

# 4.5

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 4.5.1 Introduction

This section describes the existing cultural resources conditions, regulations applicable to cultural resources, impacts on cultural resources that may result from implementing the General Plan Update, and mitigation measures that would reduce the significance of these impacts. Cumulative impacts on cultural resources are discussed near the end of the section.

### 4.5.2 Existing Conditions

Each city has its own unique history – the people, events, and forces that determine how it was settled in recent times; its place in a historical context, which often shaped its recent history; and its prehistoric past, which reveals itself through archaeological investigations. Together, these components of a city's history and origin contribute to its present-day uniqueness and community heritage. Cultural resources include physical remains of past human activities: prehistoric and historical archaeological remains; historical architectural remains, including buildings, structures, and other features of the built environment; and places of importance to Native Americans.

### Record Search

A records search for the study area was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at California State University, Fullerton, on May 16, 2007. The search consulted the state's database of previous cultural resources studies and recorded cultural resources sites, as well as the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR),

California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and local historical registers.

According to the record search, approximately 20 cultural resources studies have been previously conducted within the city limits, with 10 historical architecture resources (buildings, structures, and objects) recorded as a result and no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites recorded.

## **Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology**

The following summarizes existing literature and previous studies that describe the prehistoric and historic contexts for the city. The record search indicated that no prehistoric or historical archaeological sites have been previously recorded in the City of La Cañada Flintridge.

## **Prehistoric and Ethnographic Context**

The valley, southern foothills, and the San Gabriel Mountains are generally understood to have been within the territory of the Gabrielino (Tongva), according to Kroeber (1925) and Bean and Smith (1978); however, Kroeber also notes that the mountains are the territory of the Alliklik, a Serrano group bordering the Chumash (as does McIntyre [1986]).

The term “Gabrielino” (Tongva) is used to refer to the Takic-speaking people who came to be associated with Mission San Gabriel and included the Fernandeano, who were associated with Mission San Fernando. Gabrielino (Tongva) territory is known to have included the watersheds of the nearby Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and extended into the mountains to the north. Bernice Eastman Johnston (1962) notes that the eastern borderlands were mixed in ethnographic habitation accounts, some describing Gabrielino (Tongva) villages far into the territory of the Serrano beyond the known unclear boundaries of the San Gabriel Mountains. Gabrielino (Tongva) social organization is not well known but is similar to the Luiseño to the south in that both a village chief and a religious chief or shaman were recognized as leaders, and there was a hierarchy in differentiating other individual roles and status, similar to that of the strong family ownership of the Luiseño. Structures were domed and thatched and housed multiple families. The Serrano also lived in thatched covered domed structures, though they tended to be smaller. The Serrano clan leaders inherited their positions and were also the tribe’s religious heads.

Gabrielino (Tongva) technology reflected high artisanship and included many baskets, shell tools, and wooden weapons, all extremely perishable. Though known for their use of steatite, pottery was also made by the Gabrielino

(Tongva). Basketry and pottery were made by the Serrano as well and were used in their travels to the foothills to trade desert fruits and seeds for items not available in the desert.

Game included deer, mountain sheep, antelope, and rabbits. The Serrano and the Gabrielino (Tongva) hunted a large variety of game, and fished using numerous types of traps (Bean and Smith 1978).

Archaeological studies in the vicinity of the city include excavations at the Chilao Flats Ranger Station (Rozaire 1958), at the Sheldon Reservoir Site, near Devil's Gate Dam at the eastern edge of the city, following the discovery of a skeleton during the enlarging of the reservoir in 1938, and at the Big Tujunga Site, near Big Tujunga Wash along Foothill Boulevard in 1945 and 1966.

Key information about the people of the area was gained from these excavations. Cameron (2000) notes that Rozaire's Chilao Flats site reflected a coastal people located in the San Gabriel Mountains, as evidenced by artifacts such as a large serpentine birdstone effigy, the furthest and highest inland known animal effigy, which are typically found along the coast. The Sheldon Reservoir site represents burial practices prior to the arrival of the Spanish (Walker 1951), as the first pioneers in the area reported observing no signs of native graves (Reid 1895).

The Big Tujunga Site, though apparently lacking cultural stratigraphy like so much of southern California, may represent continuous occupation from approximately A.D. 435 to European occupation in the nineteenth century (Ruby 1966). Ruby also noted that the artifact assemblage of the Big Tujunga Site appeared representative of desert culture sites.

The presence of Native American archaeological sites is apparent in the area including and surrounding the city.

## Historic Archaeological Context

Foothill Boulevard has been in existence since 1878 when the owners of Rancho La Cañada, Dr. Jacob Lanterman and A. W. Williams, divided La Cañada into 46 parcels to either side of the boulevard. There is a strong potential for historical subsurface deposits along the boulevard because it has been a state highway since 1916 (McKenna 2000).

