

4.6 CULTURAL and HISTORIC RESOURCES

Cultural Resources were previously evaluated and reported for the majority of the subject property as part of the Chandler Ranch Master Plan Draft EIR (Douglas Wood and Associates, Inc., June, 2000); however, the currently proposed boundary differs slightly from that evaluated in the previous study. An archaeological review and adequacy evaluation of the previous surface survey within the Chandler Ranch area was prepared by Gibson's Archaeological Consulting (February 17, 1998) and is attached in Appendix G of this EIR. Other reports contained in Appendix G were prepared by C. A. Singer & Associates for subareas 15, 16 and 17 (December 7, 2004) and subareas 18 and 19 north of Union Road (December 16, 2004), and by Authentic Resources Team for the Chandler Ranch house/barn complex on subarea 11 (July 25, 2005). These reports, and the other cultural and historic resources information provided in the Douglas Wood and Associates, Inc. EIR Technical Appendices, are incorporated by reference into this EIR.

4.6.1 Setting

a. Regional Setting.

Prehistoric Resources. The Chandler Ranch area lies within the historic territory of the Native American Indian group known as the Chumash (Kroeber 1953; Greenwood 1972; Gibson 1983). The Chumash occupied the region from San Luis Obispo County to Malibu Canyon on the coast, and inland as far as the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley, and the four northern Channel Islands (Grant 1978). The Chumash are subdivided into factions based on six distinct dialects: Barbareño, Ventureño, Purisimeño, Ynezeño, Obispeño, and Island. The Obispeño were the northernmost Chumash group, occupying much of San Luis Obispo County, including the Paso Robles area (Gibson 1983). The name Obispeño is derived from the mission with local jurisdiction, San Luis Obispo de Tolosa.

The archaeological record indicates that sedentary populations occupied the coastal regions of California more than 9,000 years ago. Several chronological frameworks have been developed for the Chumash region including Rogers (1929), Wallace (1955), Harrison (1964), Warren (1968), and King (1990). King postulates three major periods -- Early, Middle and Late. Based on artifact typologies from a great number of sites, he was able to discern numerous style changes within each of the major periods. The Early Period (8000 to 3350 Before Present [B.P.]) is characterized by a primarily seed processing subsistence economy. The Middle Period (3350 to 800 B.P.) is marked by a shift in the economic/subsistence focus from plant gathering and the use of hard seeds, to a more generalized hunting-maritime-gathering adaptation, with an increased focus on acorns. The full development of the Chumash culture, one of the most socially and economically complex hunting and gathering groups in North America, occurred during the Late Period (800 to 150 B.P.). Prehistoric marriage patterns and post mission settlement patterns have also identified Yokuts and Salinan people living in the northern portions of San Luis Obispo County (Gibson 1998).

The Chumash and Salinan aboriginal way of life ended with Spanish colonization. As neophytes brought into the mission system, they were transformed from hunters and gatherers into agricultural laborers and exposed to diseases to which they had no resistance. By the end of the Mission Period in 1834, the Chumash and Salinan population had been decimated by



disease and declining birthrates. Population loss as a result of disease and economic deprivation continued into the next century.

Historical Resources. The first European contact in San Luis Obispo County occurred in 1595, when Sebastian Rodriguez Cermeno put in at Port San Luis. The next documented European expedition to land in the area was Sebastian Vizcaino in 1602. Over one hundred and fifty years passed before the next major European expedition reached San Luis Obispo County. In 1769, Gaspar de Portola and Fray Crespi departed the newly established San Diego settlement and marched northward toward Monterey with the objective of securing the port and establishing five missions along the route. They passed through present-day San Luis Obispo County that same year. Three years later, in 1772, Father Serra founded the Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa. Spanish rule in Alta California came to an end in 1821 with Mexican Independence and the missions were secularized in 1832.

b. Site Specific Setting.

Prehistoric Resources. An archival records search was conducted for the majority of the Chandler Ranch site and an area within one-half mile of site boundaries with the Central Coast Archaeological Information Center at the University of California, Santa Barbara. This records search indicated a total of 19 previous surveys had been conducted within one-half mile of the Chandler Ranch property. These surveys indicate that a total of one prehistoric archaeological site and one isolated prehistoric artifact have been recorded.

