

# Table of Contents

---

|       |                             |        |
|-------|-----------------------------|--------|
| 4.4   | Cultural Resources .....    | 4.4-1  |
| 4.4.1 | Environmental Setting ..... | 4.4-1  |
| 4.4.2 | Regulatory Setting .....    | 4.4-5  |
| 4.4.3 | Impact Analysis .....       | 4.4-9  |
| 4.4.4 | Cumulative Impacts .....    | 4.4-14 |

## Tables

[No table of contents entries found.](#)

## Figures

[No table of contents entries found.](#)



## 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

The background information and analysis in this section is partially based on the *Archaeological Resources Assessment* prepared for the project by Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. in December 2017, a memorandum prepared by Dudek in September 2022, which confirmed project site conditions have not changed since the 2017 study was prepared (Appendix E-1), and the *Historic Resources Technical Report* prepared for the project by Dudek in March 2023 (Appendix E-2).

Tribal Cultural Resources are addressed in Section 4.15, *Tribal Cultural Resources*.

### 4.4.1 Environmental Setting

#### a. Regional Setting

The Santa Barbara region was historically occupied by the Chumash. The Chumash were a diverse population living in settlements along the California coast from Malibu Creek in the south to Estero Bay in the north, and from Tejon Pass, Lake Casitas and the Cuyama River inland to the islands of San Miguel, Santa Rosa, and Santa Cruz. The ethnography, prehistory, and history of the region are described below.

#### Ethnography

The Chumash spoke six closely related Chumashan languages, which have been divided into two broad groups—Northern Chumash (consisting only of Obispeño) and Southern Chumash (Purisimeño, Ineseño, Barbareño, Ventureño, and Island Chumash) (Mithun 2001:389). Groups neighboring the Chumash included the Salinan to the north, the Southern Valley Yokuts and Tataviam to the east, and the Gabrielino (Tongva) to the south.

Permanent Chumash villages included hemispherical dwellings arranged in close groups. Each Chumash village had a formal cemetery marked by tall painted poles, often with a defined entrance area (Gamble et al. 2001). Archaeological studies have identified separate sections for elite and common families within the cemetery grounds (King 1969).

The acorn was a dietary staple for the mainland Chumash, though its dominance varied by coastal or inland location. Chumash diet also included cattail roots, fruits and pads from cactus, and bulbs and tubers of plants such as amole (Miller 1988). On the coast, the wooden plank canoe (*tomol*) was employed in the pursuit of marine mammals and fish. The *tomol* not only facilitated marine resource procurement but also facilitated an active trade network maintained by frequent crossings between the mainland and the Channel Islands.

Chumash populations were decimated by the effects of European colonization and missionization. Traditional lifeways largely gave way to laborer jobs on ranches and farms in the Mexican and early American periods. At the time of first European contact in 1542, the Goleta area was occupied by a Native American group speaking a distinct dialect of the Chumash language. Historically, this group became known as the Barbareño Chumash (Landberg 1963); the name deriving from the Mission Santa Barbara under whose jurisdiction many local Chumash came after its founding in 1776. Today, the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians is the only federally recognized Chumash tribe, though many people of Chumash descent continue to live throughout their traditional territory.

## Prehistory

Prehistoric chronology for southern California is divided into four distinct periods: Early Man Horizon (ca. 10,000 – 6,000 B.C.), Milling Stone Horizon (6,000 – 3,000 B.C.), Intermediate Horizon (3,000 B.C. – A.D. 500), and Late Prehistoric Horizon (A.D. 500 – Historic Contact).

### *Early Man Horizon (ca. 10,000 – 6,000 B.C.)*

The Early Man Horizon was a diverse mixture of hunting and gathering and focused on use of aquatic resources in coastal and inland lakeshore areas (Jones et al. 2002). However, the Early Man Horizon had a greater emphasis on hunting than later horizons. A warm and dry 3,000-year period called the Altithermal began around 6000 B.C. which was likely responsible for the change in human subsistence patterns, including a greater emphasis on plant foods and small game.