The foundation of the present-day city was established in the early 1920s when developers began to subdivide the area to attract buyers with the beautiful scenery (City 1980). In 1976, the two unincorporated communities of La Cañada and Flintridge joined to become one incorporated city, called La Cañada Flintridge. A number of buildings within the city have been identified as

significant historical resources at the federal, state, and local levels. Over 50 historical structures identified by the local historical society as significant predate 1935 (McKenna 2000).

## Historic Built Environment

The Lanterman House (also known as El Retiro) was built in 1915 and is currently listed in the NRHP (CHRIS P19-176486; Building No. 94001504) and the CRHR, and is a California Point of Historical Interest (LAN-062). Descanso Gardens is listed as a California Point of Historical Interest (LAN-004), as is the Church of the Lighted Window, which was built in 1924 (LAN-007). California Historical Landmarks lists no properties within the city boundaries but shows two nearby: the Angeles National Forest (No. 717), created in 1892, bordering the city on the north; and the Old Short Cut (No. 632), which was built in 1900 and is now the Chilao Visitor Center and also the location of the Chilao Flats excavations, which were conducted in 1958 by Charles Rozaire, approximately 25 miles northeast of the city.

Over 50 historical structures identified by the local historical society as significant predate 1935, and are noted in a previous study for sanitary sewer improvements (McKenna 2000). These include structures built in the late 1800s on Linda Vista Street and Curran Street, the Huntington Inn built circa (c.) 1912, and the Wallace Castle built in 1911.

Resources that are currently listed in the NRHP are:

- Lanterman House/El Retiro (NR-94001504; LAN-062; P19-176486)

Resources currently listed in the California Points of Historical Interest are:

- Descanso Gardens (LAN-004; P19-186576)
- Church of the Lighted Window (LAN-007; P19-179344)

Other resources currently listed in the Office of Historic Preservation Directory of Properties in the Historical Property Data File are:

- Gould Eucalyptus Trees, Gould Ave (1890; P19-150321)
- Woodwardia Canyon Bridge (1931)

Resources included in the CHRIS are:

- Angeles Crest Highway (first construction 1929; P19-003037)
- Jet Propulsion Laboratory, multiple buildings at the California Institute of Technology (est. 1936; CA-LAN-2189H)

- Southern California Edison Eagle Rock–Laguna Bell Transmission Line Corridor (1922; P19-186870)
- The Angeles Crest Building (1959; P19-187695)
- The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company building (1959; P19-188009)

Resources that are currently listed in the existing La Cañada Flintridge General Plan as part of the City’s historical heritage are:

- “Homewood,” Jacob Lanterman home, 1322 Verdugo Boulevard (1876)
- “Foxwood,” Senator Flint home site (C. Jones’ home)
- “Pink Castle,” Lieutenant Governor Wallace home, 5455 Castle Knoll Road (1910)
- Dr. Roy Lanterman home, Orange Knoll (1895)
- Nadeau House, Chevy Chase Drive, and Hampstead Road (1923)
- Knight homes, 600 and 640 Knight Way (1925 and 1930)
- “Villa Elena,” Wenzl home, 1619 W. Fairmount Avenue
- Ralph Moses home, Palm Drive and Lombardy Drive (1891)
- St. Francis High School, site of Flintridge Country Club (1925)
- “Flintridge Biltmore Hotel,” Sacred Heart Academy, 440 St. Katherine Drive (1923)
- Flintridge Riding Club, 4625 Oak Grove Drive (1923)
- The site of La Cañada Flintridge Elementary School (1917)
- The site of Flintridge Preparatory School (1920)
- Berkshire Bridge (1923)
- Deodar Trees, Alta Canyada area
- Edwin T. Earl home, Alta Canyada area
- Santa Inez Oak Trees
- Punks Sanitarium, “Old Verdugo Heights Health Resort,” Frank P. Doherty home, north of El Vago Street (1875)
- Indiana Avenue and Curran Street between Foothill Boulevard and Interstate 210, the first public streets

According to previous research and consultation with the local historical society (McKenna 2000), the community unofficially recognizes several sites and structures as significant historical resources. Unofficial, locally recognized significant historic resources in the city include the following:

- 5268 Linda Vista Drive, hall, winery, and barn (1880)
- 1425 Curran Street (1889)
- 4914 Alta Canyon Road, house and barn (1895)
- 1743 Fairmount Avenue (1900)
- 4905 Alta Canyon Road (1901)
- 4537 El Camino Corto Street (1908)
- 743 Craig Avenue (1908)
- 4409 Beulah Drive (c. 1910)
- 1413 Curran Street (1911)
- 4832 Commonwealth Avenue (1911)
- 1428 Foothill Boulevard, Huntington Inn (c.1912)
- 818 Old Landmark Lane (1910)
- 1417 Curran Street (c.1887)
- 711 Craig Avenue (1914)
- 2102 Cross Street (1914)
- 5011 La Cañada Boulevard (1915)
- 4632 Palm Drive (c.1915)
- 700 Flintridge Avenue (1915)
- 964 Foothill Boulevard, garage (1916)
- 4441 Alta Canyon Road (c.1916)
- 4634 La Cañada Boulevard V. Robertson (1916)
- 800 Berkshire Avenue (1916)
- 4409 Bel Aire Drive (1917)
- 700 Berkshire Avenue (1918)
- 5250 La Cañada Boulevard (1918)
- 615 Berkshire Avenue (1918)
- 721 Craig Avenue (1918)
- 4459 St. Francis Place (1918)
- 757 Hillcrest Avenue (1918)
- 1135 Fairview Street (1918)
- 1966 Lombardy Drive, Neff (1925)
- 5357 Alta Canyon Road, Boddy (1927)
- 5200 Alta Canyon Road (1929)
- 1219 Journey's End Drive "Fairview" (1927)
- 4427 Chevy Chase Drive, Cooper home (1921)
- 530 Georgian Road (1925)
- 4234 Chevy Chase Drive (1924)
- 4236 Woodleigh Lane (1923)
- 435 Georgian Road (1924)
- 4418 Oakwood Avenue (1921)
- 1350 Journey's End Drive (1934)
- 900 Descanso Drive (1932)
- 2270 Cross Street (date unknown)
- 4831 Hampton Road, last subdivision (1921)
- 1250 Journey's End Drive (1921)
- 2102 Lyons Avenue (1932)
- 566 Meadow Grove Street (1924)
- 4400 Woodleigh Lane (1923)
- 1600 Fairmount Avenue (1929)

In addition to specific identified structures, the existing General Plan acknowledges in the Housing Element that the majority of residences in the city are 1,200 to 2,500 square feet in area and were built between 1930 and 1960. A cursory review of the built environment along Foothill Boulevard confirmed the existence of numerous structures appearing to be of that age (over 45 years).

## Paleontological Resources

The general area is underlain by pre-batholithic metavolcanic rock and is not fossiliferous. No previously identified paleontological fossil localities are present within the city boundaries. The potential for the discovery of fossils is low as other soils in the area are located in waterways, such as drainages containing mostly recent alluvial deposits. According to the USGS Preliminary Geologic Map of the Los Angeles 30' by 60' Quadrangle (Yerkes and Campbell 2005), the following is present within the city:

- The southern portion of the city consists mostly of a Mesozoic biotite-hornblende diorite that is medium- to dark-gray, medium-grained, and includes scattered small bodies of older brownish-gray, coarse-grained, weakly gneissic, biotite quartz monzonite.
- A small pocket of the middle to early Pleistocene Pacoima Formation, an indurated, yellow-brown, locally intensely folded and faulted fanglomerate, a mixture of a series of conglomerates, is surrounded by the diorite described above.
- The mountains and the foothill slopes consist of late Cretaceous granitic rocks that are a variety of plutonic igneous rocks, which include quartz monzonite, granodiorite, tonalite, quartz diorite, and diorite.
- At the base and on the slopes of the foothills, there are a number of alluvial deposits, ranging from terraced Pleistocene to fanned Holocene deposits.
- The city lies a few miles north of the Verdugo fault line.

The potential for the presence of paleontological resources in the area including and surrounding the city is low.

## 4.5.2 Regulatory Setting

### Federal

#### National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, is the primary set of federal laws governing projects that may affect cultural resources. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that all federal agencies review and evaluate how their actions or undertakings may affect historic properties. Historic properties may include those that are already listed on the NRHP or those that are eligible but not yet listed. The regulations implementing Section 106 are codified at 36 CFR 800 (2001). The Section 106 review process involves four steps:

1. Initiate the Section 106 process by establishing the undertaking, developing a plan for public involvement, and identifying other consulting parties.
2. Identify historic properties by determining the scope of efforts, identifying cultural resources, and evaluating their eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP.
3. Assess adverse effects by applying the criteria of adverse effects to historic properties (resources that are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP).
4. Resolve adverse effects by consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and other consulting agencies, including the Advisory Council if necessary, to develop an agreement that addresses the treatment of historic properties.

To determine whether an undertaking may affect NRHP-eligible properties, cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and architectural properties) must be inventoried and evaluated for eligibility to be listed on the NRHP. Criteria considers whether the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association; the resource must also meet one of the following:

- A. associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (Criterion A); or
- B. associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (Criterion B); or
- C. embody 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 (Criterion C); or



- D. have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (Criterion D).

Section 106 only applies to federal agency activities, and does not directly apply to City activities that might be undertaken as a part of the general plan process or to the City approval of subsequent projects, in the absence of federal funding or other involvement.

