



5.7 Cultural Resources



5.7 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The purpose of this section is to identify potential impacts to existing cultural resources (including prehistoric, historic, and paleontological resources) within and around the project site and to assess the significance of such resources. Mitigation measures are recommended to minimize impacts to cultural resources as a result of project implementation. The information in this section is based primarily upon the *Cultural and Paleontological Record Searches for UPR and Todd Project*, prepared by Cogstone Resources Management, dated January 2014; refer to [Appendix 13.7, *Cultural Resources Records Search*](#).

5.7.1 EXISTING SETTING

PREHISTORIC OVERVIEW

For the Los Angeles Basin and the foothill region of Azusa, the presence of Native Americans has been documented to at least 6,000 years ago. Although there is some debate over who the first prehistoric people were, many scholars would agree that members of the Hokan speaking people likely arrived first and were later displaced by, or assimilated into the Shoshonean speaking people who arrived sometime after 2,000 years ago. The Spaniards encountered the Shoshonean speakers in the later decades of the 1700s and named them Gabrielino after the Mission San Gabriel. Similarly, other nearby Shoshonean speakers were labeled Juaneno (Mission San Juan Capistrano) and Luiseno (Mission San Luis Rey). Although there is some uncertainty, the name Azusa is thought to be an altered form of the Gabrielino word for a hill east of the City (*Azuncsabi*), with the possible meaning of “place of the skunk” or “skunk hill.”

The Gabrielino left their permanent marks on the land, although floods, erosion, relic collecting, and development have erased many of them. Examples of the prehistoric past can be found in the painted rocks (pictographs) that dot the hills, in remnants of camp sites that still exist in undeveloped areas, in the occasional discovery of stone bowls and mortars, and probably in sites buried by the alluvial soils brought down from the mountains and hills over the past centuries. Contemporary Gabrielinos have a vested interest in preserving their past and ensuring that their story is part of the overall history of the region.

HISTORIC OVERVIEW

The City’s history shares much in common with other communities in the region, yet also has a uniqueness that sets it apart. Hispanic roots are deep in the region due to the early settlement of the area by Spanish explorers and missionaries, and the later establishment of the rancho system by Mexican settlers.

With the arrival of the Spanish colonists in 1769, life changed for the people in the area. With the founding of Mission San Gabriel in 1771, the region began the gradual shift from Indian homeland to Spanish colonial outpost and mission lands. By 1834, the Alta California missions were secularized and became parish churches and many were abandoned or saw only occasional use. Secularization was followed by what is often called the rancho period or the era of Mexican land grants.



Approximately three square miles (almost 2,000 acres) were granted to Luis Arenas in 1841. Arenas named his holding Rancho El Susa and it was this rancho that he sold to the Englishman Henry Dalton in 1844. Dalton was a highly successful mercantilist who focused on west coast trade between South America and California. Typical of the times, Dalton blended Spanish and English and christened his new holding Azusa Rancho de Dalton. The 1850 to 1870 period represents the gold rush era for the region and, in spite of floods that wiped out the nascent towns of Prospect Bar (1859) and Eldoradoville (1862), the mines produced more than 12 million dollars of gold. During this period much of California was caught in a legal web of conflicting land claims, fraudulent claims, and a tug-of-war between the new California government and the claims of the Federal government.

The lands of Henry Dalton and others throughout California who had purchased or acquired Mexican land grants were reduced by Federal surveys, thus opening the way for homesteaders. Although Jonathan S. Slauson mapped and laid out the lines for the town of Azusa in 1887, incorporation would not come until the last days of 1898. The Census of 1890 recorded a population of 800, and ten years later the population had increased by 65 to a total of 865.

