

4.10 Cultural Resources

4.10.1 Abstract

Monterey County was first inhabited by the Costanoan then Esselen people. Spanish explorers first landed in Monterey Bay in the early 1600s; however, Franciscan missionaries did not establish missions in the county until the late 1700s. Americans began settling in the county in the 1800s during the Mexican period and especially after the Gold Rush of 1849. The unincorporated area of Monterey County contains a number of historic resources, including Mission Nuestra Señora de la Soledad and the Old Mission School near Soledad, the Site of the Battle of Natividad near Salinas, and the Glass House in Pajaro. Archaeological and paleontological resources have also been found at numerous sites in the county.

All potential cultural resources impacts from development and land use activities contemplated by the 2007 General Plan would be less than significant and would not require mitigation.

All potential cultural resources impacts from implementation of the proposed *Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan* (AWCP) would be less than significant and would not require mitigation.

4.10.2 Environmental Setting

Cultural resources encompass paleontological, archaeological, and historic resources. Below is a brief summary of each component.

- **Paleontological Resources:** Paleontology is the study of plant and animal fossils. Generally, paleontological resources are more than 10,000 years old.
- **Archaeological Resources:** Archaeology is the study of prehistoric human activities and cultures. Archaeological resources are generally associated with indigenous cultures and are less than 10,000 years old.
- **Historic Resources:** Historic resources are associated with the more recent past. In California, historic resources are typically associated with the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods in the state's history and are usually less than 200 years old.

4.10.2.1 Monterey County History

Pre-Historic Period

The earliest human presence in what is now Monterey County probably dates back as far as 10,000 to 12,000 years ago. The first inhabitants were nomadic hunters, banding together in small groups, following game herds for their subsistence. The earliest settlements began to appear around 7,500 to 8,000 B.C. These occupation sites, which comprised small villages, indicate a cultural shift to a different form of subsistence based on exploitation of a broader range of local resources, including marine and freshwater food sources (fish and shellfish), game (rabbits, deer, elk), acorns, and wild roots, and nuts and berries. By 6,000 B.C., at least four such village sites from this period are known to have existed in the area around Moss Landing and Elkhorn Slough, undoubtedly because of the abundance of resources in this area.

A little later, a second shift occurred, again reflecting a change in subsistence strategy that is evident in changes in prehistoric settlement patterns. This change is thought to have occurred because of in-migration of a different people from the north, who were part of a larger movement emanating from farther east. During the middle period (2,500 to 1,600 years ago), villages became larger but fewer in number. They were augmented by a large number of small, widely distributed sites for the collection, processing, and distribution of resources. This new settlement pattern reflects a fundamental shift in strategy from smaller sites dependent on close proximity to resources, to villages supported by outlying sites specializing in collecting and processing resources. Rather than being constrained to living near the food source, the people developed a specialized system to collect and transport resources to population centers.

This new strategy of collection rather than foraging allowed an even broader use of resources and over time resulted in a larger population. The ocean and nearby salt and freshwater marshes were used in conjunction with the oak woodland, savanna, and grassland habitats that provided game, acorns, and other resources. The larger collection strategy enabled early inhabitants to expand in number. The specialization of roles allowed the culture to develop. Instead of generalized foraging, individualized skills developed, such as production of arrowheads, musical instruments, shell beads, and tools. During this middle period of prehistory the local indigenous culture reached its peak in terms of cultural expressions of concentrated wealth.

During the period between A.D. 900 and 1,100, a severe climatic shift began. There was a warming period in which the ocean temperature rose, perhaps not unlike a prolonged El Niño event. The marine and coastal environment became less productive and less reliable as a food source. These conditions necessitated another adaptation in subsistence strategy, stimulating further movement inland and greater dependence on acorns as a staple food. Acorns were particularly useful because they could be stored for as long as a year, providing a secure supply of winter food. The climate change led to a redistribution of occupation sites into many different environments. Villages became further disseminated

and very seasonal. The overall effect was decentralization with many new sites farther inland. Settlement sites became specialized according to seasonal use, differentiating into winter and summer sites. In wintertime, occupants would move inland, seeking the shelter and resources in inland canyons and habitats. At this time Rancho San Carlos was first occupied intensively, as a winter village site. The resource-rich regions of what is now Fort Hunter Liggett, along the Nacimiento River, were also intensively occupied at the same time.

At roughly A.D. 1500, the climate shifted again, entering what is known as the Little Ice Age, a colder period which lasted until at least A.D. 1800. Collection behavior became very specialized and migratory. The indigenous people were still in this middle period of subsistence behavior when Spanish explorers saw them for the first time.

Historical Period

Monterey County has been called the “cradle of California history,” owing to its central position relative to historical activities. Monterey Bay became the focus of several Spanish exploratory expeditions after it was first noticed by Juan Cabrillo in 1542. Sebastian Vizcaino, who sailed into it in 1602, named the bay after Conde de Monterrey, Viceroy of Spain. The Franciscans founded three missions (San Carlos Borroméo, San Antonio de Padua, and Nuestra Señora de Soledad) in what is now Monterey County, and these, along with the Presidio established in the late 1700s and eight large ranchos that formed from land concessions to Spanish army veterans, became focal points of activity.

When the Mexican Republic formed in 1822, the missions were secularized and new ranchos developed on 68 Mexican land grants. A robust economy emerged, based on cattle ranching on these large ranchos, some of which exceeded 10,000 acres. This economy received a great boost when the Mexican regime opened Monterey harbor to foreign trade. The Custom House in Monterey became the site for collection of duties, providing the main source of income for Alta California’s government. The harbor enabled rancheros to trade their hides and tallow for products from around the world. This commercial vitality led to Monterey’s role as the Mexican capital of California.

