

Chapter 5J. Cultural Resources

INTRODUCTION

To provide the context on which potential impacts can be assessed, this chapter presents information on the prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic setting of the planning area. This information is based on a review of historical data, a records search at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historic Resources Information System at California State University, Sonoma, and a limited field reconnaissance of the various sites being studied by a Jones & Stokes Associates archaeologist. This chapter also provides information on the regulatory setting that applies to cultural resources.

SETTING

Prehistoric Setting

Specifically, three patterns that overlap somewhat in adjoining areas are recognized for central California: the Windmill, Berkeley, and Augustine Patterns. Descriptions of these development patterns follows.

Windmill Pattern (4500 to 3000 B.P.)

The earliest identified pattern, the Windmill Pattern, extends from approximately 4500 to 3000 before present (B.P.). It focused primarily on the lower Central Valley and Delta regions but extended at least into the Sierra Nevada foothills to the east and an unknown distance up the valley to the north. Windmill peoples are known to have used a wide variety of mammal, fish, and fowl and gathered hard seeds. The material culture assemblage included large spear and projectile points, trident fish spears, at least two types of fish hooks, quartz crystals and a diversity of charm stone styles, a baked clay industry that included net sinkers, pecan-shaped fishline sinkers, and cooking balls. Ground stone items included both the mano and metate and the mortar and pestle. The bone tool industry appears minimal, but included awls, needles, and flakers. Utilitarian items were often acquired as finished products through trade with outlying localities. Windmill groups buried their dead in formal cemeteries both within and separated from their villages in a ritual complex that included the use of red ochre, often rich grave offerings. Cremations also are known to have occurred.

The Windmill Pattern is said to reflect the influence of a lake or marsh adaptation. The economic stance of a marsh or lake culture may have preadapted them for the environment of the lower Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley and Delta, and they may have entered the region with this adaptation more or less fully developed. The Windmill Pattern may represent the advent of early Penutian-speaking populations and was directly ancestral to the succeeding Berkeley Pattern.

Berkeley Pattern (3000 to 1500 B.P.)

The Berkeley Pattern extends roughly from 3000 to 1500 B.P. The Berkeley Pattern differs from the Windmill Pattern primarily in its greater emphasis on the exploitation of the acorn as a staple as is reflected in the numerous and varied mortars and pestles. This complex also is noted for its especially well-developed bone industry and such technological innovations as ribbon flaking of chipped stone artifacts. During this era, the use of grave goods generally declined. The Berkeley Pattern initially may represent the spread of proto-Miwok and Costanoans, collectively known as Utians, from their hypothesized lower Sacramento Valley/Delta homeland.

Augustine Pattern (1500 B.P. to Contact Period)

The last complex in this sequence is the Augustine Pattern, which extended temporally from 1500 B.P. until European contact. The Augustine Pattern initially appears to be largely an outgrowth of the Berkeley Pattern but may have become a blend of Berkeley Pattern traits with those carried into the area by the migration (that began approximately 1800 B.P.) of Wintuan populations from the north. This pattern witnessed a great elaboration of ceremonial and social organization, including the development of social stratification. Exchange became well developed, and even more intensive emphasis was placed on the use of acorns as indicated by the use of shaped mortars and pestles and by numerous hopper mortars. Other notable elements of the material culture assemblage include flanged tubular smoking pipes (cloud blowers); harpoons; an especially elaborate baked clay industry that includes figures and pottery vessels (Cosumnes Brownware); clam shell disk beads; and the use of a small projectile point, referred to as the Gunther Barbed series. The use of small projectile points suggests the use of the bow and arrow. Other traits include increased fixed village sites, population growth, and a developing monetary economy in which beads were used as a standard of exchange.

Ethnographic Setting: The Patwin

The Patwin, who held an extensive region within the Northern Central Valley of California, once inhabited the land associated with the City. Patwin territory included the lower portion of the west side of the Sacramento Valley west of the Sacramento River from about the location of the Town of Princeton in the north to Benicia in the south (Kroeber 1925). The Patwin were bounded to the north, northeast, and east by other Penutian-speaking peoples (the Nomlaki, Wintu, and Maidu, respectively), and to the west by the Pomo and other coastal groups. Within this large

territory, the Patwin have traditionally been divided into River, Hill, and Southern Patwin groups, although in actuality, a more complex set of linguistic and cultural differences existed than is indicated by these three geographic divisions.

