impact cultural resources by altering land use regulations that govern these properties or surrounding sites. Implementation of the proposed project would allow for an increase in residential, commercial, and industrial development in Santa Rosa over the planning horizon of the proposed General Plan 2050. Potential future development in the EIR Study Area could cause a significant impact on the historical resources in question if new construction were incompatible with the existing historical resources' site relationships that contribute to the significance of the existing property, or if the massing (height and bulk) of new construction were incompatible with the historical resource. Lastly, the design characteristics and materials of new construction could impact adjoining or nearby historical buildings. If new development near historic properties is not compatible, impacts on historical resources could be significant. Additionally, if new development were to directly impact existing resources, impacts on historical resources could be significant.

SRCC Chapter 18-04 adopted the California State Historic Building Code, which provides regulations for permitting repairs, alterations, and additions necessary for the preservation, rehabilitation, relocation, related construction, change of use, or continued use of a qualified historical building or structure. SRCC Chapter 17-22 outlines the methods that items can be identified and protected as cultural and historical resources. Article V, *Permits for Restoration, Rehabilitation, Alteration, Removal, or Demolition*, bans alterations of any kind to any building in a preservation district without a permit from the City. The SRCC-H combining district applies to all properties in a historical district and outlines the standards for the planning and development of sites in these districts. Additionally, the City's *Design Guidelines* contain guiding policies pertaining to historic properties to preserve historic heritage, limit the demolition of historical sites, and ensure alterations are compatible with the existing character of the structure and neighborhood. Standards include requesting a review from the City to determine any historic or architectural significance prior to demolition or alteration if it is determined that the exterior appearance of any designated landmark or any structure in a Preservation District may change.

The proposed General Plan 2050 Chapter 4, *Urban Design, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Historic Preservation, and Art and Culture,* contains goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to historic resources in the built environment. The following goals, policies, and actions would minimize impacts to historic resources:

- **Goal 4-1:** Preserve and enhance Santa Rosa's community character through attractive urban and environmental design and intentional development.
 - Policy 4-1.1: Preserve and enhance the visual beauty and value of the city's natural waterways, hillsides, historic districts, buildings, structures, and landscapes.
 - Policy 4-1.2: Strengthen and emphasize community focal points, visual landmarks, and features that contribute to the identity of Santa Rosa by applying the design concepts and standards of the Zoning Code, Design Guidelines, Historic Combining Districts, Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and the Citywide Creek Master Plan.

- **Goal 4-3:** Protect the historic and cultural resources of Santa Rosa and enrich the sense of place and understanding of the city's history and prehistory.
 - Policy 4-3.1: Preserve Santa Rosa's historic sites, buildings, and neighborhoods.
 - Action 4-3.1: Identify funding sources and resources to pursue designating new landmarks and historic preservation districts.
 - *Action 4-3.2: Follow the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction for the treatment of historic properties.
 - Action 4-3.3: Provide owners of older and historic buildings, structures, and sites clear and cost-effective options to measurably enhance energy efficiency while maintaining the historic integrity to the greatest extent possible.
 - Action 4-3.4: Pursue designation as a Certified Local Government Program by the National Parks Service to assist in funding local historic preservation.
 - Action 4-3.5: Seek funding and establish mechanisms, such as social media and periodic flyers, to educate property owners in preservation districts about the steps required for changes to historic properties.
 - *Action 4-3.6: Identify and minimize or remove obstacles for owners of historic properties to support preservation, including guides for repurposing facilities. Identify resources to:
 - Keep cultural surveys relevant.
 - Periodically update the City's Cultural Heritage Survey to ensure consistency with current guidelines and best practices, to reflect potential changes in status, and to include properties that have become age-eligible for listing.
 - Conduct cultural and/or historic inventories or surveys of areas of the city that have not been surveyed.
 - Install plaques and/or educational signage at locations of cultural significance and significant events.
 - Implement recommendations in the City's Cultural Heritage studies.
 - Partner with the local tourism industry, property owners, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and other public agencies to develop and promote Heritage Tourism opportunities, integrating efforts with ongoing initiatives for economic development and the creative economy.
 - Work with local schools and historic organizations to engage and interest residents of all ages in Santa Rosa's history and historic sites, structures, and neighborhoods.
 - *Action 4-3.7: Identify buildings that should be recognized for cultural significance and/or considered for landmark designation.
 - Action 4-3.8: Strongly encourage and incentivize adaptive re-use of historic buildings and structures over demolition.
 - *Action 4-3.9: Preserve historic aspects of parks while integrating modern uses and amenities.