The isolated prehistoric artifact, Chandler Isolate #1, was recorded within the proposed Chandler Ranch Specific Plan boundary during a 1988 survey. This artifact was recorded in 1988 near the northwest portion of the Specific Plan area just east of the terminus of Gilead Lane. This artifact was noted in an area of various sized cobbles and pebbles. It is a single platform flake core of dark colored grainy chert that measures about 12 cm (4.7") by 7 cm (2.7"). The core weighs 933 grams and is characterized by a series of at least eight contiguous flake removals which probably yielded a number of chert flakes subsequently used as tools. No additional prehistoric artifacts or cultural materials were found in the general area of the chert artifact. It is not unusual for Native American stoneworkers to visit concentrations of cobbles, occasionally assay some with a single blow or two and then partially flake better quality cobbles. Often these more worked pieces would be taken back to the village sites for further stone working. Evidence of additional stone working activity at the location was not found. This isolated artifact was mapped and collected by the survey crew in 1988. A field survey in February of 2000 of the surrounding area of this previously-collected artifact yielded no additional prehistoric stone tools, chert flakes or other prehistoric cultural materials.

Additional information about prehistoric resources on the site can be found in Appendix G, in two reports prepared by C. A. Singer in December 2004.

Historical Resources. The February 17, 1998 report by Gibson's Archaeological Consulting discussed several areas containing structures within and adjacent to the Chandler Ranch area. Most of these structures are estimated to be over 50 years old, but the area has not been identified as an historic district, nor would it potentially qualify for this status based on



required criteria, including unified architecture, an historic event, or other historic activities that would distinguish the area in such a manner.

Ranch House Complex: This area is adjacent to the southwest corner of the Chandler Ranch east of Fontana Road. It consists of a well-maintained ranch house and several associated structures (barn, auxiliary house, corrals, well and windmill). This complex was used as the headquarters for the larger Chandler Ranch, which dates back to about 1905, and was at that time under the ownership of the Aaroe family, Danish immigrants who arrived in California in 1877 and ultimately settled in Paso Robles in about 1905. The name “Chandler Ranch” dates from about 1960, at which time Linden Chandler purchased the property from heirs of the Aaroe family, as part of a forced bank sale to repay debts incurred associated with the financially unsuccessful Our Town project, which was developed from a piece of the original Aaroe property. Chandler’s holdings ultimately included about 50,000 acres in the greater Paso Robles area, including what is now the Specific Plan area. Please refer to Appendix G for a complete history of the Aaroe family, the construction of the ranch complex, and subsequent history of the house and ranch (*Authentic Resources Team, July 25, 2005*).

Farm-Orchard Complex: Adjacent to and extending into the northwest portion of the Chandler Ranch site (east of Golden Hill Road and south of Kapareil Lane) is a small house and almond orchard dating back to the 1950s. These were previously not recorded as historic resources due to their modern age and lack of integrity. However, the Gibson report (February, 1998) recommended these structures for preservation as an example of a local architectural style.

Barn Complex: Within the northeast portion of the Chandler Ranch site are two barns, a set of trailers/houses, tack shed, septic/cistern and trash dump dating to the middle 1940’s to 1950’s. This barn area also contained more modern material. The trash and debris dump was located in a narrow ravine within the northeast portion of the Chandler Ranch site and is considered recent, containing appliances, a rusted car and other items.

Our Town: There are a few existing residential units within the Our Town area near the intersection of Condict Boulevard and Aaroe Road. Our Town was a 1960s era subdivision that was never completely built. Please refer to Appendix G, which includes a report by C. A. Singer describing cultural resources associated with Our Town. Additional historical context for this property can be found in the comprehensive historical report prepared by Authentic Resources Team, also found in Appendix G.

4.6.2 Project Impacts

Cultural resources are places or objects that are important for scientific, historical, and religious reasons to cultures, communities, groups, or individuals. Cultural resources include archaeological sites, architectural remains, and other artifacts that provide evidence of past human activity. Cultural resources also include places of importance in the traditions of societies or religions. The types of activities conducted at sites and the distance of sites from villages or other types of settlements varied depending on changes in the sizes of territories the region was divided into; the degree to which populations were concentrated in a few or many



settlements; the exact locations of neighboring settlements; and the relative importance of particular resources. Sites may have been used in different ways during different time periods.

a. Methodology and Significance Criteria. To determine impacts to cultural resources, it is necessary to assess the significance of the resources and the effects of the project on their significance. The significance of cultural resources in the project area is based on their importance to scientific-historic research, their importance to Native Americans, and their educational and community value for the general public.