### *Milling Stone Horizon (6,000 – 3,000 B.C.)*

The Milling Stone Horizon is “marked by extensive use of milling stones and mullers, a general lack of well[-]made projectile points, and burials with rock cairns” (Wallace 1955). The dominance of these types of artifacts indicates a subsistence strategy focused on collecting plant foods and small animals. A broad range of food resources were consumed including small and large terrestrial mammals, sea mammals, birds, shellfish and other littoral and estuarine species, near-shore fishes, yucca, agave, and seeds and other plant products (Kowta 1969; Reinman 1964).

Chipped stone artifacts associated with Milling Stone Horizon sites are predominantly manufactured from locally available lithic material. Chopping, scraping, and cutting tools along with grinding tools such as manos and metates<sup>1</sup> were common. Scraper-plane tools were likely used to process agave or yucca for food or fiber (Kowta 1969). Milling stones (such as manos and metates) were used to grind hard seeds into flour. The mortar and pestle, used for pounding acorns or other foods, were first used during the Milling Stone Horizon and their use increased dramatically in later periods (Wallace 1955, 1978; Warren 1968). Sometime during this period, people began making *Olivella* shell beads (beads made from the shell of a small sea snail), which possibly indicates the start of a regional exchange system (Glassow et al. 2007).

### *Intermediate Horizon (3,000 B.C. – A.D. 500)*

The Intermediate Horizon is characterized by a shift toward a hunting and maritime subsistence strategy, as well as greater use of plant foods. During the Intermediate Horizon, there was a noticeable trend toward use of local resources along the coast, including a broad variety of fish, land mammal, and sea mammals. Tool kits for hunting, fishing, and processing food and materials reflect this increased diversity, with flake scrapers, drills, various projectile points, and shell fishhooks being manufactured.

Mortars and pestles became more common during this transitional period, gradually replacing manos and metates as the dominant milling equipment. Many archaeologists believe this change in milling stones signals a change from the processing and consuming of hard seed resources to the increasing reliance on acorns (e.g., Glassow et al. 1988; True 1993). Mortuary practices during the Intermediate Horizon typically included fully flexed burials oriented toward the north or west (Warren 1968).

---

<sup>1</sup> Manos are handheld stones used when grinding hard seeds on a metate, a flat or slightly hollowed oblong stone on which materials are ground.

### *Late Prehistoric Horizon (A.D. 500 – Historic Contact)*

During the Late Prehistoric Horizon, the diversity of plant food resources and land and sea mammal hunting increased even further than during the Intermediate Horizon. More types of artifacts were observed during this period and high quality, exotic lithic materials were used for small, finely worked projectile points for bow and arrows. Steatite<sup>2</sup> containers were made for cooking and storage and there was an increased use of asphaltum, or naturally occurring tar, for waterproofing. More artistic artifacts were recovered from Late Prehistoric sites and cremation became a common mortuary custom. Larger, more permanent villages supported an increased population size and social structure (Wallace 1955).

After A.D. 500, a wealth of ornaments, ceremonial, and artistic items characterize the Chumash Tradition along the central coast and offshore islands (Warren 1968). Ground stone items include bowls, mortars and pestles, balls, grooved stones, doughnut stones, stone beads, pendants, pipes, tubes, and mammal effigies. Projectile points, both large and small, were typically non-stemmed and leaf-shaped, with convex or concave bases. Chipped stone implements also included drills and scrapers. Utilitarian objects were made from bone (e.g., awls, fishhooks, whistles, and tubes) and shell (e.g., fishhooks and abalone shell dishes). Shell beads and ornaments were abundant, and bowls, pestles, pipes, and stone tubes were inlaid with shell beads and engraved. Bowls, pipes, and ornaments were commonly manufactured from steatite.

Characteristic mortuary practices during the Chumash Tradition included burial in crowded cemeteries. Burials were normally flexed, placed face down, and oriented toward the north or west (Warren 1968). The interments were typically marked by vertical pieces of whalebone and contained abundant grave goods, such as ornaments, effigies, and utensils.