As with most of the hunting-gathering groups of California, the “tribelet” represented the basic social and political unit. Typically, a triblet chief would reside in a major village where ceremonial events were held. The status of such individuals was inherited patrilineally among the Patwin, although village elders had considerable power in determining who actually succeeded to particular positions. (McKern 1922, Kroeber 1925.)

Hunting and fishing were the responsibilities of the men in the community, who also produced the associated tool assemblage, including nets, boats, bows, and arrows. Women’s tools primarily consisted of a variety of baskets of many sizes and shapes manufactured from available materials such as sedge roots and willow and redbud shoots.

Many items that could not be obtained locally were procured through an active and extensive trade network. Clam shell disk beads served as currency in the region, and the Patwin routinely imported pine nuts, seeds, bear hides, beads, and sinew-backed bows from the central Wintun; and shell beads, magnesite, salt, clams, and obsidian from the Pomo. In exchange, they exported salmon, river otter pelts, cordage, shell beads, yellow hammer headbands, and sinew-backed bows to the Pomo (Davis 1974). In some instances, they acted as middlemen for particular items in the east-west or north-south movement of various commodities.

The missionization of California was disastrous for the Patwin. Mission San Francisco de Asis, Mission San Jose, and later Mission San Francisco Solano, all recruited neophytes from southern Patwin villages. Residents from the village of Aguastos were taken to Mission San Francisco de Asis as early as 1800. Once at the missions, introduced diseases such as measles and smallpox were instrumental in reducing the population to the point that established cultural traditions and settlement systems could no longer be maintained (Cook 1976, Johnson 1978, Bennyhoff 1977, McCarthy 1984). The onslaught of Euroamericans during the late 1840s, coupled with the Gold Rush beginning in 1849, decided the fate of the Patwin culture. The southern Patwin were devastated by these events, and by 1871-1872, when Stephen Powers surveyed the state gathering ethnographic information, the Patwin culture appeared to him to be virtually extinct.

Historic Setting

Regional Exploration

During the first half of the 19th century, exploratory expeditions along the Sacramento River resulted in the introduction of Euroamericans to the region. In 1808, Gabriel Moraga led a Spanish expedition into the Sacramento Valley in an effort to locate potential sites for missions in the interior. He traveled up the eastern side of the Sacramento River to the American River and proceeded north to the Feather River. In 1817, Commander Luis Arguello and Father Narcisco

Duran traveled to the Sacramento River. In 1821, Commander Arguello and Father Blas Ordaz traveled to the interior valley west of the Sacramento River to investigate reports of Russian intrusion. They ferried across the Carquinez Straits and camped at Putah Creek near present day Winters.

In 1827, fur trapper Jedediah Smith explored the American River region and possibly the Sacramento River. In 1830, Captain John Sutter was granted land by the Mexican government and he established New Helvetia at Sacramento, becoming the first permanent settler in the lower Sacramento Valley. From 1830 to 1833, John Work (an Englishman of the Hudson Bay Company) explored Sacramento Valley from Pit River to French Camp.

Early Settlement and Agriculture

The City's planning area is considered historically part of the Rancho Laguna Santos Calle, which was granted to Marcos Vaca and Victor Prodon (22,000 acres to each man) in 1845 (Larkey and Walters 1987). In the 1850s and 1860s, the U.S. Land Commission reviewed titles to Mexican land grants, and eventually rejected the Rancho Laguna Santos Calle grant, placing it in the public domain (Mathews 1865). The rejection of this grant was not an isolated case, and as a whole, the rejections of many grants led to the subdivision of large ranches and further development of agricultural lands.

In 1849, Joseph B. Chiles began grazing his cattle on the Rancho Laguna Santos Calle, and by 1850 had purchased approximately 4,200 acres of it from Manuel and Marcos Vaca, which may have included portions of the planning area. Chiles had come to California first in 1841. In 1843, he helped lead a party to California along an uncharted trail now known as the Yellowstone Cutoff. He was granted the Rancho Catacula in 1844 in Napa County where he built a house and gristmill. In 1848 he brought his family to California. One of his daughters, Mary, married Jerome C. Davis, who by 1850 was helping operate a rope ferry connecting Sacramento with the property of Joseph B. Chiles (Fitz 1970).