In May 1846, the United States declared war against Mexico, commencing the Mexican-American War. Commodore John Drake Sloat sailed into Monterey Bay 2 months later and demanded surrender of the port. On orders to secure men and horses for the war in southern California, Lt. Colonel John C. Fremont arrived in Monterey as well. In November, as Fremont and his men were driving horses from San Juan Bautista to Monterey, Californios led by Manuel Castro attacked them. The Battle of Natividad was the only military engagement fought in northern California during the Mexican-American War. Organized resistance to the American occupation ended in 1847. On February 2, 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed, giving the United States possession of Alta California.

Monterey continued to play a key role for some time after the Mexican-American War. At the beginning of the American period, the convention to draft and sign California's new constitution convened at Colton Hall in Monterey, considered California's finest building at the time. This period coincided with the California Gold Rush, and the market for tallow and hides shifted to a demand for beef to feed the population of gold prospectors. By the 1870s, dairy farming was introduced in the area around Gonzales and Soledad. This enterprise required irrigation to support alfalfa production, a practice based on rudimentary canal systems used earlier by friars at the missions.

In 1863 and 1864, a disastrous drought wiped out the cattle industry. Grain production quickly became Monterey County's principal activity. Between 1857 and 1865, the county's grain acreage increased from 2,450 to 27,358 acres. The resulting grain surplus was an incentive to build the harbor at Moss Landing from which farmers could ship their grain products worldwide. Bixby's Landing played a similar role for the export of tanbark and lumber from the Big Sur coast. Transportation soon became a major factor in supporting the county's growing economy. In 1872, Southern Pacific Railroad extended its rail line to Salinas from Pajaro. As the railroad pushed farther south, it opened new markets and stimulated settlement of new towns. From Salinas, it extended southward to Chualar, followed by Gonzales and Soledad, as landowners donated rights-of-way across their ranches. With this new transport capability, grain could be loaded at Soledad, expanding the acreage available for cultivation. By 1875, nearly 100,000 acres of grain were harvested in the county, making it one of California's principal grain-producing regions.

In the 1880s, a transformation began in the lower Salinas Valley, initiated by systematic draining and reclamation of the extensive marshland and several dozen lakes in the northern end of the valley. By the 1880s, Chinese laborers had cleared 1,000 acres of land, increasing its value from \$28 to \$100 an acre. As land prices rose, dry farmers and cattle and sheep ranchers sold out or shifted to row crops.

Widespread sugar beet cultivation in the Salinas area prompted Claus Spreckels to open what was then the largest sugar beet refinery in the world in 1899, south of Salinas. Capacity of the plant reached 3,000 tons of beets per day—more than all of the other refineries in California combined. Spreckels also built the town that still bears his name around the facility. The community of Spreckels was one of California's few company towns and was home to a variety of businesses, a school, a church, and cottages for company employees.

The extension of the railroad, improved irrigation systems, refrigerated freight cars, and other innovations in technology transformed the agricultural economy of the Salinas Valley, further opening up cultivated lands to row crops in place of dry farming dominated by grain crops. This development established the basis for the Salinas Valley's modern economy.

In the late nineteenth century, Monterey County became a destination for tourism and resort activities. Three resorts with hotels developed at Paraiso, Tassajara,

and Slates Hot Springs. Pacific Grove was founded as a religious and cultural retreat, growing from a tent city to a town of small Victorian cottages. In the early 1900s, Pebble Beach was subdivided and became a fashionable summer resort. In Carmel, the Arts and Crafts movement took hold in local architecture, as the town became a colony for artists and writers.

On the coast, at Moss Landing and in Monterey, sardine fisheries flourished for a little less than two decades between 1931 and the late 1940s. The cannery buildings at both of these locations are historical remnants of that brief period before the sardines and then the canning industry disappeared.

4.10.2.2 Ethnography

Costanoan/Ohlone

The Costanoan were speakers of languages in the Penutian language family. The Costanoan, now commonly referred to as Ohlone, consisted of over 50 tribal groups, speaking eight different but related languages that included Karkin (northern and southern portions of the Carquinez Strait); Chochenyo (east shore of San Francisco between Richmond and Mission San Jose and probably Livermore Valley); Tamien (southern San Francisco Bay and lower Santa Clara Valley); Ramaytush (San Mateo and San Francisco Counties); Awaswas (Santa Cruz Costanoan between Davenport and Aptos); Mutsun (Pajaro River drainage); Achastan/Rumsen (lower Carmel, Sur, and lower Salinas Rivers); and Chalon (Salinas River). This territory encompasses a lengthy coastline as well as several inland valleys.

The Ohlone relied on gathering, hunting, and fishing to procure a wide variety of flora and fauna for subsistence and material needs. The Ohlone had both permanent village locations and seasonal camps to take advantage of the diverse terrain along the central coast. The first Spanish encounters with the Ohlone occurred as early as 1602 with the Sebastian Vizcaino navigational expedition, followed by the inland exploratory expedition of Gaspar de Portola in 1769. Seven missions were established in Ohlone territory between 1770 and 1797. Ohlone were both forcibly and voluntarily brought to the missions along with other tribes, including Yokuts, Miwoks, Esselen, and Patwin. Once part of the mission system, the Ohlone were discouraged or forced from practicing their traditional rituals and social activities. Contact with Euroamericans resulted in a drastic reduction of population due to disease, violence, and a declining birth rate. The Ohlone population fell from an estimated 10,000 in 1770 to fewer than 2,000 by 1832. Following secularization of the missions in 1834, most of the remaining Ohlone moved into growing towns and surrounding ranchos to work as laborers or domestic servants. By the mid-twentieth century, the Ohlone population was reduced to 130 in the San Francisco Bay area, although some research suggests that in the early 1970s there may have been approximately 200 surviving Ohlone.