From the turn of the century to the early 1940s, Azusa grew and developed largely on the strength of its citrus and other agricultural products. The packinghouses and railroads prospered, banks and churches were erected, and the town spread out from its original center. The war years and the coming of Aerojet in 1944, coupled with the decline in the citrus industry, spelled the end of the citrus groves and the industry that they had spawned. Industry replaced agriculture, with notable exceptions such as the Monrovia Nursery. Azusa Pacific University was established through a merger of the old Azusa Bible College and the Los Angeles Pacific College in 1965. Development of the freeway system left old Route 66 as a remnant highway while at the same time bringing new families to the town in search of affordable housing and a sense of community.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AND FEATURES

According to the *City of Azusa General Plan* (General Plan), prehistoric and historic archaeological sites have been recorded in the area. Historic archeological sites in the area include a trash dump located near the Equestrian Staging Center and sparse scatters of glass and artifacts near 2nd Street and near Azusa Avenue, none of which were determined to be eligible for the National Register. The canal/ditch near San Gabriel Canyon Road may have local and State significance, as it is within the alignment of the historic 1880 canal and perhaps portions of the earlier 1840s ditch. Nineteen archaeological studies have been conducted within the City limits. These studies covered 0.5- to 45-acre areas within the City, and no archaeological resources were determined to be present. However, archaeological artifacts were subsequently discovered during the grading phase of a residential development (the Rosedale development) in the northern portion of the City.

There are two prehistoric sites within the Azusa Sphere of Influence. One is located near Beatty Canyon, less than one-quarter mile outside of the City limits. This site is described as a shell midden with milling stones, hammer stones, scrapers, and chert flakes. This site was noted in 1962 as almost completely destroyed by farming and erosion. The second site was recorded near Van Tassel Canyon. This site contained milling tools, scrapers, and a core tool. It is unlikely that any recorded prehistoric site would qualify as a Designated Historic Landmark.



PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Based on the *City of Azusa General Plan Environmental Impact Report* (General Plan EIR), certain rock units are present within the City that would be sensitive to paleontological resources. These include: Mesozoic plutonic rocks, Quarternary terrestrial sediments, and Tertiary marine sediments. These rock units include formations (Pliocene Fernando and Miocene Topanga) that have been known to contain fossiliferous materials, including remains of marine mammals.

CULTURAL RECORDS SEARCH

A cultural resources records search and associated constraints memorandum was prepared for the proposed project (*Cultural and Paleontological Record Searches for UPR and Todd Avenue Project*, Cogstone Resources Management, January 2014); refer to [Appendix 13.7, *Cultural Resources Records Search*](#). The purpose of the records search was to (1) identify potential cultural resources within the project site and surrounding area, (2) identify previous cultural resources studies in the project area, (3) develop management recommendations for cultural resources within or adjacent to the project area, and (4) assess what additional cultural resources studies would need to be undertaken for the project.

The records search included a cultural resource records search of the project area and a one mile radius at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located at California State University, Fullerton on January 9, 2014. The records search included the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest. The records search also included a paleontological resource records search of the project area and a one mile radius by the natural History Museum of Los Angeles County on January 10, 2014.

Archaeological Records Search Findings

The archaeological records search determined that there are no known cultural resources within the project site boundaries. Five cultural resources were discovered within a one mile radius of the project site. The five cultural resources include one historic era archeological resource within a quarter mile of the project site; one prehistoric resource within one mile; and three additional historic resources within one mile of the project site. It should be noted that these cultural resources are different from those identified in the “Archaeological Sites and Features” discussion above. None of the resources identified above are included in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, California Historical Landmarks, or California Points of Historical Interest.

Paleontological Records Search Findings

The paleontological records search determined that there are no paleontological resources known on or within one mile of the project site. The search revealed the project site is mapped as surface deposits of younger Quaternary alluvium from the San Gabriel River and these surface sediments are too young to contain fossils. The surface deposits are underlain by older Quaternary alluvium that has a moderate potential to produce fossils at depth. According to the paleontological records search, the nearest known fossil in older Quaternary alluvium are fossils of horse and camel recovered 15 to 20 feet below the surface southwest of the City of Chino.



Previous Inventories

The records search also included a query of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) to determine if previous studies exist for the project site. The search identified 19 previously conducted cultural resource studies within one mile of the project site. However, none of the cultural resource studies were conducted within the boundaries of the project site.

5.7.2 REGULATORY SETTING

Numerous laws and regulations require Federal, State, and local agencies to consider the effects a project may have on cultural resources. These laws and regulations stipulate a process for compliance, define the responsibilities of the various agencies proposing the action, and prescribe the relationship among other involved agencies (i.e., State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation). The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the California Register of Historical Resources, Public Resources Code (PRC) 5024, are the primary Federal and State laws governing and affecting preservation of cultural resources of national, State, regional, and local significance. The applicable regulations are discussed below.