After marrying Mary Chiles, Davis bought the western half of Chiles' land in 1854. Chiles' other son-in-law, Gabriel Brown, also acquired a portion of Chiles' land. By 1856, Davis was irrigating his land with water pumped from Putah Creek with a steam engine. At this time, he had developed the land to include a pear orchard, several thousand grapevines, and 400 acres of wheat and barley. In 1858, the 12,000-acre Davis Ranch was recognized as the most improved stock farm in California. By the 1860s, 700 people lived on farms in the area surrounding the Davis Ranch, which by that time was known as Putah Township. (Gregory 1913, Larkey and Walters 1987, Kyle 1990.)

Transportation

By 1865, an early wagon road ran through the present City of Davis in an east-west direction (Mathews 1865), which may have been the antecedent of the current Covell Road. By 1900, this

road was realigned to run along the southern boundary of Section 3 (Ashley 1900). Additionally, an early road that ran from the State Capitol in Benicia crossed Putah Creek at Davis Ranch and extended to Sacramento. This road eventually developed into the east-west line of the California Pacific Railroad (Larkey and Walters 1987).

The California Pacific Railroad Company (California Pacific) was incorporated in 1865. Two years later, the California Pacific purchased 3,000 acres of the Davis family holdings and formed the Davisville Land Company. In 1868, a 32-block town plat was officially recorded and lots of the newly named town, Davisville, were placed on the market. That same year, the California Pacific completed a line from Vallejo to Davisville, which eventually became an important stop along the railroad. In 1870, the California Pacific built a 44-mile branch line to Marysville, cutting through the western half of Section 3, just west of the current project area (Yolo County 1871). In 1870, the California Pacific also completed the extension of their line from Vallejo to Sacramento. (Larkey and Walters 1987.)

By 1870, Davisville had reached a population of 400, with a rural surrounding population of 100. By the turn of the century, this railroad town had become the commercial center for the surrounding agricultural area, which included small industrial plants which manufactured farm machinery. In 1906, the name of the Davisville post office was shortened to its present Davis. (University of California, Davis 1994.)

University of California, Davis

The state legislature established the University Farm in 1905; and in 1906 plans were underway to transform a 779-acre tract of land near the Town of Davis into a university. In January of 1909, 16 faculty members who commuted from the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley) taught the first regular farm school classes. In 1922, a 4-year degree program was offered at the University Farm, which had become a branch of the College of Agriculture of UC Berkeley. The offering of a 4-year degree ushered in a new era of growth and development at the University Farm; and by 1930, the campus had grown to encompass 1,000 acres. (Larkey 1984.)

Immediately following World War II, a major period of growth occurred at the University Farm. Campus administration was reorganized, and the curriculum was expanded. In 1951, the College of Letters and Science was organized, and in 1959 Davis was authorized as a general campus of the University of California. A graduate division was established in 1961 with professional schools of engineering, law, medicine, and administration. (Larkey 1984, Kyle 1990.)

Historic Resource Sites

Currently, the City's planning area has seven historic sites listed with the National Register of Historic Places, seven in the California Inventory of Historic Resources, and 149 with the City's Cultural Resources Inventory. The City has designated 36 structures and 2 cultural landscapes, which it considers historic landmarks. These include the Dresbach-Hunt Boyer Home at 602 Second

Street, and the Davis Junction train station of the California Pacific Railroad. A recent update of the City's Cultural Resources Inventory has listed a number of additional properties with potential historic merit. This list does not have regulatory provisions associated with it.

Sites Being Studied

Table 5J-1 identifies whether specific surveys have been completed at the sites being studied with the proposed land use map alternatives and indicates whether any cultural resources have been identified at these sites. Where site-specific surveys are identified, discussion of the individual sites is provided below.

Table 5J-1. Summary of Cultural Resource Survey Information for the Sites Being Studied

Sites Being Studied	Previous Survey Work	Identification of Cultural Resource ^a
Nishi/Gateway	Yes	No (see discussion below)
Covell Center	Yes	Yes
Signature	No	No
Mace Ranch	No	No
Under Second Street	No	No
Sutter-Davis Hospital	Yes (small portion of site)	No
Oeste Campus	Yes (small portion of site)	Yes
Davis Technology Campus	No	No
Intervening Land	No	No

^a Information for this column is based on any previously recorded resources on file with the California Historic Resources Information System.