In the 1960s, the Ohlone Indian Tribe was incorporated as a formal organization, now holding title to the Ohlone Indian cemetery in Fremont, California. In the 1970s, the Pajaro Valley Ohlone Indian Council was created and was actively preserving sites of traditional importance. Four Ohlone groups had sought recognition: the Amah-Mutsun Tribal Band, the Carmel Mission Band, the Indian Canyon Band, and the Muwekma/Ohlone Tribe. Similarly situated as previously Federally Recognized Tribal groups, were the Ohlone Costanoan Esselen Nation of the Monterey Bay region, historically identified by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) under the jurisdiction of the Reno and Sacramento Agencies as the Mission San Carlos Indian Band (Helen Hunt Jackson 1883) and Monterey Band of Monterey County (Special Indian Agent C. E. Kelsey 1906–1913; Superintendent James Jenkins, Reno Agency 1923), and the Amah-Mutsun Tribal Band identified by the BIA as the San Juan Bautista Band (C. E. Kelsey 1906–1913; Jenkins 1923; and L. A. Dorrington, Superintendent of Sacramento Agency 1927). The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe has historically used the term “Ohlone” throughout the twentieth century. On their 1928–1932 and 1968–1972 BIA enrollment applications, the families used either Ohlone or Mission San Jose Tribe. The Amah Mutsun community used only Mission San Juan Bautista Tribe, and the Monterey community used either Esselen or Mission Carmel Tribe.

There have been continued efforts to document genealogies by using mission records to piece together family and tribal history. The groups mentioned above, as well as other individuals, have been actively involved in the management and preservation of their heritage and are frequently involved in the management of cultural resources. Ohlone descendants continue to conduct ceremonies and traditional practices such as the gathering of plant materials for basket making. Some of these activities are known to take place on Fort Ord Public Lands in the Central Coast Management Area.

Esselen

Peoples of the Esselen language group inhabited the area south of Monterey, including the upper drainage of the Carmel River south to the vicinity of Junipero Serra Peak and west to the Sierra de Salinas. The area encompassed a 25-mile stretch along the Pacific Coast. Research in the early 1970s recognized six Esselen tribelets: Excelen, (Carmel Valley), Echilatg (Santa Lucia Mountains), El Pino (lower Arroyo Seco), Cuchunu (Arroyo Seco), Eslenajan (near Soledad Mission), and Tucutnut (Carmel River) (Hester 1978:497). Very little is known about the lifeways of the Esselen prior to Euroamerican contact. Documentation of Esselen lifeways has been minimal, and much of what is known about the group is gleaned from archaeological research and mission records. The population of the Esselen in the eighteenth century is estimated at 500 to 1,285 persons. With the founding of Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Monterey at Carmel in 1770, many Esselen were moved to the mission. It has been suggested that by the mid-1800s they were totally absorbed into the mission population, where many also perished. Families have taken steps to preserve their history and identities as Esselen by founding the Ohlone Costanoan Esselen

Nation, currently located in and around Carmel Valley. The Ohlone Costanoan Esselen Nation consists of 500 members and has been petitioning the federal government to regain recognition as a formal Federally Recognized Tribe.

4.10.2.3 Documented Cultural Resources

Paleontological Resources

Significant paleontological resources are fossils or assemblages of fossils that are unique, unusual, rare, uncommon, and diagnostically or stratigraphically important—and those that add to an existing body of knowledge in specific areas, stratigraphically, taxonomically, or regionally. They include fossil remains of large to very small aquatic and terrestrial vertebrates, remains of plants and animals previously not represented in certain portions of the stratigraphy, and assemblages of fossils that might aid stratigraphic correlations—particularly those offering data for the interpretation of tectonic events, geomorphologic evolution, paleoclimatology, and the relationships of aquatic and terrestrial species.

Most of the fossils found in Monterey County are of marine life forms and form a record of the region's geologic history of advancing and retreating sea levels. Because of the marine origin of these deposits, the area lacks the large, terrestrial fossils found in other regions such as the dinosaur fossils of the southwestern United States. Most of Monterey County's fossils are micro-organisms such as foraminifera or diatoms, or assemblages of mollusks and barnacles most commonly found in sedimentary rocks ranging from Cretaceous age (138 to 96 million years old) to Pleistocene age (1.6 million to 11 thousand years old).

Fossils are found throughout the county because of the widespread distribution of marine deposits. A review of nearly 700 known fossil localities was conducted by paleontologists in 2001, and 12 fossil sites were identified as having outstanding scientific value. To avoid potential degradation of the sites, the precise locations have been omitted from this document. However, the general location of the sites is shown in Exhibit 4.10.1. For the most part, the fossils at these 12 sites reflect the type of assemblages found throughout the county (microorganisms or invertebrates); however, each has special characteristics that make it unique or rare, or in some way provide important stratigraphic or historic information.