## **History**

A summary of the history of the general project area, excerpted from Appendix E-2, is provided below.

In 1823, during the Rancho period, Daniel Hill was the first American settler to arrive in the Goleta Valley. Hailing from a suburb of Boston, Massachusetts, Hill arrived at Refugio Beach where he met Rafaela, Don Jose Vicente Ortega's daughter and decided to settle in the area. He went on to open Santa Barbara's first trading post. Hill eventually turned to carpentry, soap making, and stone masonry as new business ventures. He built himself a one-story adobe, named the Hill-Carrillo Adobe located at 11 East Carrillo Street in Santa Barbara, and worked towards achieving Mexican citizenship while learning Spanish and converting to Catholicism.

In 1836, Nicholas Den arrived in Santa Barbara from Ireland after experiencing financial hardship in his home country. Upon learning that the Mexican government was giving away land grants to qualified Catholic citizens, he booked passage by boat to California. When he arrived, he befriended Daniel Hill and began trying to assimilate into the local culture, speaking only Spanish and changing the spelling of his name to "Nicolas". In 1841, Den became a naturalized Mexican citizen and applied to the government for a land grant of 15,534 acres consisting of the Rancho Los Dos Pueblos. His request was granted, and he formally took possession of the rancho in December 1842. The original land grant included the entire Goleta Slough area.

In 1845, with the looming annexation of California into the United States, local Friar Duran turned to Den and Hill to take control of the mission lands so that it would stay in the hands of Catholic landowners with a nine-year lease. Hill was also weary of newly arriving American settlers taking

---

<sup>2</sup> A mineral talc, also known as soapstone.

control of more land in present day Goleta Valley, so he petitioned Governor Pico to grant him the remaining 4,426-acre Ranch La Goleta in 1846. He was successful and for the first time in history, all of the land in the Goleta Valley was privately owned. When California officially became a part of the United States in 1850, Santa Barbara County was created as one of the original counties of the state. The Rancho period came to an end in the area when a major drought from 1863 to 1865 resulted in the death of many cattle. Upon their deaths, both Hill and Den's ranchos were divided into smaller farmsteads. This division shifted the land use from cattle ranching to small crop farming.

Between 1870 and 1890, the population of the Goleta Valley increased from 200 to 700 people. Two small towns, La Patera and La Goleta, were established in the area and provided goods and services to the new residents. Amenities such as the telegraph, telephone, and railroad were slowly brought to the area in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the late 1880s, the Southern Pacific Railroad was completed in the area and the first train arrived in Santa Barbara from Los Angeles. After a few months, the railroad tracks were extended north to Goleta. The arrival of the railroad had a major impact on the development of Santa Barbara County, as it led to the construction of several depots, ancillary buildings, and roadways.

As the agricultural industry in Goleta became successful between 1866 and 1918, many resources related to the industry were constructed, such as packing warehouses for walnuts, lima beans, and lemons, acres of large orchards, machine shops, and cooperative offices and sites. While local farmers grew several different crops, walnuts dominated the area.

Between World War I and II, Goleta grew from two small towns into a single booming citrus and oil town. From 1919 to 1940, several more residences were added to the area in the town of La Patera, which would go on to become the commercial center of the new town of Goleta. Residences during this time were commonly constructed as single-family homes in the Craftsman or Spanish Colonial Revival styles. Multi-family residences were more popular after World War II. The area also saw a lot of commercial development with the establishment of Goleta's original commercial districts on Hollister Avenue. The rise in popularity of the automobile resulted in the construction of auto garages and other businesses such as general stores, carpenters, blacksmiths, barbers, restaurants, pool halls, and bakers.

The Great Depression nearly halted development of new construction and agriculture in Goleta. A fungus in the 1930s destroyed Goleta's walnut trees and more land was devoted to lemons. Tomatoes also became a popular crop during this time and these two industries helped keep Goleta afloat during the economic downturn.

In 1941, the citizens of Santa Barbara purchased land in the Goleta Valley to develop a commercial airport occupying the vacant marshland on the Goleta Slough. During World War II, the U.S. Navy leased the airport for a U.S. Marine Corps Air Station which resulted in the construction of many new buildings and residences.