STATE LEVEL

California Environmental Quality Act

As defined in Section 21083.2 of CEQA, a “unique” archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is 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 being 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.

If a lead agency determines that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of Section 21084.1 of CEQA and Section 15064.5 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* apply. If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for a historical resource contained in the State *CEQA Guidelines*, then the site is to be treated in accordance with the provisions of CEQA Section 21083, which is unique archaeological resource. The State *CEQA Guidelines* note that if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment (State *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15-64.5(c)(4)).



LOCAL LEVEL

City of Azusa General Plan

City policies pertaining to cultural resources are contained in the Historic/Cultural Resources Element of the Azusa General Plan. The Historic/Cultural Resources Element establishes a framework to develop a rich and diverse cultural experience that enhances daily life. The City's historical and cultural resources are those buildings, objects, landmarks, and features of the land that evoke a sense of the past and reflect the cultural history of the City. These policies include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Policy 1.1 Determine, early in the planning process, through field surveys and Native American consultation, whether archaeological or cultural resources are located within a proposed development site.

- Policy 3.2 Incorporate natural resources such as the San Gabriel River drainage into development when appropriate as a means of understanding and appreciating the history of the site or area. This may include the mining activities and any prehistoric sites that may be encountered during subsequent studies of the drainage.

- Policy 4.1 Work closely with the Azusa Historical Society to improve and maintain the Museum as an integral part of historical interpretation and understanding. Ensure that the Museum reflects cultural diversity and the multiple layers of Azusa's history.

- Policy 4.3 Working together with the Historical and Cultural Preservation Commission, Azusa Unified School District, and other local schools, the Autry Museum, and APU, consider establishing Azusa Heritage programs that sponsor educational walking tours and other public events highlighting local historical resources and issues.

5.7.3 IMPACT THRESHOLDS AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The purpose of this analysis is to identify any potential cultural resources within or adjacent to the project site, and to assist the Lead Agency in determining whether such resources meet the official definitions of "historical resources," as provided in the Public Resource Code, in particular CEQA.

SIGNIFICANCE GUIDELINES

Archaeological Resources

A significant prehistoric archaeological impact will occur if grading and construction activities will result in a substantial adverse change to archaeological resources determined to be "unique" or "historic." "Unique" resources are defined in Public Resources Code §21083.2; "historic" resources are defined in Public Resources Code §21084.1 and *CEQA Guidelines* §15126.4.



Public Resources Code §21083.2(g) states:

As used in this section, “unique archaeological resource” means 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 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; or*
- 3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.*

Paleontological Resources

An impact on paleontological materials would be considered a significant impact if the project results in the direct or indirect destruction of a unique or important paleontological resource or site. The following criteria are used to determine whether a resource is unique or important:

- The past record of fossil recovery from the geologic unit(s);
- The recorded fossil localities in the project site;
- Observation of fossil material on-site; and
- The type of fossil materials previously recovered from the geologic unit (vertebrate, invertebrate, etc.).

CEQA SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines* contains the Initial Study Environmental Checklist form, which includes questions relating to cultural resources. The issues presented in the Initial Study Checklist have been utilized as thresholds of significance in this section. Accordingly, a project may create a significant adverse environmental impact if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5 (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*);
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5 (refer to Impact Statement CUL-1);
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (refer to Impact Statement CUL-2); and/or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*).



Based on these standards/criteria, the effects of the proposed project have been categorized as either a “less than significant impact” or a “potentially significant impact.” If a potentially significant impact cannot be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of goals, policies, standards or mitigation, it is categorized as a significant and unavoidable impact. The standards used to evaluate the significance of impacts are often qualitative rather than quantitative because appropriate quantitative standards are either not available for many types of impacts or are not applicable for some types of projects.

5.7.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

CUL-1 THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Impact Analysis: The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing one-story office building in the eastern portion of the site near North Todd Avenue, demolition of building foundations and the concrete remnants of the former shipping/receiving bay, and the construction of a 342,629 square-foot industrial/warehousing development. As stated above, the archaeological records search performed for the project determined that there are no known cultural resources within the project site boundaries. Although the records search identified five resources within a one-mile radius of the site, none of the five resources would be affected by the project and none were included in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, California Historical Landmarks, or California Points of Historical Interest.