Archaeological Resources

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. In the protection and management of the cultural environment, CEQA Guidelines provide definitions and standards for cultural

resource management. The term “unique archaeological resource” has the following meaning according to CEQA:

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

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

The likelihood for occurrence of archaeological resources is shown on Exhibit 4.10.2. The sensitivity map identifies three levels of archaeological sensitivity: high, moderate, and low. The mapping of these areas is based on three different considerations. One of these is the distribution of known archaeological resources (previously discovered and recorded sites). This distribution is reflected in the areas of high sensitivity concentrated in the lower Salinas Valley north of Salinas and extending to Castroville, Moss Landing, and coastal north county. It also accounts for the high-sensitivity zone extending from Monterey Peninsula southward along the full length of the coast, including the upper Carmel Valley; Fort Hunter Liggett; Cone Peak; and the Arroyo Seco, Big Sur, and Big Creek watersheds.

A second consideration used in the mapping is uncertainty in the number of resources in some areas. This is evident in the high-sensitivity rating given to Peachtree Valley and the Parkfield area, where little or no archaeological surveying has been conducted. In the interest of erring on the conservative side rather than putting unknown resources at risk, these areas are rated as high-sensitivity on the map.

A final consideration in defining sensitivity zones is the well-founded observation on the part of archaeologists that river courses and major drainages are common locations of human occupation or use. This consideration is reflected in the high-sensitivity designations given to Salinas River tributaries such as Pancho Rico and Sargent Creeks in the south county, and Chualar and Gabilan Creeks in the northern portion of the valley. The importance of streams and rivers in human occupation is evident in the several burial sites that have been uncovered on the terraces of the Salinas River.

Historical Resources

Exhibit 4.10.3 depicts the location of federally, state-, and county-listed historic resources. More than 200 sites in Monterey County are included in a federal, state, or county listing of designated or eligible historic resources. Notable historic resources in the unincorporated county include Mission Nuestra Señora

de la Soledad and the Old Mission School near Soledad, Richardson Adobe near Soledad, the Site of the Battle of Natividad near Salinas, the José Eusebio Boronda Adobe Casa in Boronda, the Glass House in Pajaro, and Mission San Antonio de Padua near Jolon.

4.10.3 Regulatory Framework

4.10.3.1 State Historic Preservation Programs

The State Office of Historic Preservation oversees four historic preservation programs:

- National Register of Historic Places
- California Register of Historic Places
- California Historical Landmarks
- California Points of Historic Interest

Each program has its own specific eligibility criteria, although historic resources often overlap on multiple lists.

Resources listed in the National Register, California Historical Landmarks 770 and above are automatically listed in the California Register. Points of Historical Interest designated after December 1997 and recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission are also listed in the California Register.

4.10.3.2 California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires that discretionary land use approvals be reviewed for potential environmental impacts, including impacts on cultural resources, and that potentially significant cultural resource impacts be disclosed, and if possible, mitigated to a level of less than significant (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[3]).

4.10.3.3 Senate Bill 18—Tribal Consultation Guidelines

Senate Bill 18 (SB18) requires that local governments consult with tribal representatives about the implications of proposed general plans or amendments on protected cultural places and sacred sites. SB18 introduces a separate process that expands the focus to include traditional tribal cultural places on both public and private lands for Federally and non-Federally Recognized Tribes. A cultural place is a landscape feature, site, or cultural resource that has some relationship to particular tribal religious heritage or is an historical or archaeological site of

significance or potential significance. The cultural place may be outside the reservation boundary. Many tribes have “Traditional Use Areas” that extend miles beyond reservation boundaries, reflecting their historical mobile patterns. SB18 consultation is designed to be concurrent with the general plan process.

4.10.3.4 Monterey County Local Official Register of Historic Resources

The local Official Register of Historic Resources is the County of Monterey’s listing of locally designated historic resources.

4.10.3.5 Monterey County Historic District Design Guidelines

Monterey County has specific design guidelines for the East Garrison and Spreckels Historic Districts. These guidelines are intended to preserve and protect historic structures and ensure that surrounding land uses are compatible with historic districts.

Project Impacts

This section describes the CEQA impact analysis relating to cultural resources for the project and alternatives. It describes the methods used to determine the Project’s impacts and lists the thresholds used to conclude whether an impact would be significant. Measures to mitigate (avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for) significant impacts accompany each impact discussion.

4.10.3.6 Thresholds of Significance

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in a significant impact on cultural resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource; or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

4.10.3.7 Impact Analysis

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan to the 2030 and 2092 planning horizons could result in impacts on historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources and burial sites, in Monterey County.

New development in the 2007 General Plan could potentially damage, degrade, or destroy the historic integrity of historical resources resulting in significant adverse affects on such resources. Grading, trenching, and other subsurface construction activities associated with buildout of the 2007 General Plan have the potential to encounter undiscovered archaeological resources. Undiscovered archaeological resources could potentially be damaged or destroyed. Development activities associated with the 2007 General Plan (i.e., subsurface earthmoving) may have the potential to damage or destroy paleontological resources. The same development activities also have the potential to disturb or destroy burial sites, particularly those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Historical Resources

Impact CUL-1: Development under the 2007 General Plan could potentially damage or destroy historic resources. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan to the 2030 planning horizon would result in new development that could damage, degrade, or destroy the historic integrity of various sites that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register, State Register, or County Inventory of historic places. Ground-disturbing activity associated with new development could potentially damage, degrade, or destroy the historic integrity of these sites.

Special Treatment Area (STA) Paraiso Hot Springs contains sensitive historic and prehistoric archaeological resources (cultural resources). Specific archeological information is not currently available regarding these resources, but this site and its history imply that the resources may be significant. Applying an STA designation to the site would allow further study of the area for recreational and visitor-serving commercial development and, potentially, approval of discretionary permits that allow future development. The future discretionary project review will be subject to CEQA.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized below set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historical resources to the maximum extent practicable.