However, Section 106 may apply to future projects if there is an USACE 404 permit involved, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds are allocated in the event of floods or earthquakes, and if the City seeks and receives Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

## State

### California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA mandates that local agencies consider potential significant adverse changes to cultural resources as a result of proposed projects. The State CEQA Guidelines define three ways that a property may qualify as a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA review:

- The resource is listed in or determined eligible for listing on the CRHR.
- The resource is included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey that meets the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- The lead agency determines the resource to be significant as supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.

The first two conditions are related to the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the CRHR. A cultural resource may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR for the same criteria listed for the NRHP. The criteria are summarized as follows:

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States (Criterion 1).
2. Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history (Criterion 2).
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values (Criterion 3).

4. Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation (Criterion 4).

In addition, properties that are listed on or eligible for listing on the NRHP are considered eligible for listing on the CRHR, and thus are significant historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

Further, the CEQA Guidelines state that a unique archaeological resource is 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 the resource:

- contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; or
- has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
- is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

## Senate Bill 18 Consultation

SB 18 (Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) requires city and county governments to notify California Native American tribes prior to the adoption of, or any amendment to, a general plan or specific plan. The intent of the bill is to provide the tribes an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early stage for the purpose of protecting or mitigating impacts on cultural places. As defined in California PRC Sections 5097.9 and 5097.995, California Native American Cultural Places include any:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, places of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site, that is listed or may be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources, including any historic or prehistoric ruins, any burial ground, and any archaeological or historic site.

## California Public Resources Code

### Section 5097.5 (Stats. 1965, C. 11362792)

PRC 5097.5 defines the unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources located on public lands as a misdemeanor offense. It prohibits the knowing destruction of objects of antiquity without a

permit (expressed permission) on public lands and provides for criminal sanctions. It was amended in 1987 to require consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) whenever Native American graves are found. Violations for taking or possessing remains or artifacts are felonies.

### **Chapter 1332, Section 5097.9**

Chapter 1332 of PRC 5097.9 allows the NAHC to make recommendations to encourage private property owners to protect and preserve sacred places in a natural state and allow appropriate access to Native Americans for ceremonial or spiritual activities. The NAHC is authorized to assist Native Americans in obtaining appropriate access to sacred places on public lands and aid state agencies in any negotiations with federal agencies for the protection of Native American sacred places on federally administered lands in California.

### **Section 5097.98–99 (Stats. 1982, C. 1492, Amended 1987)**

PRC 5097.98–99 requires the governor's NAHC to be consulted whenever Native American graves are found. It makes it illegal to take or possess remains or artifacts taken from Native American graves. This does not apply to materials taken before 1984. Violations occurring after January 1, 1988, are felonies.

## **California Code of Regulations**

### **Title 14, CCR, Section 4307**

This code states that “no person shall remove, injure, disfigure, deface, or destroy any object of paleontological, archaeological, or historical interest or value.”

## **Local**

### **La Cañada Flintridge General Plan Update**

The proposed Project would replace the existing General Plan. The Conservation Element would include several policies that would seek to protect sensitive cultural resources. The applicable policies are described in the Impact Analysis section.

## **City of La Cañada Flintridge Municipal Code**

### **Title 4 Public Welfare, Chapter 4.26 Preservation, Protection and Removal of Trees**

The purpose of this chapter is to preserve and protect city trees that are of historic or aesthetic importance, and to provide for the protection and replacement of trees in order to maintain the community's wooded character; to protect the scenic beauty of the area; reduce erosion of top soil, flood hazard, risk of landslides, and cost and maintenance of drainage systems through reduced flow and diversion of surface waters; and to address fire concerns by discouraging the planting of pines, deodar cedars, and other highly flammable trees. The intent is to preserve and encourage the regeneration of a healthy urban forest that contributes to clean air, soil conservation, shade and windbreak protection, moderation of climatic extremes, aesthetics, enhanced property values, and quality of life.

### **Title 11 Zoning, Chapter 11.24 Special Purpose Zones—O-S Open Space Zone**

Zone O-S is established to provide adequate recreational and open space opportunities for the needs of the population; to preserve and protect natural resources, including those areas necessary for the managed production of resources; and to prevent incompatible development of areas that should be preserved or regulated for scenic, historic, conservation, or public health and safety purposes. Provisions of this zone also provide for limited recreational development of land and necessary public facilities.

## **4.5.3 Impact Analysis**

This section describes the impact analysis relating to cultural resources. It describes the methods used to determine general impacts on cultural resources as part of the General Plan Update and lists the thresholds for whether an impact would be significant. Measures to mitigate (i.e., avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for) significant impacts accompany each impact discussion. Cumulative impacts are discussed at the end.