Nishi/Gateway

This portion of the larger Gateway/Olive Drive specific plan area has been previously surveyed in its entirety (Bouey 1995). Overall, no cultural resources have been documented in the area. However, the proximity of recorded resources in surrounding areas to the Nishi/Gateway site suggest that undiscovered resources may exist. The burials documented at the nearby CA-SOL-211 suggest the likelihood of encountering human remains at the Nishi/Gateway site. Additionally, the scatter of lithics recorded at CA-SOL-222 indicates that the Nishi/Gateway site may contain buried cultural resources. These two recorded resources occur just across the railroad tracks from the Nishi/Gateway site.

Covell Center Property

This site was previously surveyed in its entirety (Jones & Stokes Associates 1996). Surveyors recorded a collection of buildings consisting of a ranch house, a barn, and associated outbuildings towards the southern end of the Covell Center property site. These structures were all evaluated as ineligible for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), with the exception of a small monument located on the property (JSA-Covell-1). This particular element may reveal the presence of an interred animal or human. Therefore, because the complete nature of this resource is unknown, its significance is also unclear.

Sutter-Davis Hospital

A records search at the Northwest Information Center revealed that two surveys were conducted across portions of this site (Supernowicz 1994, Derr 1991), but did not encompass the site in its entirety. Neither survey reported any cultural resources sites on the portions of the site surveyed.

Oeste Campus

A records search at the Northwest Information Center revealed that two surveys were conducted across this site (Supernowicz 1994, Derr 1991). The surveys covered portions of the site, but did not encompass the site in its entirety. As a result of the surveys, one historic resource was recorded at the southeastern corner of Oeste Campus. The resource, CA-YOL-173-H, consists of a ranch house and barn. The Historic Property Data File for Yolo County and the original site record for 173-H does not indicate that the property has been formally evaluated for either the CRHR or NRHP.

Regulatory Setting

The regulations with which a project will need to comply regarding cultural resources will be largely dependent on specific project activities, areas that will potentially be affected, and sponsoring and/or funding agencies. The following discusses general guidelines for complying with CEQA, and with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Specific compliance measures will ultimately be defined in consultation with the parties involved with future projects.

City CEQA Review. The City of Davis has an inventory of 36 structures and 2 cultural landscapes that it considers historic landmarks. Although this inventory does not regulate use of these structures, it does allow the City to review exterior changes and establishes the significance

of these structures for purposes of CEQA. Adverse impacts to these landmarks would be considered a significant effect requiring preparation of an EIR.

The City is currently drafting design guidelines for the downtown area that comprises the original 1917 Davis City limits. These guidelines will discourage the demolition of structures that contribute to the district's historic character. Upon completion of the guidelines, the City Council will consider whether to create a 1917 Historic/Conservation Overlay Zoning District to further control demolition and in-fill construction in the area. The mitigating effects which the guidelines may exert over potential impacts to historic resources are too speculative to rely upon at this time.

NHPA Section 106. NHPA Section 106 requires federal agencies, before beginning any undertaking, to take into account the effects of the undertaking on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on these actions. Specific regulations regarding compliance with Section 106 state that, although the tasks necessary to comply with Section 106 may be delegated to others, the federal agency is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the Section 106 process is completed. The Section 106 process has five basic steps:

- Identify and evaluate historic properties.
- Assess effects of the project on historic properties.
- Consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding adverse effects on historic properties, resulting in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).
- Submit the MOA to the ACHP.
- Proceed in accordance with the MOA.

Section 106 compliance may be required if a project uses federal funding (such as a grant) or if a federal permit is required.

IMPACTS AND METHODOLOGY

The impacts associated with the General Plan update were evaluated for their potential to disturb archaeological resources and the potential to affect historic resources within the City's planning area. For impacts found to have a significant impact on the environment, mitigation measures are provided to reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level.

This discussion focuses on the current base of knowledge regarding cultural resources for the planning area. This information is based on a review of historical data, a records search at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historic Resources Information System at California State University, Sonoma, and a limited field reconnaissance of the various project sites by a

Jones & Stokes Associates archaeologist. This chapter outlines the steps for compliance with CEQA with regard to cultural resources that may be identified in the future. The chapter also identifies potential impacts to cultural resources associated with specific projects and proposed mitigation measures.