- Action 4-3.10: Ensure that historic surveys are available on a dedicated City webpage, easily accessible and promoted online.
- Policy 4-3.2: Promote conservation for efforts related to historic buildings, structures, or sites.
 - Action 4-3.11: Explore programs, policies, or procedures that encourage the preservation of materials, such as historic windows, doors, siding, and trim, for potential reuse, as feasible when historic buildings are demolished or renovated.

Because future development under the proposed General Plan 2050 has the potential to occur where historic buildings and/or properties may exist, known and yet to be classified, impacts from the proposed General Plan 2050 are potentially *significant*.

Impact CUL-1: Impacts to known or yet to be classified historic buildings or structures could occur from potential future development under the proposed General Plan 2050.

Significance with Mitigation: Less than significant. Implementation of the Santa Rosa City Code (SRCC), Design Guidelines, and the proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions, would ensure that new development and exterior remodels are compatible with cultural and historic resources; that landmarks and historic treasures would be preserved, enhanced, and rehabilitated, and that cultural and historic resources of Santa Rosa would be protected and restored. Specifically, proposed General Plan 2050 *Action 4-3.2 would mitigate potential impacts by requiring the City to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction of historic structures in Santa Rosa, and *Action 4-3.6 would require the City to work with the owners of historic properties to promote preservation, renovation and rehabilitation of historic structures. Under proposed *Action 4-3.6, *Action 4-3.7, and *Action 4-3.9, the City would require cultural and/or historic inventories or surveys of the city and the identification of buildings and park properties that should be recognized for their cultural significance to further preserve qualifying historic properties in Santa Rosa. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed General Plan 2050 would require the preservation of historic resources and require new development to analyze and avoid any potential impacts to designated historic resources through record searches, preconstruction field surveys, ground-disturbance monitoring, and implementation of appropriate measures or project alternatives to avoid identified significant impacts. Finally, CEQA would require that future potential projects in the EIR Study Area with the potential to significantly impact historical resources be subject to project-level CEQA review wherein the future potential project's potential to affect the significance of a surrounding historical resource would be evaluated and mitigated to the extent feasible. The requirement for subsequent CEQA review, pursuant to State law, would minimize the potential for new development to indirectly affect the significance of existing historical resources to the maximum extent practicable.

Potential impacts from future development on historical resources could lead to (1) demolition, which by definition results in the material impairment of a resource's ability to convey its significance; (2) inappropriate modification, which may use incompatible materials, designs, or construction techniques in a manner that alters character-defining features; and (3) inappropriate new construction, which could introduce incompatible new buildings that clash with an established architectural context. While any of these scenarios, especially demolition and alteration, have the

potential to change the historic fabric or setting of an architectural resource such that the resource's ability to convey its significance may be materially impaired, compliance with federal and State laws as described in Section 4.5.1.2, *Regulatory Framework*, SRCC, and the proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions identified would ensure future development would not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity and impacts would be *less than significant*.

CUL-2 Implementation of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5.

Historical and pre-contact archaeological deposits that meet the definition of archaeological resources under CEQA could be damaged or destroyed by ground-disturbing activities associated with potential future development in Santa Rosa. A substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource would occur from its demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1). Should this occur, the ability of the deposits to convey their significance, either through containing information important in prehistory or history, or through possessing traditional or cultural significance to Native American or other descendant communities, would be materially impaired.

The overall pre-contact archaeological sensitivity of the EIR Study Area is generally considered high. As discussed in Section 4.5.1.3, *Existing Conditions*, remnants of Native American civilization have been discovered throughout Santa Rosa. Given the environmental setting, the archaeologically rich nature of the Santa Rosa area, and the amount of unsurveyed land, there is a high potential for finding additional Native American sites in Santa Rosa.

Implementation of the proposed project could result in development on a number of vacant, rural, or agricultural sites that may not have been as extensively disturbed as urbanized areas. The potential remains that archaeological deposits could be discovered because implementation of the proposed project could result in development on or in the vicinity of areas with the potential to contain significant resources. In addition, development in proximity to known archaeological sites in Santa Rosa would have the potential to contain significant resources that could be permanently damaged by potential future development over the buildout horizon of the proposed project. Ground-disturbing construction activities (e.g., site preparation, grading, excavation, and trenching for utilities) associated with the proposed project may result in unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources or the damage or destruction of previously undiscovered resources. As described in Section 4.5.1.3, *Existing Conditions*, the creeks in the EIR Study Area may hold prehistoric resources because Native American archaeological sites tend to be near waterways.