## **Methodology**

Although the General Plan Update does not propose specific developments, changes in land uses and zoning regulations associated with the implementation of the General Plan Update would allow for future development that may impact

cultural resources. Potential impacts on cultural resources from the implementation of the Project were evaluated by determining whether it is reasonably foreseeable that future demolition or ground disturbance activities allowed by the Project would affect areas that contain or could contain any archaeological or historical sites listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, that are designated as a local historic property, or that are otherwise considered a unique or important archaeological resource under CEQA.

A project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* or *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (Weeks and Grimmer 1995) would be considered as mitigated to a level of less than significant. Impacts on paleontological resources were evaluated similar to buried archaeological resources, that is, by determining whether reasonably foreseeable future ground disturbance activities would affect areas that contain or could contain a unique paleontological resource or site, or a unique geologic feature.

Furthermore, the impact analysis assumes that implementation of future development projects under the Project would comply with all applicable local, state, and federal laws, including those discussed in the "Regulatory Setting" section.

## Thresholds of Significance

For this analysis, an impact pertaining to cultural resources was considered significant under CEQA if it would result in any of the following environmental effects, which are based on professional practice and State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). An impact related to cultural resources is considered significant if it would:

- CUL-1:** cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5;
- CUL-2:** cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5;
- CUL-3:** directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or
- CUL-4:** disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

## Impacts and Mitigation Measures

*Threshold CUL-1: Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?*

The city is largely built out, and future vacant land growth will be mostly limited to redevelopment of single lots. Aside from these developments, the City intends to focus much of its future residential growth within the DVSP in response to the limited vacant land resources. As such, additional opportunities for redevelopment lie in residential infill and remodeling and/or intensification of commercial uses along Foothill Boulevard, specifically within the DVSP. The city has approximately 84 acres of land designated for commercial use, all of which is located along Foothill Boulevard. Approximately 38 of these acres are located within the West Gateway, The Link, and Old Town Districts, as identified in the Foothill Boulevard Master Plan.

Most development will be sporadic infill in the Foothill Boulevard corridor and the DVSP area, which is characterized by a variety of low-intensity uses. The majority of the non-vacant properties in the area were constructed at least 20 years ago. The median year of built improvements in the area is 1955, making most of the structures at least 50 years old. These properties are occupied primarily by independent small businesses. A number of buildings within the city, including within the DVSP area, have been identified as significant historic resources at the federal, state, and local levels. The proposed redesignation of existing land uses to Mixed Use would potentially damage the historic value of these properties.

To minimize any impacts on historical resources, the General Plan Update includes the following goal, objective, and policies:

**CNE Goal 3:** Encourage the preservation of significant historical resources within the City.

**CNE Objective 3.1:** Mitigate the loss or compromise of significant archaeological, historical, and other cultural resources within the City.

**CNE Policy 3.1.1:** Encourage and work with the La Cañada Flintridge Historical Society in designating and preserving local historical resources and maintain an inventory of buildings and other significant historical sites.

**CNE Policy 3.1.2:** Encourage public awareness of the significance of the area's cultural resources and historic features.

**CNE Policy 3.1.3:** Identify landmarks by means of appropriate monuments, plaques, displays, or other means to publically designate historic sites and commemorate their significance to the City.

**CNE Policy 3.1.4:** Require that archaeological reports (prepared by a certified archaeologist and including a literature search and a site survey) be completed for large, undeveloped parcels for which development is proposed, consistent with CEQA.

**CNE Policy 3.1.5:** If any archaeological excavations are recommended on a project site, require that such investigations include Native American consultation prior to project approval.

**CNE Policy 3.1.6:** If any significant archaeological sites or artifacts are discovered on a site, require coordination with professional archaeologists, relevant state agencies, and concerned Native American tribes regarding preservation of sites or professional retrieval and preservation of artifacts prior to development of the site.

**CNE Policy 3.1.7:** Consult with Native American tribes under Senate Bill 18 for amendments to the General Plan.

**CNE Policy 3.1.8:** Consider acquisition of identified historical buildings for public uses.

**LUE Policy 2.1.3:** Preserve the historic character and identity of the Old Town District (from Alta Canyada Road to La Cañada Boulevard) as a local-serving commercial area of smaller shops and offices. Encourage senior housing opportunities through the Mixed Use-Senior Overlay designation. Provide for increased parking facilities and encourage pedestrian- and transit-oriented design.

With these policies impacts on historical resources would be reduced, but the flexibility of the above policies could mean that in some cases a significant impact could still occur. Mitigation is proposed to help facilitate compliance with these policies.