Public Service Element

The 2007 General Plan contains policies that are designed to promote historical preservation. Public Services Element Policies PS-12.2 through PS-12.4 (identification and designation of historic resources) encourage the listing of eligible historical sites by means of regularly updating cultural resources inventories, encouraging private property owners to submit applications for appropriate properties to qualify on the National Register of Historic Places and/or the California Register of Historical Resources, and by designating such properties with a Historic resource (HR) overlay on the zoning map. This will ensure awareness of existing historic resources and their locations.

Policies PS-12.1, PS-12.9, PS-12.10, and PS-12.12 through PS-12.15 (plans and regulations for protection of historical resources) promote the continued use of land use planning tools such as zoning to protect the integrity of historical sites. This will ensure consistency with guidelines and requirements of state and federal historic preservation laws, that new development will be compatible with existing historical resources in order to maintain the special values and unique character of the historic properties, that repair or rehabilitation would not preclude the structures continued designation as a historic structure, and that the special character of designated historic districts and neighborhoods shall be retained.

Policy PS-12.6 (support incentives to help preserve historic and cultural resources) promotes tax incentives such as the Mills Act and covenants that encourage historical preservation. This would encourage landowners to help preserve structures or building on their property that may be deemed historically significant.

Policies PS-12.5, PS-12.7, PS-12.8, PS-12.11, PS-12.16, and PS-12.17 (enhancement of the county's historical programs and documentation) encourage enhancement of programs that promote historical preservation and documentation by seeking out sources of funding for such programs, continuing support for the efforts of Monterey County's historical organizations to preserve the county's historical resources, development of public information programs regarding opportunities and programs to preserve historic and cultural resources, and promotion of heritage tourism to highlight Monterey County's diverse cultural back ground.

Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan

The AWCP is included in the 2007 General Plan. It is designed to promote the development of an integrated wine industry in Monterey County. The plan designates three winery corridors in the Salinas Valley and establishes land use policies to guide the development of no more than 60 wine-related facilities on the three corridors (refer to Section 3.0, Project Description, for the type and number of allowed facilities on each corridor).

The 2007 General Plan Agriculture Element Policies AG-4.1 through AG-4.4 establish land use policies to guide the development of the AWCP. These land use policies include standards that regulate the size and location of wineries and allow for the development of wine-related facilities that are consistent with the existing agricultural land uses. Under the ultimate buildout scenario of the AWCP, 40 artisan wineries, 10 full-scale wineries, and 10 tasting rooms would be developed. A specified number of each wine-related facility is identified on each of the three corridors; however, specific locations are not.

Historical resources within the AWCP boundaries include Mission Nuestra Señora de la Soledad, the Old Mission School, and the Richardson Adobe on the River Road/Arroyo Seco Road/Central Avenue Corridor and Mission San Antonio de Padua on the Jolon Road Corridor. As shown on Exhibit 4.10.2, most of the Jolon Road Corridor is designated as having high sensitivity for archaeological resources while most of the River Road/Arroyo Seco Road/Central Avenue and Metz Road corridors are designated as having low sensitivity. As shown on Exhibit 4.10.1, taken from the 2007 General Plan, no recorded paleontological sites are within any of the three AWCP corridors.

Implementation of the AWCP would allow for the development of wineries and tasting rooms along three corridors in the Salinas Valley. The development of these facilities could result in the alteration or demolition of existing structures that meet historic eligibility criteria. Construction activities associated with the development of new or expanded winery or tasting room facilities could also damage or destroy historical resources.

The AWCP is a component of the 2007 General Plan and is consistent with the policies that pertain to historical resources. Furthermore, any wineries or tasting rooms that would adversely affect historical resources would be required to comply with all federal and state laws governing historical preservation.

Area Plan Policies

Three Area Plans also have supplemental policies in the 2007 General Plan to preserve and protect historical resources.

North County Area Plan

Policy NC-2.2 (protection of Old Stage Road) calls for the preservation of the historical value of Old Stage Road, which will ensure that the road maintains its historic integrity in spite of new development. Policy NC-3.6 (North County Historic Sites) lists sites to be considered for inclusion in a historical resources zoning district, which will encourage protection of such sites from destruction caused by future development.

Greater Salinas Area Plan

Policy 1.4 (restricted development of town of Spreckles) stipulates that future development projects in Spreckels be harmonious with the surrounding historic character and be reviewed by the Historic Resource Review Board. Policy GS-3.3 (historic walnut tree maintenance and preservation) promotes preservation of the walnut trees along Spreckels Boulevard and encourages the use of private fund-raising efforts for tree maintenance. Implementation of these policies will help protect the town of Spreckels from possible destruction caused by future development. Policy GS-3.4 (support efforts to preserve historic resources) identifies the Boronda Adobe and Darrington Adobe as significant historical resources and promotes efforts of the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) to maintain and preserve these sites. This will contribute to the protection and preservation of Monterey County's historic resources.

Carmel Valley Master Plan

Policy CV-3.13 (designation and protection of historic resources) stipulates that future development in Carmel Valley preserve the integrity of historical sites. Implementation of this policy will aid in preventing the damage or destruction of historic resources potentially caused by future development.

Federal and State Historic Preservation Requirements

All future development activities contemplated by the 2007 General Plan would be required to comply with all applicable federal and state statutes that concern the preservation of historical resources (e.g., the National Historic Preservation Act).