Applicable Policies

The existing and proposed General Plans contain a number of goals, policies, standards, and actions that are designed to reduce or eliminate potential environmental impacts that may be related to the implementation of each plan. In evaluating the cultural resource impacts, Alternative 2 assumes implementation of the existing General Plan and the goals, policies, standards, and actions it contains. A comparison of the major policy differences between the existing General Plan and the General Plan update is contained in Chapter 3, "Project Description".

In evaluating the cultural resource impacts associated with Alternatives 3 through 5, it is assumed that the goals, policies, standards, and actions contained in the General Plan update will be implemented with all future projects. The following is a list of the goals, policies, standards, and actions that affected the impacts assessed in this chapter.

Goals and Policies Specific to Historic and Archaeological Resources

The General Plan update includes goals, policies, standards, and actions relating to the designation and preservation of historic and archaeological resources within the Planning Area. Specific goals, policies, standards, and actions that affect the assessment of impacts include the following:

GOAL HIS 1. Designate, preserve and protect the archaeological and historic resources within the Davis community.

- **Policy HIS 1.1.** Maintain an inventory of archaeological and historic resources.
 - **Action HIS 1.1b.** Establish archaeological or historic districts where significant numbers of archaeological or historic resources are grouped together. Areas to consider for such districts include, but are not limited to, College Park, Bowers' Addition, Old East Davis, the area between 5th and 8th Streets, and the Lincoln Highway.
 - **Action HIS 1.1c.** Work cooperatively with the University to identify historic resources and historic and prehistoric archaeological resources and to plan for their preservation.

- **Policy HIS 1.2.** Incorporate measures to protect and preserve historic and archaeological resources into all planning and development.
 - **Standard HIS 1.2a.** The City shall review proposed alteration to City-designated historic resources and improvements within historic districts utilizing the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and the State Historic Building Code.
 - **Standard HIS 1.2b.** Historic and archaeological resources found prior to development or during construction shall be evaluated before development takes place or construction continues.
 - **Action HIS 1.2c.** Establish standards, rules and regulations governing the protection, preservation, restoration, remodeling, reconstruction, redevelopment or demolition of historic resources and improvements within historic districts and the development or alteration of archaeological resources, with the purpose of cultivating an environment that reflects Davis' roots.
- **Policy HIS 1.3.** Assist and encourage property owners and tenants to maintain the integrity and character of historic resources, and to restore and reuse historic resources in a manner compatible with their historic character.
 - **Action HIS 1.3a.** Continue to serve as a leader in historic preservation by preserving, restoring and reusing City owned historic resources where feasible.
- **Policy HIS 1.4.** Preserve historic features of the core area and historic districts.
 - **Standard HIS 1.4a.** The City shall establish procedures for demolitions and standards and/or guidelines for remodeling and reconstruction in Davis' older neighborhoods within and around the core area, generally bounded by First Street, Seventh Street, A Street and L Street (precise boundaries subject to further study). The objective would be to maintain the historic character of these neighborhoods.

GOAL HIS 2. Promote public awareness of the prehistoric and historic past of the Davis area.

Summary of Impacts Related to Land Use Map Alternatives

This chapter evaluates cultural resource impacts related to the General Plan update and establishment of a new junior high school, including the four land use map alternatives. For this evaluation, impacts have been assessed in two categories. Table 5J-2 provides an overview of the significance findings made for the General Plan update project and each of the sites being studied under each alternative. The table also shows the impacts related specifically to the establishment

of a new junior high school under the heading "Signature Site" for Alternatives 4 and 5. The following paragraphs provide a brief summary of each impact.

- **Impact CR-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies.** Consistency with the policies stated in the existing General Plan (Alternative 2) and the General Plan update (Alternatives 3 through 5) were evaluated. All of the land use map alternatives evaluated were found to be consistent with proposed policy guidance. In addition, the goals, policies, standards, and actions in the existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan update were found to not adversely impact other environmental resources. General Plan policies are expected to have no adverse impact on cultural resources.
- **Impact CR-2. Potential Damage to or Destruction of Known and/or Unknown Cultural Resources.** Each of the four land use map alternatives has the potential to damage or destroy cultural resources that have not been identified at this time. Despite the protections that will be provided by the goals, policies, standards, and actions of the existing General Plan and proposed General Plan update, the land use map alternatives may still have a significant impact on cultural resources. Given the larger geographic extent of new development that would result from Alternatives 4 and 5, these alternatives have a greatest potential for impacting cultural resources.