Post-World War II, the population boom and housing shortage did not drastically impact Goleta, which remained a smaller farming community into the 1950s. It was not until the construction of the Cachuma Dam in 1953 that the town began to develop more rapidly, as there was enough water to service a larger population. Aerospace companies such as Raytheon, Aerophysics, and Delco moved to Goleta. The establishment of the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1954 also increased local demand for housing. Between 1956 and 1958, nearly \$30 million in construction occurred in the area with 1,000 new homes as well as new stores, industrial buildings, and schools. Most homes constructed during this time were in the Ranch style of architecture and located in planned subdivisions.

Throughout the mid-century, the population experienced steady growth. In 1950, the population was approximately 7,000, which grew to 47,000 by 1966. The City of Goleta was officially incorporated in 2002. Presently, the City's population is approximately 33,000.

## **b. Project Site Setting**

A records search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) was conducted in 2017 to identify previously conducted cultural resource studies and previously recorded cultural resources within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. The results from the CHRIS records search identified one previously conducted cultural resources study within the "southern portion" of the project site. The CHRIS search identified no previously recorded cultural resources in the project site; however, the search identified three precontact archaeological resources and one area of redeposited cultural materials within the 0.25-mile buffer. The locations of cultural resources cannot be shared and are exempt from the California Public Records Act.

A review of historic-era accounts of the Goleta Slough indicated that the current project site was within the tidal zone during the Holocene era. Based on the fact that any cultural materials related to the terminal Pleistocene would be deeply buried during Holocene-era sea level rise and the infilling of sediments within the project site throughout the Holocene period, and especially during the 1860-1861 flooding event, there is no potential for extant cultural deposits to exist within the project site. A subsurface soils investigation concluded that the top 4 feet of soil on the project site consists of modern imported fill, with at least 4 to 24 feet below ground surface representing Holocene-era soil accumulation. The project site would have been at an elevation of 8 feet above sea level (ASL), and the historic records indicate that tidal levels would have extended up to 10 feet ASL. The project site would have been infilled as sea level rose throughout the Holocene (Amec 2017).

A review of existing structures on the project site determined that Twin Screens Drive-In theater is not eligible under the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, or City designation criteria as a historic resource. There are no eligible historic resources identified on the project site (Appendix E-2).

## 4.4.2 Regulatory Setting

### **a. Federal Regulations**

#### **National Register of Historic Places**

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was established by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 as "an authoritative guide to be used by federal, State, and local governments, private groups, and citizens to identify the Nation's cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment" (CFR 36 CFR 60.2). The NRHP recognizes properties that are significant at the national, State, and local levels. To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of potential significance must also possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

## b. State Regulations

### California Environmental Quality Act

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines states that a cultural resource is “historically significant” if it meets one of the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Public Resources Code § 5024.1; 14 CCR § 4852). A resource may qualify for CRHR listing if it:

- Criterion A:** It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- Criterion B:** It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past.
- Criterion C:** It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- Criterion D:** It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Cultural resources meeting one or more of these criteria are defined as “historical resources” under CEQA. Included in the definition of historical resources are prehistoric archaeological sites, historic archaeological sites, historic buildings and structures, traditional cultural properties important to a tribe or other ethnic group, cultural districts and landscapes, and a variety of other property types.

Impacts to “unique archaeological resources” are also considered under CEQA as described under Public Resources Code § 21083.2. This section defines a “unique archaeological resource” as:

“an archaeological artifact, object, or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person (Public Resources Code § 21083.2(g)).”

Potential impacts to identified cultural resources need only be considered if the resource is an “important” or “unique archaeological resource” under the provisions of CEQA Guidelines sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 and the eligibility criteria. If a resource cannot be avoided, then the resource must be examined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 and pursuant to the eligibility criteria as an “important” or “unique archaeological resource.”

A non-unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the above criteria. Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources and resources that do not qualify for listing on the CRHR receive no further consideration under CEQA.