CEQA Review

In addition, future discretionary development activities contemplated by the 2007 General Plan would be required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. This review would include assessment of potential impacts on historical resources.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan within the 2030 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on historical resources. New development could potentially damage, degrade, or destroy the historic integrity of these resources.

However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historical resources to the maximum extent practicable. The 2007 General Plan contains policies that are designed to promote historical preservation, such as setting forth measures to encourage the listing of eligible historical sites, the use of land use planning tools such as zoning to protect the integrity of historical sites, promotion of tax incentives and covenants that encourage historical preservation, and enhance the county's historical programs and documentation. Therefore, historic resources, including STA Paraiso Hot Springs, would not be significantly impacted by the buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Precise locations of future AWCP facilities are unknown at the time of this writing; therefore, it is speculative to engage in further analysis of impacts on historical resources. Further analysis of potential historical resource impacts will take place at the project level.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1:

Policy CSV-1.1 of the Central Salinas Valley Area Plan will be revised to read:

CSV-1.1 Special Treatment Area: Paraiso Hot Springs - The Paraiso Hot Springs properties shall be designated a Special Treatment Area. Recreation and visitor serving land uses for the Paraiso Hot Springs Special Treatment Area may be permitted in accordance with a general development plan and other discretionary approvals such as subdivision maps, use permits, and design approvals. The Special Treatment Area may include such uses as a lodge, individual cottages, a visitor center, recreational vehicle accommodations, restaurant, shops, stables, tennis courts, aquaculture, mineral water bottling, hiking trails, vineyards, and orchards. The plan shall address cultural resources protection, fire safety, access, sewage treatment, water quality, water quantity,

drainage, and soil stability issues (APN: 418-361-004, 418-361-009, 418-361-021, 418-361-022).

Significance Conclusion

In summary, buildout of the 2007 General Plan within the 2030 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on historic resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historic resources to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, historic resources would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan to the 2092 planning horizon would result in new urban development in undeveloped areas beyond 2030 levels. New development could damage, degrade, or destroy the historic integrity of various sites that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register, State Register, or County Inventory of historic places. New development could potentially damage, degrade, or destroy the historic integrity of these sites resulting in significant adverse affects on historic resources.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historic resources to the maximum extent practicable.

Significance Determination

Buildout by 2092 could potentially result in adverse impacts on historical resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historic resources to the maximum extent practicable. The 2007 General Plan contains policies that are designed to promote historic preservation. Assuming these or similar policies and requirements remain in place, historic resources would not be significantly impacted by 2092 buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies, as modified by Mitigation Measure CUL-1, is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

In summary, buildout by 2092 could potentially result in adverse impacts on historical resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historical resources to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, historic resources would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Archaeological Resources

Impact CUL-2: Development under the 2007 General Plan could potentially damage or destroy archaeological resources. (Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Grading, trenching, and other subsurface construction activities associated with buildout of the 2007 General Plan have the potential to encounter undiscovered archaeological resources. Undiscovered archaeological resources could potentially be damaged or destroyed.

As mentioned previously in the historic impacts section, STA Paraiso Hot Springs contains sensitive historic and prehistoric archaeological resources (cultural resources). Future development would be subject to discretionary project review pursuant to CEQA. Policy CSV-1.1 of the Central Salinas Valley Area Plan, as modified by Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would avoid a significant impact on this resource.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized below set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable.

Open Space and Conservation Element

The 2007 General Plan contains policies that address potential impacts on archaeological resources. Policies OS-6.1, OS-6.2, and OS-6.6 (identification and protection of archaeological resources) establish procedures to identify archaeologically sensitive areas using the statewide inventory developed by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), to educate the public on such matters archeological resources, and to stipulate that the County shall adopt a uniform set

of guidelines for data recovery programs as well as for consultation with Native American descendants. By creating public awareness, these policies protect archaeological resources from the potential damages of future development. Policy OS-6.5 (avoidance of development in culturally sensitive areas) stipulates policies and procedures must be established to encourage the avoidance or clustering of new development away from sensitive areas. Policies OS-6.3 and OS-6.4 (field surveys in sensitive areas) require field surveys for projects in sensitive areas, and use of the SHPO Clearinghouse and the NAHC's list of sacred sites. These policies will ensure that archaeological resources are not destroyed during new development.

Native American Consultation

In accordance with SB18 and above policies OS-6.2, OS-6.3, and OS-6.6, the County of Monterey initiated consultation over the 2007 General Plan with local Native American representatives in spring 2006. Consultation efforts included contacting six tribal groups (list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission and included Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan, Xolon Salinan Tribe, Amah/Mutsun Tribal Band, Ohlone Costanoan Esselan, Nation, Salinan Tribe of Monterey, San Luis Obispo and San Benito Counties, Ohlone-Jakki Kehl). The County met with representatives of the Ohlone Coastanoan Esselan Nation (OCEN) tribe on about six occasions to review General Plan language relative to archaeology, burial sites, and paleontology. Several language changes were suggested by OCEN representatives and incorporated in the current draft. An OCEN representative was present at the Planning Commission hearings and agreed to the current language. None of the other tribes responded to the request for consultation.

Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan

As noted above, the AWCP would allow for the development of wineries and tasting rooms along three corridors in the Salinas Valley. Development of these facilities could result in damage or destruction of archaeological resources. The AWCP is a component of the 2007 General Plan and is consistent with the policies that pertain to archaeological resources.

Furthermore, any wineries or tasting rooms that would adversely affect archaeological resources would be required to comply with all state laws governing preservation of archaeological resources. Included are requirements that cultural resource surveys be conducted prior to development.