In addition to impacts on unknown resources, studies on the Covell Center and Oeste Campus sites have identified potential resources that will require additional survey work and/or mitigation. These have also been determined to be significant prior to application of mitigation.

The impacts identified will all be reduced to a less than significant impact with application of mitigation measure CR-2.1.

Table 5J-2. Summary of Cultural Resources Impacts by Land Use Map Alternative

Project Impacts	Project Mitigations	Overall General Plan	Sites Being Studied									
			Nishi/Gateway	Covell Center	Signature Site	Mace Ranch	Under Second Street	Sutter-Davis	Oeste Campus	Davis Technology	Intervening Lands	In-fill
Alternative 2. Buildout to 2010 Using Existing General Plan												
CR-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies	Not required	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI					NI
CR-2. Potential Damage to or Destruction of Known and/or Unknown Cultural Resources	CR-2.1	S	S	S		S	S					S
Alternative 3. Reduced Buildout Scenario												
CR-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies	Not required	NI		NI		NI	NI					NI
CR-2. Potential Damage to or Destruction of Known and/or Unknown Cultural Resources	CR-2.1	S		S		S	S					S
Alternative 4. Community Expansion Scenario with Oeste Campus												
CR-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies	Not required	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI			NI
CR-2. Potential Damage to or Destruction of Known and/or Unknown Cultural Resources	CR-2.1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S			S
Alternative 5. Community Expansion Scenario with Davis Technology Campus												
CR-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies	Not required	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI			NI	NI
CR-2. Potential Damage to or Destruction of Known and/or Unknown Cultural Resources	CR-2.1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		S	S	S
SU = Significant unavoidable S = Significant, but can be reduced to less than significant with mitigations included			LS = Less than significant NI = No impact N/A = None available									

Project Impacts

Impact CR-1. Consistency with General Plan Policies

Significance Criterion

- A significant impact would occur if the land use map alternative or one of its components would conflict with the environmental plans and goals of the local community or other planning regulations.
- For Alternatives 3 through 5, a significant impact would occur if a policy change in the General Plan update would result in a substantial adverse change in the environment related to cultural resources.

Impacts of the proposed project related to General Plan consistency was assessed with application of the above significance criteria. Table 5J-3 provides an overview/comparison of the level of impact associated with the General Plan under the four land use map alternatives evaluated in this EIR. A more detailed discussion of each alternative is described below.

Table 5J-3 General Plan Policy Consistency under Each Land Use Map Alternative

Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
• Planned development consistent with cultural resource policies	• Planned development consistent with cultural resource policies	• Planned development consistent with cultural resource policies	• Planned development consistent with cultural resource policies

Alternative 2. Buildout to Year 2010 Using Existing General Plan. The existing General Plan contains policies on the protection/preservation of historic structures and the protection of archaeological resources. While the policies in the existing General Plan should be enhanced and individual projects may be found to impact cultural resources (see Impact CR-2 for this discussion), development under this alternative does not conflict with the policies contained in the existing General Plan. Therefore, this alternative is considered to have *no impact* related to General Plan policies.

Alternative 3. Reduced Build-Out Scenario. Implementation of Alternative 3 would only allow growth and development in the City to 2010 for projects that are already entitled and additions in Covell Center (Variation 3, business park). The General Plan update contains policies that are intended to preserve, restore, and protect historic and prehistoric archaeological resources in the Davis area. Policies are designed to reduce or avoid impacts to historic and prehistoric resources that provide a link to Davis' past. There are also policies to encourage the reuse of existing

structures without creating impacts to the integrity of such historic resources. Additionally, policies designed to educate the public and expand the knowledge of the history of Davis are intended to increase awareness and respect for cultural resources in the City. The updated policies would be a positive change and enhance protections to cultural and historic resources. Therefore, this alternative is considered to have no adverse impact (*no impact*) related to General Plan policies.