The State of California has provisions in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statutes and the California Public Resources Code for the protection and preservation of significant archaeological resources. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, a cultural resource shall generally be considered “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

- *Is associated with events or patterns of events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history and cultural heritage of California and the United States.*
- *Is associated with the lives of persons important to the nation or to 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 values.*
- *It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the State and the Nation.*

The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

If the Specific Plan may cause damage to a significant archaeological resource, the Specific Plan may have a significant effect on the environment. Section 15064.5 of CEQA pertains to the determination of the significance of impacts to archaeological and historic resources. CEQA provides guidelines for administering to archaeological resources that may be adversely affected by project development in Section 151226.4. Achieving CEQA compliance with regard to treatment of impacts to significant cultural resources requires that a mitigation plan be developed for the resource(s). Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to significant archaeological resources.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact CR-1 **There is potential that Specific Plan implementation will disturb previously unidentified buried archeological deposits and/or human remains. This is considered a Class II, *significant but mitigable*, impact.**

Prior archaeological surveys of the Chandler Ranch area resulted in the recordation and removal of one isolated prehistoric artifact. The December 2004 surveys of subareas 15, 16, 17,



18 and 19 did not uncover any prehistoric artifacts within those areas. No other significant prehistoric, cultural or historic resources are known to exist or have been subsequently observed within the Chandler Ranch area.

Under the proposed Specific Plan, construction within areas known to contain archaeological resources (the previously collected Chandler Isolate #1) would include the extension of Gilead Lane. In addition, Specific Plan implementation could also unearth previously unidentified cultural and/or historical resources. Disruption of any such resources is a potentially significant impact as such buried historic deposits often are important under the criteria listed above. This would be considered a potentially significant impact unless mitigation is incorporated.

Mitigation Measures. Impacts to archeological resources would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of these mitigation measures.

CR-1(a) Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring. At the commencement of construction activities in ~~of~~ the Specific Plan area, an orientation meeting shall be conducted by an archaeologist, general contractor, subcontractor, and construction workers associated with earth disturbing activities. The orientation meeting shall describe the potential of exposing archaeological resources, the types of cultural materials may be encountered, and directions on the steps that shall be taken if such a find is encountered.

A qualified archaeologist shall be present during all initial earth moving activities within native soil within 600 feet of Chandler Isolate #1. All cultural resource monitors hired to monitor future initial earth moving activities within this area shall be properly informed of the occurrence of the aforementioned isolate for the understanding of the known cultural resources in the area. In the event that archaeological and historic artifacts are encountered during project construction, all work in the vicinity of the find will be halted until such time as the find is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and appropriate mitigation (e.g., curation, preservation in place, etc.), if necessary, is implemented.

In the event of the discovery of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps shall be taken:

- I. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:
 - A. The county coroner in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and
 - B. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American:



1. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.
 2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American.
 3. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public resources Code Section 5097.98, or
- II. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representatives shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.
- A. The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.
 - B. The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or
 - C. The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

CR-1(b)

Halt Work Order. If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission.

Plan Requirements and Timing. This condition shall be in effect throughout Specific Plan implementation. **Monitoring:** The Community Development Department shall check plans prior to approval of building permits and shall spot check in the field.

Residual Impacts. Impacts would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of these mitigation measures.

Impact CR-2 Development under the Specific Plan could result in direct and indirect impacts to historical resources. This is considered a Class I, *significant and unavoidable, impact.*



Impacts Related to the Ranch Complex. The Lauritz Nissen Aaroe Ranch/Farm Complex within subarea 11 was evaluated by the Authentic Resources Team in July 2005. That report found that the complex is eligible for state and national listing, and that while mitigation measures may be possible, based on the proposed development pattern, the complex could not be preserved in place, which would be the mitigation needed to ensure that impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Additional detail regarding potential impacts to this resource is included below. The complete historic evaluation of this resource is included in Appendix G.

The Lauritz Nissen Aaroe Ranch/Farm Complex and main residence appear to meet at least the stated purpose of the San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Framework for Planning (Inland), Chapter 7 – Combining Designation goals as outline under H-HISTORIC SITE under purpose 1 (ad) and 2 (outlined on page 3 of this report). However, the subject property is no longer a part of the county. In the absence of established and written designation criteria for the City of El Paso de Robles, the National Park Service criteria has to be applied to determine if this resource is historically significant and, therefore, subject to CEQA evaluation with regard to project impacts.