Section 15064.5(b)(3) of the CEQA guidelines state that if significant cultural resources are identified within a proposed project site, the lead agency is required to identify potentially feasible mitigation measures and ensure that these measures are enforceable through permit conditions. Preservation in place is the preferred mitigation for archaeological sites, which can be accomplished by capping or covering the site with sterile soil (PRC 21083.2 [b]; CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4[b][3]).



## **California Register of Historical Resources**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21084.1) requires that a lead agency determine whether a project could have a significant effect on historical resources. A historical resource is a resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (PRC Section 21084.1), a resource included in a local register of historical resources (PRC Section 15064.5[a][2]), or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (PRC Section 15064.5[a][3]).

PRC Section 5024.1 requires an evaluation of potential historical resources to determine their eligibility for listing in the CRHR. The purpose of the register is to maintain listings of the state's historical resources and to indicate which properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change. The criteria for listing resources in the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP.

PRC, Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it does one or more of the following:

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

Impacts to significant cultural resources that affect the characteristics of any resource that qualify it for the NRHP or adversely alter the significance of a resource listed in or eligible for listing in the CRHR are considered a significant effect on the environment. These impacts could result from physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5 [b][1], 2000). Material impairment is defined as demolition or alteration in an adverse manner [of] those characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion or eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[b][2][A]).

## **California Coastal Act**

The project site is located in the City's Coastal Zone. According to PRC Section 30244, "where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required."

## **Codes Governing Human Remains**

The disposition of human remains is governed by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98 and falls within the jurisdiction of the NAHC. If human remains are discovered, the County Coroner must be notified within 48 hours and there should be no further disturbance to the site where the remains were found. If the remains are determined by the coroner to be Native American, the coroner is responsible for contacting the NAHC within 24 hours. The NAHC, pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98, will immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely

descended from the deceased Native Americans so they can inspect the burial site and make recommendations for treatment or disposal.

### **c. Local Regulations**

#### **Goleta General Plan**

The City of Goleta's Open Space Element of the General Plan (2006) outlines several goals and policies related to the preservation of historic and cultural resources. Policies that are relevant to the project include:

- **Policy OS 8.5: Mitigation.** If research and surface reconnaissance shows that the project area contains a resource of cultural significance that would be adversely impacted by proposed development and avoidance is infeasible, mitigation measures sensitive to the cultural beliefs of the affected population shall be required. Reasonable efforts to leave these resources in an undisturbed state through capping or covering resources with a soil layer prior to development shall be required. If data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, the City shall confer with the affected Native American nation or most-likely descendants, as well as agencies charged with the responsibility of preserving these resources and organizations having a professional or cultural interest, prior to the removal and disposition of any artifacts.

Please see Section 4.10, *Land Use and Planning*, for a comprehensive list of applicable goals and policies.

#### **Goleta Coastal Zoning Ordinance**

Section 35-65 of the City's previous Coastal Zoning Ordinance provides archaeological resource development standards for projects. According to Section 35-65, when archaeological or other cultural resources are located on the project site, projects should be designed to avoid impacts to such resources, implement mitigation if impacts are unavoidable, and engage in Native American consultation when projects may impact significant archeological or cultural resources.

#### **Goleta Historic Preservation and Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Ordinance (Ordinance No. 22-05)**

This ordinance, passed in April 2022, established regulations and processes associated with historic resources, archaeological resources, and tribal cultural resources. Chapter 17.33 (Historic Resources Preservation) and Chapter 17.43 (Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources) of the City's Municipal Code were established by this ordinance, excerpts from Chapter 17.33 and Chapter 17.43 that would potentially apply to the project are provided below.