## Impact Determination

**Impact CUL-1:** Although there are historic buildings and structures located throughout the Project area that have been documented through previous cultural resource studies and historical registers, the majority of potentially significant historic resources in the City (over 50 years old) are undocumented. Unique and potentially significant historic structures are likely to exist within the areas that have not been systematically surveyed. Specifically, many historic resources are likely to exist in the DVSP area given the age of most structures,

and the General Plan Update would focus much of the redevelopment and infill in this area. Furthermore, as identified in the Housing Element of the existing General Plan, the majority of city residences are in excess of 50 years of age, and thus may be considered significant historic resources. As such, future development focused in the DVSP area as well as infill and redevelopment activities throughout the city, as permitted under the General Plan Update, would significantly impact historic buildings and structures. This impact would be considered significant.

## Mitigation Measures

**MM CUL-1: Historic Building/Structure Evaluation.** The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Prior to future project approval and the issuance of any construction permit within the city, including but not limited to a demolition or building permit, and if research indicates that any onsite building(s) or structure(s) is 45 years or older, the applicant shall be required to conduct an evaluation of the onsite building(s) or structure(s) to determine if it is eligible for inclusion in the state or local historical registers. The evaluation shall be performed by a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Historic Preservation Professionals. The potentially historic building/structure shall be evaluated according to the NRHP criteria A-C and CRHR criteria 1-3. The historian/architectural historian shall consult with knowledgeable local groups and individuals, appropriate archives, and appropriate repositories in an effort to identify the original and subsequent owners as well as the architect and the builder to establish whether any of these individuals played important roles in local or regional history (criterion B). Additionally, the physical characteristics and condition of the building or structure shall be evaluated under criterion C, and those judged to possess "the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction" shall be further assessed for integrity and context.

The results of the archival research and field assessment shall be documented in an evaluation report. This report shall explicitly state whether the resource is eligible for either state or local historical registers and shall also make specific recommendations for mitigation as appropriate. The historian/architectural historian shall complete the necessary California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site forms (minimally a Primary Record and a Building/Structure/Object Record, with others as required) and include them as an attachment to the report. Copies of the DPR site forms shall be submitted to the CHRIS. Properties found in the evaluation report to meet NRHP criteria A-C or CRHR criteria 1-3 shall be considered "historical resources" as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA regulations. Significant effects on historical resources shall be avoided or mitigated by the lead agency and as recommended by a qualified historian or architectural historian.



## Residual Impacts

After implementing mitigation measure MM CUL-1, impacts related to Impact CUL-1 would remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

### *Threshold CUL-2: Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?*

Cultural resources include archaeological sites, those places occupied or utilized by prehistoric or historic human populations. Examples of prehistoric sites include temporary campsites, village sites, quarries, flake scatters, and bedrock milling stations. Typical historic sites might include wells/cisterns, trash pits, privy pits/septic systems, or basements/cellars associated with residential or commercial activities; as well as special features associated with specific industries, heavy foundations with mounts for machinery, etc. Archaeological sites usually, but not always, have a surface and a subsurface component.

As noted above in Section 4.5.1, “Existing Conditions,” the records search conducted for the General Plan Update indicated that no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites have been recorded in the city. However, the presence of Native American archaeological sites is apparent in Project vicinity, and other sensitive historic archaeological sites are likely to exist within areas that have not been systematically surveyed. Consequently, the General Plan Update would employ several policies designed to facilitate the preservation of suspected archaeological sites. These policies are listed under Threshold CUL-1 and include requirements for archaeological reports and Native American monitors. Moreover, mitigation is required to facilitate compliance with the policies and help to ensure a significant impact would not occur.

## Impact Determination

**Impact CUL-2:** There are potentially unknown prehistoric and historic archaeological resources within the Project area. Land use changes proposed as part of the Project could trigger future development and redevelopment activities throughout the city that could impact unknown significant archaeological resources.

## Mitigation Measures

### **MM CUL-2a: Phase I Pedestrian Survey, Records Search, and Letter Report.**

The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Prior to future project approvals and the issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to a grading permit, future projects within the city that have the potential to impact

archaeological resources shall obtain a qualified archaeologist and Native American consultant, if applicable, to conduct a pedestrian survey and records search to determine the potential for the project area to contain significant archaeological resources. A qualified archaeologist shall be a registered professional archaeologist and possess an advanced degree in archaeology, history, or a related discipline. The findings from the pedestrian survey and records search shall be included in a brief archaeological letter report. The report shall indicate whether the project area has a low, moderate, or high potential to contain prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. Projects characterized by no known resources and a low potential for unknown archaeological resources shall not involve any additional investigative work nor require any mitigation related to archaeological resources.