The project site and surrounding area have been highly disturbed as part of development that has occurred on-site, and the project site occurs in a highly urbanized area. The site has been used for industrial/manufacturing purposes since the early 1900s and the potential for impacts to unknown buried archaeological resources is considered low. However, in the unlikely event that cultural resources are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would be implemented. Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would require that construction activities are halted in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. An archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (Secretary of the Interior 1983) would be retained to evaluate the find’s significance under CEQA. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be recommended by the archaeologist, in consultation with the City, and if so recommended, shall be implemented by the Applicant. Therefore, impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant with implementation of CUL-1.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1 If evidence of subsurface archaeological resources is found during construction, excavation and other construction activity in that area shall cease and the construction contractor shall contact the City of Azusa Community Development Department. With direction from the Director of Community Development, an archaeologist certified by the County of Los Angeles shall be retained to evaluate the discovery prior to resuming grading in the immediate vicinity of the find. If warranted, the archaeologist shall collect the resource and prepare a technical report describing the results of the investigation. The



test-level report shall evaluate the site including discussion of significance (depth, nature, condition and extent of the resources), final mitigation recommendations (which shall be adopted and implemented by the Applicant), and cost estimates.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

CUL-2 THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS TO PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Impact Analysis: Based on the paleontological records search conducted by the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, there are no known paleontological resources within one mile of the project site. According to the records search, the project site contains deposits of younger Quaternary alluvium from the San Gabriel River, which are too young to contain fossils. The surface deposits are underlain by older Quaternary alluvium that has a moderate potential to produce fossils at depth. The nearest known fossil in older Quaternary alluvium are fossils of horse and camel recovered 15 to 20 feet below the surface southwest of the City of Chino. As such, there is a low probability to encounter fossils in the project area unless excavations more than 15 feet deep will occur.

As noted above, the project site and surrounding area have been highly disturbed as part of development that has occurred on-site, and the project site occurs in a highly urbanized area. The site has been used for industrial/manufacturing purposes since the early 1900s and the potential for impacts to unknown buried paleontological resources is considered low. However, in the event unexpected paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would be required. This measure would

Impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels upon implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-2 If evidence of subsurface paleontological resources is found during construction, excavation and other construction activity in that area shall cease and the construction contractor shall contact the City of Azusa Community Development Department. With direction from the Director of Community Development, a paleontologist certified by the County of Los Angeles shall evaluate the find. If warranted, the paleontologist shall prepare and complete a standard Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program for the salvage and curation of identified resources. The Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program shall be adopted and implemented by the Applicant.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



5.7.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

- **THE PROJECT, COMBINED WITH OTHER RELATED CUMULATIVE PROJECTS, WOULD NOT RESULT IN CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE IMPACTS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

Impact Analysis:

Cumulative Archaeological Resources Impacts

Impacts related to archaeological resources are generally considered site-specific and are assessed on a case-by-case basis. As with the proposed project, potential impacts to cultural resources due to cumulative development within the project area would be analyzed and mitigated on a site-specific, individual basis. Incremental development within the project area would be required to comply with all applicable City, State, and Federal regulations concerning preservation, salvage, or handling of cultural resources.

As discussed above, impacts to archaeological resources due to implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant with incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure. In addition, given the site-specific nature of archaeological resources and existing regulations applicable to cumulative development in the project area, cumulative impacts related to these resources would not be considerable.

Mitigation Measure: Refer to Mitigation Measure CUL-1.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Cumulative Paleontological Resources Impacts

Impacts related to paleontological resources are generally considered site-specific and are assessed on a case-by-case basis. As with the proposed project, potential impacts to cultural resources due to cumulative development within the project area would be analyzed and mitigated on a site-specific, individual basis. Incremental development within the project area would be required to comply with all applicable City, State, and Federal regulations concerning preservation, salvage, or handling of cultural resources.

As discussed above, impacts to paleontological resources due to implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant with incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure. In addition, given the site-specific nature of paleontological resources and existing regulations applicable to cumulative development in the project area, cumulative impacts related to these resources would not be considerable.

Mitigation Measure: Refer to Mitigation Measure CUL-2.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.



5.7.6 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

No unavoidable significant impacts related to cultural resources have been identified in this section.