##### *Chapter 17.33.030 Historic Resources Inventory*

- a. **Establishment.** The City shall create and maintain a list of properties known as the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) adopted by City Council Resolution. The HRI shall collectively consist of buildings, structures, objects, or sites that satisfy one or more of the following:
  1. Are identified as potentially eligible for designation through historic resources survey or other evaluation conducted by a qualified preservation professional using accepted professional practices and formally adopted for inclusion on the HRI by the City Council; or

2. Are listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources, either individually or as a Contributor to a designated Historic District; or
  3. Are designated as a County of Santa Barbara Landmark or County of Santa Barbara Place of Historic Merit; or
  4. Are designated Historic Landmarks or contributors to designated Historic Districts by the City Council.
- b. **Purpose.** The HRI may be used for reference for future determinations for the designation of Historic Landmarks or Historic Districts. In addition, all properties on the HRI are subject to provisions of this chapter including the standards and review processes associated with alterations to or demolition of historic resources. All properties on the HRI are considered historical resources as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act and may be eligible to use alternative Building Code provisions as determined by the Building Official.

#### *Chapter 17.43.040 Development Standards*

- a. The following standards are applicable to all permits issued under this chapter:
1. If unanticipated discovery of archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources occurs during earth-disturbing activities, earth-disturbing activities must be stopped immediately until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the archaeological and/or tribal cultural resource pursuant to standards set forth in Council Resolution No. 08-40, Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual as amended, and local Chumash tribal representative(s) can evaluate the importance of the find.
  2. If human remains are uncovered as a result of earth-disturbing activities, work must stop immediately and the Planning and Environmental Review Department must be contacted, and the applicant must follow the procedures identified by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.
  3. As applicable, recommendations identified in the Preliminary Archaeological Assessment, Phase 1 Report, or Extended Phase 1 Report and agreed upon by the City, must be implemented and printed on the approved building plans.

### 4.4.3 Impact Analysis

#### **a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds**

##### **Methodology**

In December 2017, Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. (Amec) prepared an *Archaeological Resources Assessment* in support of the proposed project. The study included a cultural resources records search and an environmental setting reconstruction of the project site based on a summary of a geotechnical engineering study prepared by Earth Systems Pacific, Inc. in 2017. In accordance with the City of Goleta's requirement to verify that the project site has not changed in its physical condition since the 2017 *Archaeological Resources Assessment*, in September 2022, Dudek drafted a memorandum that confirmed the on-site conditions of the project site (Appendix E-1). In March 2023, Dudek prepared a Historic Resources Technical Report that evaluated the historic significance of on-site structures (Appendix E-2). The analysis of cultural resources impacts in this section is based on information presented in the prior three cultural resources studies.

*Amec 2017 Archaeological Resources Assessment*

**CULTURAL RESOURCES RECORDS SEARCH**

The Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) then located at the University of California, Santa Barbara (recently relocated to the Santa Barbara County Natural History Museum) conducted a search of the CHRIS records on November 21, 2017. The search was undertaken to identify previously conducted cultural resource studies and previously recorded cultural resources (prehistoric or historic) within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. A 0.5-mile buffer is the industry standard for a CHRIS search, but a 0.25-mile buffer can be used in areas known to have a high resource density as the larger radius is not needed to understand the local archaeological landscape. The CHRIS records search documented no prehistoric or historic archaeological resources within the project site, three prehistoric resources and one area of redeposited cultural materials within the 0.25-mile buffer, and one previous cultural resources study that addressed the southern portion of the project site (Amec 2017).

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING RECONSTRUCTION**

The *Archaeological Resources Assessment* summarized a geotechnical engineering study conducted by Earth Systems Pacific, Inc. in 2017, which consisted of 4, 6-inch-wide, hollow-stem auger borings within the four corners and center of the project site. Based on the borings, the *Archaeological Resources Assessment* concluded that the top 4 feet were modern imported fill, with at least 4 to 24 feet below ground surface representing Holocene-era soil accumulation (Amec 2017).

*Dudek 2022 Memorandum*

In September 2022, Dudek drafted a memorandum to verify the consistency of project site conditions with the 2017 *Archaeological Resources Assessment*. This memorandum was conducted in compliance with the City of Goleta's requirement that a qualified archaeologist verify that the project site did not change since the 2017 *Archaeological Resources Assessment*. The memorandum reviewed aerial imagery from 2016, 2018, and (then) current aerial images in order to determine whether the project site conditions had changed, and completed a cursory survey of the project site. The memorandum concluded that the project site use remained the same from 2016 to 2022, and that soils noted in the *Archaeological Resources Assessment* matched those observed during the project site survey (Appendix E-1).