The proposed General Plan 2050 Chapter 2, *Land Use and Economic Development;* Chapter 3, *Circulation, Open Space, Conservation, and Greenhouse Gas Reduction;* and Chapter 4, *Urban Design, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Historic Preservation, and Art and Culture,* contains goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to archaeological resources. The following goals, policies, and actions would minimize impacts to archaeological resources:

- Goal 2-2: Promote city-centered growth and investment with a neighborhood-focused approach to create complete and connected communities that provide community members' daily needs within easy walking or biking distance.
 - Policy 2-2.2: Encourage a compact, rather than a scattered, development pattern for new development proposals, particularly in Areas of Change.
- **Goal 3-5:** Protect, expand, maintain, and restore natural resources, open space, and the limited remaining agricultural land.
 - Policy 3-5.2: Preserve, enhance, and expand a connected network of open spaces for recreation, natural and cultural resource protection, and mobility of species by way of critical linkages between open space lands.
 - Action 3-5.4: Collaborate with regional agencies and private landowners to link inaccessible open spaces to benefit the protection of special environments and ecosystems, such as wetlands, plant communities, wildlife habitats and corridors, historic resources, and tribal and cultural resources.
 - Policy 3-5.3: Conserve and protect creeks, wetlands, vernal pools, wildlife ecosystems, rare plant habitats, and waterways from development.
 - Policy 3-5.5: Maintain, restore, and protect the city's waterways.
 - Policy 3-5.7: Ensure that construction adjacent to creek channels is sensitive to the natural environment, preserves topography and vegetation along the creek, does not disrupt or pollute the waterway, and provides an adequate setback buffer.
 - *Action 3-5.19: Require new development along channelized waterways to establish an ecological buffer zone between the waterway and development that also provides opportunities for shared use paths and recreation.
 - *Action 3-5.20: Require new development to maintain an adequate setback from channelized waterways to recognize the 100-year flood elevation, with setbacks in the Zoning Code as minimums and larger setbacks encouraged in accordance with Restoration Concept Plans to meet restoration and enhancement goals.
- **Goal 4-2:** Protect tribal cultural resources in Santa Rosa and enrich the sense of place and understanding of the city's history and prehistory.
 - Policy 4-2.1: Protect Native American heritage, honor the early stewards of this land, and treat Native American remains and resources with sensitivity.
 - *Action 4-2.1: Continue to review proposed developments in conjunction with the California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center, at Sonoma State University to determine whether project areas contain known archaeological resources, both prehistoric and/or historic-era, and tribal cultural resources, or if they have the potential to hold such resources and if so, implement mitigation to protect the resource.

- *Action 4-2.2: Work in good faith with interested communities to evaluate proposed development sites for the presence of subsurface historic, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources. These efforts may include:
 - Consideration of existing reports and studies.
 - Consultation with Native American tribes as required by State law.
 - Appropriate site-specific investigative actions.
 - On-site monitoring during excavation if appropriate.
- *Action 4-2.3: Continue to require that project areas found to contain significant archaeological resources be examined by a qualified consulting archaeologist with recommendations for protection and preservation.
- Policy 4-2.2: Collaborate with the most likely descendants, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission.
 - *Action 4-2.4: If tribal cultural resources are encountered during development, halt work to avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified consulting archaeologist and Native American representative (if appropriate) have evaluated the situation and recorded identified tribal cultural resources—which may include animals, structures, landscapes, or plants—and determined suitable mitigation measures.

Because future development under the proposed General Plan 2050 may occur where there is the potential for archeological resources, known and unknown, impacts from the proposed General Plan 2050 are potentially *significant*.

Impact CUL-2: Impacts to known and unknown archeological resources could occur from potential future development under the proposed General Plan 2050.

Significance with Mitigation: Less than significant. Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions would ensure that new development in the EIR Study Area reduces and mitigates potential impacts to archaeological resources. As demonstrated, the proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions encourage infill development, adaptive reuse of structures, and development on underutilized land, which would reduce the potential for disturbing archaeological deposits since ground-disturbing activities have already taken place in developed areas. Specifically, proposed Policy 2-2.2 encourages compact development in the Areas of Change. Proposed Policy 4-1.1 requires the preservation and enhancement of the city's natural waterways and landscapes, Policy 3-5.7 requires that construction adjacent to creek channels is sensitive to the natural environment, preserves topography and vegetation along the creek, does not disrupt or pollute the waterway, and provides an adequate setback buffer, and *Action 3-5.19 and *Action 3-5.20 require new development along channelized waterways to establish an ecological buffer zone between the waterway and development. Additionally, implementation of the proposed *Action 4-2.1 and *Action 4-2.2 would require the preservation of archaeological and historic resources that are found in the EIR Study Area and would require new development to analyze and avoid any potential impacts to archaeological resources through record searches, preconstruction field surveys, ground-disturbance monitoring, and implementation of appropriate measures or project alternatives to avoid identified significant impacts. Proposed *Action 4-2.3 requires the City to continue to require that project areas