In preparing the General Plan update, City staff has identified the primary areas of policy where the proposed update differs from the existing General Plan. A list of these major changes is listed in Chapter 3 under a section labeled “New, Expanded, or Modified Goals and Policies in the General Plan Update”. While no major changes in policy were noted cultural resources, as pointed out in the above paragraph, the General Plan update does contain policy enhancements that protect these resources from impact. The enhancement of protections of historic and archaeological resources can be accomplished without significant impacts on the environment. The overall policy additions have a positive affect on cultural resources, and would have no adverse impact (*no impact*) on cultural resources.

Alternative 4. Community Expansion Scenario with Oeste Campus. Impacts to cultural resources associated with this alternative would result in similar effects as those discussed in under Alternative 3. While the policies in the existing General Plan should be enhanced and individual projects may be found to impact cultural resources (see Impact CR-2 for this discussion), development under this land use map alternative does not conflict with the policies contained in the existing General Plan. Therefore, this alternative is considered to have *no impact* related to General Plan policies.

Related to the second significance criteria (impacts related to policy changes), changes in policy will have a positive affect on cultural resource issues (the same as described for Alternative 3, above), and would have no adverse impact (*no impact*) on cultural resources.

Alternative 5. Community Expansion Scenario with Davis Technology Campus. Impacts to cultural resources associated with this alternative would result in similar effects as those discussed in under Alternative 3. While the policies in the existing General Plan should be enhanced and individual projects may be found to impact cultural resources (see Impact CR-2 for this discussion), development under this land use map alternative does not conflict with the policies contained in the existing General Plan. Therefore, this alternative is considered to have *no impact* related to General Plan policies.

Related to the second significance criteria (impacts related to policy changes), changes in policy will have a positive affect on cultural resource issues (the same as described for Alternative 3, above), and would have no adverse impact (*no impact*) on cultural resources.

Mitigation Measures

Because no adverse impacts (*no impact*) were identified under all of the land use map alternatives, no mitigation is required.

Impact CR-2. Potential Damage to or Destruction of Known and/or Unknown Cultural Resources

Significance Criterion

- A land use map alternative was determined to have a significant impact if potential development proposed in the plan would result in the damage or destruction of known and/or unknown cultural resources.

Impacts of the proposed project related to the potential damage to or destruction of known and/or unknown cultural resources were assessed with application of the above significance criterion. Table 5J-4 provides an overview/comparison of the level of impact associated with the General Plan under the four land use map alternatives evaluated in this EIR. A more detailed discussion of each alternative is described below.

Table 5J-4 Potential Damage/Destruction of Known/Unknown Cultural Resources under Each Land Use Map Alternative

Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for cultural resource impacts on unknown sites • Potential to impact known site at Covell Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for cultural resource impacts on unknown sites • Potential to impact known site at Covell Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for cultural resource impacts on unknown sites • Potential to impact known site at Covell Center • Potential to impact known site at Oeste Campus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for cultural resource impacts on unknown sites • Potential to impact known site at Covell Center

Alternative 2. Buildout to Year 2010 Using Existing General Plan. Different types of cultural resources throughout the planning area could be affected by activities proposed under the buildout of the existing General Plan. For example, archaeological sites are susceptible to damage during excavation. Generally, the scientific value of archaeological sites is in the information that can be extracted about past lifestyles. Any activity that moves, removes, or destroys aspects of a site will compromise that information. The historic built environment and historic landscape also are quite susceptible to impacts associated with activities proposed under buildout

of the existing General Plan. For example, any activity which destroys or alters the physical makeup of structures or the setting in which they exist could compromise the integrity of these resources.

As more fully described in Chapter 3, "Project Description", implementation of the existing General Plan includes development of the Nishi/Gateway, Covell Center property, Mace Ranch, and the Under Second Street sites, in addition to development in the in-fill areas of the City. From the data collected for this EIR, information was available on a recorded cultural site at the Covell Center site. Development of the Covell Center site for residential, commercial, parks, and other urban uses as shown on the existing General Plan could have an adverse effect on presently unknown cultural resources associated with the monument comprising site JSA-Covell-1, if further study determines that the monument is a significant resource. This impact is considered *significant* because activities associated with development of the Covell Center property site may uncover significant resources.