*Dudek 2023 Historic Resources Technical Report*

The *Historic Resources Technical Report* included a field survey, archival research, and historical significance evaluation. Based on the results of this report, the Twin Screens Drive-In theater was not found eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and City designation criteria due to a lack of significant historical associations, architectural merit, and poor integrity. No historic resources were identified within the project site by the *Historic Resources Technical Report* (Appendix E-2).

**Significance Thresholds**

The significance of a cultural resource and impacts to the resource is determined by whether that resource can increase the collective knowledge regarding the past. The primary determining factors are site content and degree of preservation. As described in more detail in Section 4.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, the following thresholds are based on the County's 2021 *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* and Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

Pursuant to the Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, potentially significant impacts would occur if development of the project site would:

1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5;
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5;
3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

According to the County's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, a project would have a significant impact on a cultural resource if it results in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of such a resource would be materially impaired.

## **b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

|   |
|---|
| <b>Threshold 1:</b> Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? |
|---|

**Impact CUL-1**      **NO HISTORIC RESOURCES WERE IDENTIFIED ON THE PROJECT SITE. THE PROJECT WOULD HAVE NO IMPACT TO HISTORIC RESOURCES.**

---

The *Historic Resources Technical Report* identified one built environment resource over 45 years old that had not been previously evaluated for historical significance: the Twin Screens Drive-In theater. The following analysis summarizes the results of the *Historic Resources Technical Report* (Appendix E-2).

The Twin Screens Drive-In theater was constructed in 1966. Archival research revealed that while the Twin Screens Drive-In theater was still associated with the national trend of drive-in theaters in suburban areas, new construction of drive-ins declined as early as 1960, making the Twin Screens Drive-In theater a late example of the national trend. It was also the last drive-in theater to be constructed in Santa Barbara County. While the Twin Screens Drive-In theater is associated with the historical trend of drive-ins, it does not appear to be an early regional prototype of drive-in theaters.

The Twin-Screens Drive-In theater's original owner was listed as Lippert, Inc., which archival research revealed to be connected to Lippert Theaters, owned by Robert L. Lippert, an American theater chain owner and film producer. While the property was owned and associated with Robert Lippert, his ownership of the drive-in theater does not constitute an important association with his productive life as a film professional. The Twin Screens Drive-In theater was also associated with Raymond Syufy, owner of Syufy Theaters. Syufy opened his first theater in Vallejo, California in 1941, and went on to create a very successful chain of movie theaters with 425 screens. While Syufy Theaters is associated with the Twin Screens Drive-In theater, it is not directly tied to Syufy as a place that illustrates his important achievements.

The Twin Screens Drive-In theater was constructed in 1966 and represents a popular mid-century property type that features modest Googie-style elements in its architectural design. Upon its construction, it had two semi-circular parking areas with mounted speaker stands, two screens, two ticket booths, two projection buildings, and one concession area with restrooms. It had a long entrance driveway with pole-mounted marquee sign, and a fence surrounding the site. Presently, the theater is in poor condition and has lost some of the original character defining features. For instance,

it no longer has one of its two screens, and the speaker stands have been removed or are in ruins. The ticket booths, projection buildings, and concession building have lost several architectural features due to neglect over time, including windows and doors.

The most intact building on the property is the concessions stand, which features Googie-style elements such as being single-story, an organic shape with an expressive round roofline, and diamond shaped pillars as a thematic design detail. When compared to other examples of the property type from the same period, it does not serve as a good representation of the style, lacking many of the character-defining features such as a clear expression of materials, large expanses of plate glass, and signage designed to catch the eyes of automobile drivers.