found to contain significant archaeological resources be examined by a qualified consulting archaeologist with recommendations for protection and preservation and *Action 4-2.4 requires the evaluation and mitigation of tribal cultural resources by a qualified consulting archaeologist and Native American representative as appropriate. The proposed General Plan 2050 requires development project applicants to consult with Native American representatives regarding cultural resources to identify locations of importance to Native Americans, including archaeological sites and traditional cultural properties. Compliance with federal and State laws, as described in Section 4.5.1.2, *Regulatory Framework*, and the proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions listed previously, would protect recorded and unrecorded archaeological deposits in the EIR Study Area by providing for the early detection of potential conflicts between development and resource protection, and by preventing or minimizing the material impairment of the ability of archaeological deposits to convey their significance through excavation or preservation would ensure that potential impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

CUL-3 Implementation of the proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

Previously undiscovered human remains associated with pre-contact archaeological deposits may exist in the EIR Study Area, as ground-disturbing activities sometimes uncover such previously unrecorded remains. As described under impact discussion CUL-2, ground-disturbing activities and excavation for the project would have the potential to uncover buried resources. It is possible that human remains may be present in the EIR Study Area. Descendant communities may ascribe religious or cultural significance to such remains, making any such disturbances a potentially significant impact.

As described under impact discussion CUL-2, the proposed General Plan 2050 includes goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to minimize impacts to archaeological resources, including human remains. Specifically, proposed Policy 2-2.2 encourages infill development, particularly in the Areas of Change, which reduces opportunities to unearth human remains, Action 3-5.4 requires the City to collaborate with regional agencies to expand open space that would protect historic and tribal cultural resources, which could include human remains, and *Action 4-2.4 outlines required procedures to follow in the event TCRs are encountered. Procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains have been mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and the CCR Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA), as described in Section 4.5.1.2, Regulatory Framework. According to the provisions in CEQA, in the event a human burial or skeletal element is identified during excavation or construction, work in that location shall stop immediately until the find can be properly treated. The Sonoma County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The Coroner shall then determine whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours, who will, in turn, notify the person the NAHC identifies as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of any human remains. Further actions shall be determined, in part, by the desires of the MLD. The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations regarding the disposition of the remains following notification from the NAHC of the discovery. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the owner shall, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. If the NAHC is unable to identify an MLD, the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified, or the landowner rejects the

recommendation of the MLD, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the owner shall, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance.

Therefore, compliance with the mandatory regulatory procedures described and the proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions, potential impacts related to the potential discovery or disturbance of any human remains accidently unearthed during construction activities associated with future development in the EIR Study Area would be *less than significant*.

Significance without Mitigation: Less than significant.

CUL-4 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in lessthan-significant cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources.

The impacts of potential future development under implementation of the proposed project on cultural resources tend to be site specific, and cumulative impacts would occur when a series of actions leads to the loss of a substantial type of site, building, or resource. For example, while the loss of a single historic building may not be significant to the character of a neighborhood or streetscape, continued loss of such resources on a project-by-project basis could constitute a significant cumulative effect. This is most obvious in historic districts, where destruction or alteration of a percentage of the contributing elements may lead to a loss of integrity for the district overall. For example, changes to the setting or atmosphere of an area by adding modern structures on all sides of a historically significant building, thus altering the aesthetics of the streetscape, would create a significant impact. Destruction or relocation of historic buildings would also significantly impact the setting.

Potential future development under the proposed project would be primarily within the developed portions (Areas of Change) of the EIR Study Area. This, in conjunction with buildout of the city and the region, has the potential to cumulatively impact cultural resources. As previously discussed, impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, and human remains in the EIR Study Area would be less than significant with implementation of the proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions described in impact discussions CUL-1 through CUL-3. Additionally, the existing federal, state, and local regulations and the proposed General Plan 2050 goals, policies, and actions described throughout this chapter serve to protect cultural resources in the EIR Study Area. Continued compliance with these regulations substantially decreases potential impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, human remains, and TCRs to the maximum extent practicable. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* in this regard.

Significance without Mitigation: Less than significant.