The ranch/farm complex meets all seven aspects of integrity in determining significance for the criteria that must be applied, which are the eligibility requirements for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). The ranch complex is on its original location, the design is still in its original form, the setting is undisturbed from its original physical environment, the original materials are intact, the workmanship is the physical evidence of the craft and cultural of agriculture and the expression of Lauritz Nissen Aaroe’s vision and needs as a farmer during 1905, the property expresses a particular period of time and place, and it is directly associated with a recognized early pioneer of the city of El Paso de Robles and its agricultural development.

The property is very well preserved, and is an intact ranch/farm complex that represents the agricultural development of San Luis Obispo County and the City of Paso Robles in particular within the Salinas River Valley. A significant historical event of the development of this region is the agricultural industry and its evolution. The ranch/farm complex is a rare remaining type of building complexes that are disappearing as urbanization is advancing in this region. The main residence, the barn and the outbuildings are excellent and well preserved examples of early twentieth century rural domestic agricultural architecture that convey an authentic sense of time and place during the development of San Luis Obispo County and the City of Paso Robles in particular. Therefore, the Lauritz Nissen Aaroe ranch complex appears to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion A (association with events, agricultural development of the San Luis Obispo County during the Americanization Period from in 1905), and under Criterion C (embodiment of distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction).

The California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) includes all “properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places”, so by virtue of that similarity of criteria, the subject property is eligible for the CRHR. The property should be regarded as an environmental resource and subject to CEQA review.



The Public Resource Code used in the State CEQA guidelines defines the demolition of a qualified historic resource as an adverse environmental impact. Because the proposed development pattern for subarea 11 would require removal of the complex, and because there are no identified sites for its relocation, this evaluation assumes it will be demolished as part of future development under the Specific Plan. Therefore, the potential impact to this resource is considered significant.

Impacts to Resources Not Related to the Ranch Complex. An archival records search was conducted for the Chandler Ranch site as a part of the Chandler Ranch Master Plan EIR prepared by Gibson Archaeological Consulting (February 17, 1998). In addition to the ranch complex evaluated above, Gibson's 1998 survey identified a farm-orchard complex and a trash and debris dump. Based on historic research and its current condition, the farm-orchard complex and trash and debris dump do not meet California Register Criteria A, B or C for importance. However, it is possible that buried historic resources (i.e., privies, trash pits) associated with these resources may be destroyed by project implementation. Destruction of any such deposit, should they exist, is a potentially significant impact as such buried historic deposits often are important under Criterion D. Consequently, project impacts are considered potentially significant. Mitigation measures could be implemented to reduce such impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures. The Specific Plan includes the following policy for subarea 11 to address potential impacts to the ranch/barn complex within that area:

- ***Historical Resource Mitigation.*** *In conjunction with new development, one or more of the following approaches to addressing impacts to the historic Aaroe Ranch/Farm Complex shall be taken, in order of preference and effectiveness. Economic, social, and physical feasibility will be considerations in the approach ultimately taken, which must be approved by the City prior to granting any entitlement for new development consistent with the Specific Plan:*
 1. *Document the subject property through a Historic American Building Survey (HABS).*
 2. *Create an interpretive plan for the Aaroe Ranch/Farm Complex for an on-site educational display within the new development.*
 3. *Incorporate the Aaroe Ranch/Farm Complex into the new development with an adaptive reuse of the existing structures.*
 4. *Create a documentation survey that would record the historic exterior features of the Aaroe Ranch/Farm Complex that would be used in the development of an adaptive reuse plan while preserving a record of any alterations that would be necessary for contemporary use. This would include photographs and scaled "as built" site plan and floor plans.*
 5. *Relocate the historic structures to another site not threatened by development for an interpretive or adaptive re-use purpose. It should be noted that relocation of the historic resource would be considered an "adverse effect" because it would diminish the integrity aspects of location, setting, and feeling. However, it is preferable to the complete loss of the resource through demolition.*

Implementing one or more of the strategies described in the policy would provide some degree of mitigation for impacts to this resource. However, impacts would not be fully mitigated to a less than significant level unless the complex were to remain in place in accordance with strategy #3



described in the policy above. No additional mitigation measures for this resource would be required.