Area Plan Policies

One Area Plan contains a supplemental policy concerning archaeological resources.

Carmel Valley Master Plan

Policy CV-3.13 (designation and protection of archeological resources) stipulates that future development in Carmel Valley preserve the integrity of archaeological sites. Implementation of this policy will aid in preventing the damage or destruction of archaeological resources potentially caused by future development.

2007 General Plan Land Use Concepts

The 2007 General Plan emphasizes compact city-centered growth in and near existing urbanized areas. This land use concept is designed to preserve significant natural areas and minimize adverse cultural resource impacts, including adverse effects on archaeological resources. By emphasizing growth in areas where land use disturbances have already occurred, any potential adverse impacts on archaeological resources would be minimized. Significant natural areas that may contain unique and important archaeological sites would be preserved through this proposed land use concept.

CEQA Requirements

Future discretionary development activities contemplated by the 2007 General Plan would also be required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. This review would include assessment of potential impacts on archaeological resources.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan within the 2030 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on archaeological resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable. The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above contain policies that address potential impacts on archaeological resources. Implementation of these proposed policies would ensure that archaeological resources are protected from adverse impacts. The proposed policies reduce impacts on archaeological resources by requiring compliance with applicable laws and by implementing a land use concept that will direct new development in areas that have already experienced ground-disturbing activities

Monterey County also consulted with tribal representatives in accordance with SB18 about the implications of the 2007 General Plan on cultural places

and sacred sites. This process has provided the County with additional information about areas where potential archeological sites may occur and will enable the County to consider the potential occurrence of these sites when regulating future land use activities. Therefore, archeological resources, including STA Paraiso Hot Springs, would not be significantly impacted by the buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1, described above, will avoid a significant effect.

Significance Conclusion

In summary, buildout of the 2007 General Plan within the planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on archeological resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, archaeological resources would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan to the 2092 planning horizon would result in new urban development in undeveloped areas beyond 2030 levels. New development could create ground-disturbing activity resulting in significant adverse effects on archeological resources.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable.

Significance Determination

Buildout by 2092 could potentially result in adverse impacts on archaeological resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable. The 2007 General Plan employs land use concepts such as city-centered growth and preservation of natural areas to direct future growth away from archaeological resources that would be most deleteriously impacted by urban development. Assuming these or more stringent requirements remain in place, archaeological resources therefore would not be significantly impacted

by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies, as modified by Mitigation Measure CUL-1, is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Buildout by 2092 could potentially result in adverse impacts on archaeological resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, archaeological resources would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Paleontological Resources

Impact CUL-3: Development under the 2007 General Plan could result in damage or destruction of paleontological resources. (Less-Than-Significant Impact.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would allow for the development of new urban uses in undeveloped areas and existing urbanized areas. Development activities (i.e., subsurface earthmoving) may have the potential to damage or destroy paleontological resources.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized below set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historical resources to the maximum extent practicable.

Open Space and Conservation Element

The 2007 General Plan contains policies to specifically address potential impacts on paleontological resources. Policies OS-7 and OS-7.2 (identification and protection of paleontological resources) establish procedures to identify and map paleontological resources, by requiring complete paleontological reviews and consultation with academic professionals. Implementation of these policies will ensure that potentially significant paleontological resources are not destroyed as a result of activities related to new development.

Policies OS-7.3 and OS-7.4 (survey sensitive areas) require field surveys for paleontological resources in sensitive areas prior to approval of development. This requirement will ensure that unknown paleontological resources are protected from destruction due to future development activities. Policy OS-7.5 (development away from paleontological resources) stipulates that policies and procedures encourage avoidance or clustering of new development away from these resources, thus avoiding impacts on sensitive paleontological resources.

Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan

As noted above, the AWCP would allow for the development of wineries and tasting rooms along three corridors in the Salinas Valley. Development of these facilities could result in damage or destruction of paleontological resources.

The AWCP is a component of the 2007 General Plan and is consistent with the policies that pertain to paleontological resources, as summarized under Impact CUL-3. Furthermore, any wineries or tasting rooms that would adversely affect paleontological resources would be required to comply with all state laws governing preservation of paleontological resources. This includes requirements that cultural resource surveys be conducted prior to development.

2007 General Plan Land Use Concepts

The 2007 General Plan emphasizes compact city-centered growth in and near existing urbanized areas. This land use concept is designed to preserve significant natural areas and minimize adverse cultural resource impacts, including adverse effects on paleontological resources. Emphasizing growth in areas where land use disturbances have already occurred will minimize potential adverse impacts on paleontological resources. Significant natural areas that may contain unique and important paleontological sites would be preserved through this proposed land use concept.

CEQA Review

In addition, future discretionary development activities contemplated by the 2007 General Plan would be required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. This review would include assessment of potential impacts on paleontological resources.

Significance Determination

Development under the 2007 General Plan within the 2030 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on paleontological resources.

However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on paleontological resources to the maximum extent practicable. The 2007 General Plan contains policies to specifically address potential impacts on paleontological resources. Implementation of these proposed policies would ensure that paleontological resources are protected from adverse impacts. The proposed policies reduce impacts on paleontological resources by requiring compliance with applicable laws and by implementing a land use concept that will direct new development in areas that have already experienced ground-disturbing activities. Consequently, impacts on paleontological resources associated with implementation of the 2007 General Plan would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

In summary, buildout of the 2007 General Plan within the planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on paleontological resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on paleontological resources to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, paleontological resources would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan to the 2092 planning horizon would result in new urban development in undeveloped areas beyond 2030 levels. Development activities (i.e., subsurface earthmoving) may have the potential to damage or destroy paleontological resources.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on paleontological resources to the maximum extent practicable.