Development at the other sites included in this land use map alternative could also impact unknown cultural resources as a result of ground disturbance associated with infrastructure development and construction of new structures. Policies exist for evaluation and protection of historic resources, but the policy in the existing General Plan (6.6 Historic and Cultural Resources, Policy H) on other cultural resources is not adequate to address potential impacts, therefore, this impact is considered *significant*.

Alternative 3. Reduced Buildout Scenario. Three of the sites being studied could be developed under this land use map alternative (Covell Center, Mace Ranch, and Under Second Street) in addition to development in the in-fill areas of the City. Under this alternative, the Covell Center site could be developed in three variations (agriculture, urban reserve, research park/urban reserve). This lower intensity of development (in comparison with the other land use map alternatives) would reduce the extent of the cultural resource impacts, but the potential for significant impacts would remain. Development of the Covell Center site could have an adverse effect on presently unknown cultural resources associated with the monument comprising site JSA-Covell-1, if further study determines that the monument is a significant resource. This impact is considered *significant* because activities associated with development of the Covell Center property site may uncover significant resources.

Development at the other sites included in this land use map alternative could also impact unknown cultural resources as a result of ground disturbance associated with infrastructure development and construction of new structures. Policies exist for protection of historic resources, but the guidance provided in the General Plan update (Standard HIS 1.2b) on other cultural resources is not adequate to address potential impacts, therefore, this impact is considered *significant*.

Alternative 4. Community Expansion Scenario with Oeste Campus. Development under this alternative includes development of the Nishi/Gateway, Covell Center, Signature, Mace Ranch, under Second Street, Sutter-Davis Hospital, and Oeste Campus sites, in addition to development of the City's in-fill areas. Implementation of this alternative would result in similar impacts to those described above under Alternative 3 although the development of increased acreage increases the potential for additional cultural resources sites to be impacted.

In addition to the cultural site on the Covell Center site (see discussion under Alternative 3), the Oeste Campus site (which is included in this alternative) contains one recorded historic resource at its southeastern corner. The resource, CA-YOL-173-H, consists of a ranch house and barn. The Historic Property Data File for Yolo County and the original site record for 173-H does not indicate that the property has been formally evaluated for either the CRHR or NRHP. This impact is considered *significant* because activities associated with development of the Oeste Campus site could affect this potentially significant resource.

In addition to known sites, development at the other sites included in this land use map alternative could also impact unknown cultural resources as a result of ground disturbance associated with infrastructure development and construction of new structures, therefore, this impact is considered *significant*.

Alternative 5. Community Expansion Scenario with Davis Technology Campus. The overall impacts of this alternative would be similar to those described earlier for Alternative 3, although this land use map alternative could include development of a larger area. The development of increased acreage increases the potential for additional cultural resource sites to be impacted.

In addition to known sites, development at the other sites included in this land use map alternative could also impact unknown cultural resources as a result of ground disturbance associated with infrastructure development and construction of new structures, therefore, this impact is considered *significant*.

Mitigation Measure

Implementation of mitigation measure CR-2.1 would reduce the significant impact related to each land use map alternative to a *less than significant* level. This mitigation is programmatic in nature. Future projects may require compliance with NHPA Section 106, the outcome of which might be refinement of project specific mitigations.

CR-2.1 Protection of Unknown Cultural Resources (Alternatives 2 through 5)

This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by replacing the language in Standard HIS1.2b with the following:

“A cultural resources survey shall be required for development sites where cultural resource conditions are not known (as required by the Planning and Building Department). Resources within a project site that cannot be avoided should be evaluated. Additional research and test excavations, where appropriate, should be undertaken to determine whether the resource(s) meets CEQA and/or NRHP significance criteria. Impacts to

significant resources that cannot be avoided will be mitigated in consultation with the lead agency for the project. Possible mitigation measures include:

- *a data recovery program consisting of archaeological excavation to retrieve the important data from archaeological sites;*
- *development and implementation of public interpretation plans for both prehistoric and historic sites;*
- *preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction of historic structures according to Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties;*
- *construction of new structures in a manner consistent with the historic character of the region; and*
- *treatment of historic landscapes according to the Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Landscapes.”*

Funding Source: *Davis City Council*
Implementing Party: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department and Davis City Council*
Monitoring Agency: *City of Davis Planning and Building Department*
Timing: *Prior to adoption of General Plan update*