Mitigation measure CR-1(a) would effectively mitigate potential impacts to unknown buried resources on the site. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. Implementing one or more of the strategies described in the policy would provide some degree of mitigation for impacts to this resource. However, impacts would not be fully mitigated to a less than significant level unless the complex were to remain in place in accordance with strategy #3 described in the policy above. Because there is no guarantee this strategy will be used by the City, the impact is considered to remain Class I, Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact CR-3 Development under the Specific Plan could disturb or possibly destroy unknown paleontological resources. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable, impact.

Paleontological resources, or fossils, are the remains, imprints or traces of pre-historic animals and plants preserved in rocks and sediments. Examples include mineralized, partially mineralized, or un-mineralized bones and teeth, soft tissues, shells, wood, leaf impressions, footprints, burrows and microscopic remains. Fossils are considered non-renewable resources because the organisms from which they derive typically no longer exist, and once destroyed; a fossil can never be replaced. The significance of any particular fossil or fossiliferous formation is dependent on its rarity, regional uniqueness, and its diagnostic or taxonomic value. Fossils are important scientific and educational resources because of their use in: (1) documenting the presence and evolutionary history of particular groups of now extinct organisms, (2) reconstructing the environments in which these organisms lived, and (3) determining the relative ages of the strata in which they occur and of the geologic events that resulted in the deposition of the sediments that formed these strata and in their subsequent deformation. Fossils can also be deemed important if they are unusual, spectacular, or are rare and in danger of being depleted or destroyed.

Paleontological resources are afforded protection under various federal, state and local environmental laws and guidelines. The potential for destruction or degradation by construction impacts to nonrenewable paleontological resources is considered to be significant under CEQA.

Impacts to paleontological resources can be rated from high to low depending upon the resource sensitivity of impacted rock formations.

- High sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations known to contain paleontological localities with rare, well-preserved, and important fossil materials. Formations containing vertebrate fossils are always considered to have high sensitivity.
- Moderate sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations known to contain paleontological localities with poorly preserved, common elsewhere, or stratigraphically unimportant fossil material. The moderate sensitivity category is also applied to



geologic formations that are judged to have a strong, but unproven potential for producing important fossil remains.

- Low sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations that, based on their relative youthful age and/or high-energy depositional history, are judged unlikely to produce important fossil remains.
- Zero sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations that are entirely igneous in origin (with no inclusions of metamorphic material) or have no potential for producing fossil remains because of their extreme youth or historically altered condition.

As discussed in Section 4.5, *Safety and Geologic Hazards*, the geology of the north county is in one of the most complex formations in the state. Jurassic rocks, approximately 180 million years old, form the Franciscan complex, which is a mixture of igneous, metamorphic and sedimentary rocks. (The Jurassic period coincided with the height of the age of dinosaurs.) As such, the proposed Specific Plan site could possibly contain undiscovered paleontological resources.

Although no paleontological resources have been encountered on or immediately adjacent to the site, there remains the possibility of encountering undiscovered paleontological resources during future construction activities. Therefore, future development under the Specific Plan would require an evaluation for paleontological resources located on or immediately adjacent to the site. With the incorporation of the following mitigation measures, impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. The following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources to less than significant levels.

- CR-3(a) Paleontological Resource Construction Monitoring.** In the event of the discovery or recognition of any paleontological resources, the following steps shall be taken:

Macro/Micro Fossil Salvage. In the event that macro and/or micro fossils are encountered during future construction activities, appropriate specimens shall be salvaged as determined by a qualified paleontologist for the purpose of preservation, identification, analysis and the eventual storage of fossils found during future construction activities.

Residual Impacts. Impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of proposed mitigation.

c. Cumulative Impacts. Development under the proposed Specific Plan in conjunction with buildout of the City of Paso Robles has the potential to cumulatively impact archaeological and paleontological resources. Existing General Plan policies are intended to fully protect known archaeological resources, and onsite monitoring and proper handling of potentially uncovered resources would address this impact to a less than significant level.



The proposed Specific Plan includes policies to address impacts to historical resources on the site, but there is no guarantee that the key feature that would be impacted – the ranch/barn complex – would be preserved, a necessary requirement to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Because of the significance of the ranch/barn complex to the City’s and region’s history, this impact would result in a Class I, significant unavoidable cumulative impact to historical resources within the area.