Significance Determination

Buildout by 2092 could potentially result in adverse impacts on paleontological resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on paleontological resources to the maximum extent practicable. The 2007 General Plan employs land use concepts such as city-centered growth and preservation of natural areas that would direct future growth

away from paleontological resources that would be most deleteriously impacted by urban development. Assuming that these or more stringent requirements remain in place, paleontological resources therefore would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Buildout by 2092 could potentially result in adverse impacts on historical resources. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historical resources to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, paleontological resources would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Burial Sites

Impact CUL-4: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan could damage or destroy burial sites. (Less-Than-Significant Impact.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would allow for the development of new urban uses in undeveloped areas and in existing urbanized areas. Development activities (i.e., subsurface earthmoving) have the potential to disturb or destroy burial sites, particularly those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

2007 General Plan Policies

Open Space and Conservation Element

The 2007 General Plan contains policies to specifically address potential impacts on burial sites. Policies OS-8.1 and OS-8.2 (identification and protection of burial sites) establish procedures to identify and protect burial sites with assistance from the local Native American representatives and the NAHC, and stipulate that information on location and significance of burial sites be included in the environmental review process. Policy OS-8.3 (development at known burial sites) states that proposed development at sites where known burials or human cemeteries are located is prohibited until compliance with appropriate regulations and agencies have been completed. Policy OS-8.4 (development away from burial sites)

stipulates that policies and procedures encourage avoidance or clustering of new development away from burial sites, thus avoiding impacts on sensitive burial sites. Policy OS-8.5 (improve public recognition of the county's cultural heritage) states that a Native Californian Advisory Panel shall be established to aid public recognition of the county's cultural heritage, thus ensuring the protection of burial sites during future development efforts. Policies OS-8.6 and OS-8.7 (Native American consultation) require consultation with tribal representatives to identify potential burial sites and other significant tribal resources for all future General Plan Amendments, Master Plans, and Specific Plans. Implementation of the above policies prevents damage or destruction of burial sites potentially caused by future development.

Area Plan Policies

Native American Consultation

As discussed above, in accordance with SB18 and above policies OS-8.1, OS-8.6, and OS-8.7 the County of Monterey initiated consultation with local Native American representatives in spring 2007. Consultation efforts included contacting six tribal groups. The County met with representatives of the OCEN tribe [none of the others responded to the request for consultation] on about six occasions to review general plan language relative to archaeology, burial sites, and paleontology. Several language changes were suggested by OCEN representatives and incorporated in the current draft. An OCEN representative was present at the PC hearings and agreed to the current language.

Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan

As noted above, the AWCP would allow for the development of wineries and tasting rooms along three corridors in the Salinas Valley. Development of these facilities could result in damage or destruction of burial sites. The AWCP is a component of the 2007 General Plan and is consistent with the policies that pertain to burial sites.

Furthermore, any wineries or tasting rooms that would adversely affect burial sites would be required to comply with all state laws governing preservation of burial sites. Included are requirements that cultural resource surveys be conducted prior to development.

2007 General Plan Land Use Concepts

The 2007 General Plan emphasizes compact city-centered growth in and near existing urbanized areas. This land use concept is designed to preserve significant natural areas and minimize adverse cultural resource

impacts, including adverse effects on burial sites. Emphasizing growth in areas where land use disturbances have already occurred minimizes potential adverse impacts on burial sites. Significant natural areas that may contain unique and important burial sites would be preserved through this proposed land use concept.

CEQA Review

Future discretionary development activities contemplated by the 2007 General Plan would be required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. This review would include assessment of potential impacts on burial sites.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan within the planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on burial sites. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on burial sites to the maximum extent practicable. The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above contain policies that address potential impacts on burial sites. Implementation of these proposed policies would ensure that burial sites are protected from adverse impacts. The proposed policies reduce impacts on burial sites by requiring compliance with applicable laws and by implementing a land use concept that will direct new development in areas that have already experienced ground-disturbing activities. In addition, Monterey County consulted with tribal representatives in accordance with SB18 about the implications of the 2007 General Plan on cultural places and sacred sites. This process has provided the County with additional information about areas where potential burial sites may occur and will enable the County to consider the potential occurrence of these sites when regulating future land use activities. Therefore, burial sites would not be significantly impacted by the buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

In summary, development under the 2007 General Plan within the 2030 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on burial sites. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on burial sites to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, burial sites would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan to the 2092 planning horizon would result in new urban development in undeveloped areas beyond 2030 levels. Development activities (i.e., subsurface earthmoving) have the potential to disturb or destroy burial sites, particularly where interment has occurred outside of formal cemeteries.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on burial sites to the maximum extent practicable.

Significance Determination

Buildout by 2092 could potentially result in adverse impacts on burial sites. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on burial sites to the maximum extent practicable. The 2007 General Plan employs land use concepts such as city-centered growth and preservation of natural areas that would direct future growth away from burial sites that would be most deleteriously impacted by urban development. Therefore, burial sites would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

In summary, buildout to the 2092 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on burial sites. However, the 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies set forth comprehensive measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on burial sites to the maximum extent practicable. Assuming that these or more protective requirements remain in place, burial sites would not be significantly impacted by buildout of the 2007 General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.10.4 Level of Significance after Mitigation

All impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant with implementation of the measures in the 2007 General Plan, and no additional mitigation would be required.