**MM CUL-2b: Phase II Testing and Evaluation and Data Recovery Plan.** The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Projects in areas having known resources or a moderate to high potential for significant resources shall undergo test and evaluation to determine if potentially significant archaeological resources are present. A Native American consultant shall be retained for projects involving prehistoric or ethnohistoric resources. If a resource is determined significant based on the evaluation, the site shall be avoided or the qualified archaeologist and Native American consultant shall prepare a data recovery plan and/or require archaeological monitoring during excavation activities, as necessary. If avoidance is not possible, the data recovery or mitigation monitoring plan shall be tailored to the specific circumstances at the site and shall be designed to reduce project-level impacts on the resource to a level less than significant. Cultural materials recovered during test and evaluation or data recovery shall be cleaned, identified, cataloged, and analyzed in accordance with standard professional practices. The results of the field work and laboratory analysis shall be contained in a technical report and the entire collection transferred to a federally recognized curation facility.

**MM CUL-2c: Project Construction Monitoring.** The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Monitoring during construction grading or trenching may be required if there is a potential for encountering subsurface cultural resources. This requirement would derive from the management recommendations of either the test and evaluation report or the data recovery report discussed in MM CUL-3. When invoked, the project applicant must provide written proof that a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor, if applicable, have been retained to observe all earth-disturbing activities. Any unexpected discoveries shall be treated in accordance with MM CUL-3.

## Residual Impacts

After implementation of mitigation measures MM CUL-2a through MM CUL-2c, impacts related to Impact CUL-2 would be less than significant.

### *Threshold CUL-3: Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

A number of federal and state regulations protect paleontological resources, including the federal Antiquities Act and Paleontological Resources Preservation Act, and sections of the California Public Resources and Administration Codes. In addition, CEQA requires analysis and mitigation of impacts on paleontological resources if thought to be present. Together, these regulations create the context for policies protecting paleontological resources, and for existing City policies and regulations.

As described above in Section 4.5.1, “Existing Conditions,” the general area is underlain by pre-batholithic metavolcanic rock and is not fossiliferous. In addition, no previously identified paleontological fossil localities are present within the Project area, and thus the potential for discovery of fossils within the Project area is low. However, adoption of the General Plan Update and the future development activities may lead to the discovery of previously unknown paleontological resources or unique geologic features in the Project area.

## Impact Determination

**Impact CUL-3:** There are potentially unknown paleontological resources or unique geologic features within the Project area. Future development associated with the Project could significantly impact unknown paleontological resources. Specific development projects that would excavate more than 10 feet deep or disturb more than 1,000 cubic yards of matrix would be considered to have a potentially significant adverse impact on paleontological resources.

## Mitigation Measures

**MM CUL-3: Paleontological Monitoring.** The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance: Monitoring during construction grading or trenching shall be required for projects that would excavate to a depth of 10 feet or more, or that propose a total cut amount of 1,000 cubic yards or more. When invoked, the project applicant must provide written proof that a qualified paleontologist has been retained to observe all earth-disturbing activities. All fossil materials recovered during mitigation monitoring shall be cleaned, identified, cataloged, and analyzed in accordance with standard professional practices.

The results of the field work and laboratory analysis shall be submitted in a technical report and the entire collection transferred to an approved fossil curation facility.

### **Residual Impacts**

After implementation of mitigation measure MM CUL-3, impacts related to Impact CUL-3 would be less than significant.

#### ***Threshold CUL-4: Would the proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

Prehistoric uses within the Project area as documented in Section 4.5.1, “Existing Conditions,” indicate that it is possible that Native American burials could be encountered during ground-disturbing activities. The unexpected discovery of human remains during grading or trenching would constitute a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Strict legal protocols must be followed when human remains are discovered. The Medical Examiner (ME) (i.e., County Coroner) must be notified; and, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, the ME will determine if the human remains are modern (less than 50 years old), historic, or prehistoric. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, then the ME will notify the NAHC who, in turn, will provide a list of Most Likely Descendants (MLDs) to be consulted. Final disposition of the remains and any associated grave goods or objects of cultural patrimony must be accomplished in a documented, collaborative manner that engages the City, the property owner, MLDs, and the archaeologist. Additionally, mitigation measures MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, and MM CUL-2c would help reduce the possibility of an unexpected encounter with human remains. Moreover, mitigation measure MM CUL-4 is proposed to ensure construction crews are aware of the legal obligations associated with encountering human remains. Impacts related to Threshold CUL-4 would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

### **Impact Determination**

**Impact CUL-4:** There are potentially unknown prehistoric human remains located within the Project area. Future development associated with the General Plan Update would have the potential of resulting in a significant impact on unknown human remains.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**MM CUL-4: Inform Construction Crew of Legal Requirements Pertaining to Discovery of Human Remains.** The following shall be incorporated into the General Plan Policy Implementation Program or adopted by City ordinance:

Prior to beginning fieldwork on any new projects, the project applicant and their contractors and subcontractors shall be informed of their legal obligations in the event of the discovery of human remains during excavation or trenching. These obligations derive from the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC 5097.98. The discovery of human remains or presumed human remains requires that the area of the discovery be protected from further disturbance and that an immediate call be made to the County Coroner. If the Coroner determines that the remains are prehistoric, the Coroner, and only the Coroner, is authorized to contact the NAHC. They, in turn, will determine and notify a MLD from the local Native American community. Meaningful consultation between the MLD, qualified archaeologist, project applicant, and the City shall establish a Memorandum of Understanding detailing a reasonable course of action that will reduce adverse impacts to a level less than significant. The Memorandum of Understanding and technical reports from the MLD and the qualified archaeologist shall be submitted and distributed as required.