While the theater was designed by Vincent Raney in 1965 and 1966, it is not a good representation of his larger body of work. His most prolific designs were dome topped indoor movie theaters with signature curved screens. For example, the Solano 2 Drive-In in Concord, California has a similar overall form to the Twin Screens Drive-In theater, but has better integrity of design, materials, and workmanship and includes more original design features such as decorative arches.

Finally, the project site is not significant as a source, or likely source, of important historical information nor does it appear likely to yield important information about historic construction methods, materials, or technologies.

In conclusion, the Twin Screens Drive-In theater retains integrity of location, but lacks integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Due to a lack of important historical associations, a lack of architectural merit, compromised integrity, and an inability to serve as a good representation of the original architect's body of work, the Twin Screens Drive-In theater was found ineligible for historic resource listing. Therefore, the project would have no impact with respect to historic resources pursuant to Section 15064.5.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Threshold 2:** Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

**Impact CUL-2 CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT WOULD INVOLVE GROUND DISTURBING ACTIVITIES SUCH AS GRADING AND SURFACE EXCAVATION. HOWEVER, THERE IS NO POTENTIAL FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES TO EXIST WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE. THIS IMPACT WOULD BE CLASS III, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.**

As discussed above, the CHRIS cultural resources search results indicate no archaeological resources have been recorded within the project site. Furthermore, the environmental setting reconstruction conducted for the 2017 *Archaeological Resources Assessment* concluded that given the site's history during the Holocene Era and its accumulation of fill, there is no potential for archaeological cultural resources to exist within the project site. Considering no archaeological resources are known to exist within the project site, and there is no potential for undiscovered archaeological resources to exist within the project site, the project would not substantially affect archaeological resources, and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Threshold 3:** Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Impact CUL-3 CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT WOULD INVOLVE GROUND DISTURBING ACTIVITIES SUCH AS GRADING AND SURFACE EXCAVATION, WHICH HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO UNEARTH OR ADVERSELY IMPACT PREVIOUSLY UNIDENTIFIED HUMAN REMAINS. THIS IMPACT WOULD BE CLASS III, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.**

No known human remains or prehistoric villages where human remains and/or cemeteries are known to exist occur within the project site. As stated in the 2017 *Archaeological Resources Assessment*, there is a very low likelihood that prehistoric habitation occurred at the project site, as settlements were found at higher elevations along the Goleta Slough. The project site is primarily underlain by fill soils that reach approximately 4 feet in depth (Appendix G). As indicated by cross-sections of grading plans for the project, project construction would result in the excavation of less than 4 feet of fill for all project components, except for the bioretention basin and utility trench construction, which would involve excavation of no more than 5 feet of fill. Therefore, excavation and ground disturbance associated with construction of the proposed industrial building would primarily occur in previously disturbed and fill soils, rather than native soils, which would further reduce the potential for project-related ground-disturbing activities to disturb human remains, should they be present.

In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains during construction, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that all construction activities halt in the vicinity of the discovery and the County Coroner be contacted immediately. The County Coroner would make a determination of origin and disposition of the human remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner would notify the NAHC, which would determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD would complete an inspection of the site within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD would be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. Recommendations by the MLD may include: (1) the nondestructive removal and analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American human remains; (2) preservation of Native American human remains and associated items in place; (3) relinquishment of Native American human remains and associated items to the descendants for treatment; or (4) other culturally appropriate treatment.

With compliance with existing regulations prescribed in the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.8, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

#### 4.4.4 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development in the Goleta Valley would continue to disturb areas that may potentially contain cultural resources. All potential development sites in the City are considered sensitive for archaeological resources due to their location adjacent to the Goleta Slough. However, existing City policies and regulations would protect any unknown resources that might be uncovered in the course of project development. Individual development proposals are reviewed separately by the City and undergo environmental review when it is determined that the potential for significant impacts exists, which is occurring for this Project. In the event that future cumulative development would result in impacts to known or unknown cultural resources, impacts to such resources would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. While there is the potential for significant cumulative impacts to cultural resources in the Goleta Valley, the project site has no potential to contain historic or archaeological resources, and would not substantially affect the cultural resource landscape of the Goleta area. The project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts associated with cultural resources.