### **Residual Impacts**

After implementation of mitigation measure MM CUL-4, impacts related to Impact CUL-4 would be less than significant.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

The geographic scope for the cumulative cultural resources analysis includes those areas surrounding the city boundaries: the City of Altadena, the City of La Crescenta, and the County of Los Angeles. Past and present development projects have changed the original natural setting to low-to-very-low density, automobile-oriented communities with some natural areas preserved in open space. Known historical resources occur in the area. Unknown and significant cultural resources are likely to be present given the area's prehistory. However, past and present development has dramatically altered the historic physical conditions and has irreversibly destroyed both prehistoric and historical artifacts. At present, most of the area is developed, but that which is not would have the potential to contain cultural and paleontological resources. Redevelopment that would propose a cut depth or cut amount greater than the existing or previous development may encounter cultural or paleontological resources.

Existing laws such as the NHPA, State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, and PRC 5097.98 require future development to consider and mitigate for the potential of uncovering sensitive cultural resources. Reasonably foreseeable future projects would be required to comply with these regulations. However, because the past and

present projects have drastically changed the historic setting of the immediate region, cumulative impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects are considered significant.

The Project would update the City's General Plan in a predominantly built out community. Implementation of the General Plan Update would allow for future Mixed Use land use, and would continue to allow development of existing land uses within vacant parcels throughout the city that are currently designated for residential development. As discussed above, mitigation is required to ensure significant impacts would not occur to historic buildings and surface and subsurface prehistoric and historical archaeological resources including unknown human remains, as well as to prevent damage to paleontological resources. With mitigation measures MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-4, impacts on these resources would be less than significant with the exception of Impact CUL-1. Potential impacts on historic buildings would remain significant and unavoidable.

Because past and present projects have contributed to a cumulatively significant impact on cultural resources, the contribution of the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable because of the potential to result in a significant impact on historic buildings. However, all other potential impacts related to cultural resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level after mitigation. These mitigation measures would be implemented at the time future projects are proposed will (1) help to identify sites that contain a moderate to high likelihood of containing cultural resources, (2) put into place data recovery and evaluation methods after site testing, and (3) require construction monitoring to prevent accidental damage to cultural and paleontological resources. Therefore, future development associated with the General Plan Update would result in a cumulatively considerable impact on cultural resources as an impact would relate to historic buildings; however, the Project's impacts on all other resource areas would be considered less than cumulatively considerable.

## Impact Determination

**Impact C-CUL-1:** Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects have resulted in a cumulatively considerable impact on cultural resources. The proposed Project would lead to limited new development or redevelopment of existing buildings. Mitigation is required to prevent future adverse effects on cumulatively considerable impacts; however, because of the uncertainty associated with redevelopment of existing buildings over 50 years old, it cannot be concluded that impacts on potentially historic structures would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

Implement mitigation measures MM CUL-1 through MM CUL-4.

## **Residual Impacts**

The Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural resources from past, present, and reasonable foreseeable projects would be cumulatively considerable.

## **Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed GP Update would result in the following significant and unavoidable adverse impacts related to cultural resources:

**Impact CUL-1:** The majority of potentially significant historic resources in the City (over 50 years old) are undocumented. Unique and potentially significant historic structures are likely to exist within the areas that have not been systematically surveyed. Specifically, many historic resources are likely to exist in the DVSP area given the age of most structures, and the General Plan Update would focus much of the redevelopment and infill in this area. Furthermore, as identified in the Housing Element of the existing General Plan, the majority of city residences are in excess of 50 years of age, and thus may be considered significant historic resources. As such, future development focused in the DVSP area as well as infill and redevelopment activities throughout the city, as permitted under the General Plan Update, would have the potential to result in a significant impact on historic buildings and structures after mitigation.

**Impact C-CUL-1:** Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects have resulted in a cumulatively considerable impact on cultural resources. The proposed Project would lead to limited new development or redevelopment of existing buildings. Mitigation is required to prevent future adverse effects on cumulatively considerable impacts; however, because of the uncertainty associated with redevelopment of existing buildings over 50 years old, it cannot be concluded that the Project's incremental impacts on potentially historic structures would be less than cumulatively considerable. This impact would remain cumulatively considerable after mitigation.