

## **3.4 Cultural/Paleontological Resources**

This section describes the affected cultural resources environment, the regulatory setting pertaining to cultural resources, impacts on cultural resources resulting from implementation of the Project, and the mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts to a level below significance. A cultural resources report was completed by RECON in April 2012. The report is summarized below and included in its entirety as Appendix E of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

### **3.4.1 Regulatory Setting**

#### **3.4.1.1 Federal**

##### **a. National Register of Historic Places**

Federal criteria are those used to determine eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The NRHP was established by the National Historic Preservation Act enacted in 1966. The NRHP is the official lists of sites, buildings, structures, districts, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service. Nominations to the NRHP may come from the various State Historic Preservation Offices, Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, local governments, and from private individuals and organizations. The NRHP criteria state that 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, and:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns our history;
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values; or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Certain properties are usually not considered for eligibility for the NRHP. These include ordinary cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved or

reconstructed, properties primarily commemorative in nature, or properties that have become significant within the last 50 years. These types of properties can qualify if they are an integral part of a district that does meet the criteria, or if they fall within certain specific categories relating to architecture or association with historically significant people or events. The vast majority of archaeological sites that qualify for listing do so under criterion D, research potential.

## **b. Native American Involvement**

Native American involvement in the development review process is addressed by several federal and state laws. The most notable of these are the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (2001) and the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990). These acts ensure that Native American human remains and cultural items be treated with respect and dignity. In addition, Senate Bill (SB) 18 details requirements for local agencies to consult with identified California Native American Tribes during the development process for General Plans and Specific Plans including amendments thereto.

### **3.4.1.2 State**

#### **a. California Register of Historic Resources**

Similar to the NRHP, the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural significance; identifies resources for planning purposes; determines eligibility of state historic grant funding; and provides certain protections under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). State criteria are those listed in CEQA and are used to determine whether an historic resource qualifies for the CRHR. The CRHR was established in 1992. CEQA was amended in 1992 to define “historical resources” as a resource listed in or determined eligible for listing on the California Register, a resource included in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in a historical resource survey that meets certain requirements, and any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be significant. Some resources that do not meet these criteria may still be historically significant for the purposes of CEQA.

A resource may be listed in the CRHR if it is significant at the federal, state, or local level under one of more of the four criteria listed below.

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history and cultural heritage of California or the U.S.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important to the nation or to California's past.

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history of the state or nation.

CEQA sections 15064.5 and 21083.2(g) define the criteria for determining the significance of historical resources. Archaeological resources are considered “historical resources” for the purposes of CEQA. Most archaeological sites which qualify for the CRHR do so under criterion 4 (i.e., research potential).

Since resources that are not listed or determined eligible for the state or local registers may still be historically significant, their significance shall be determined if they are affected by a project. The significance of a historical resource under criterion 4 rests on its ability to address important research questions.

### **b. California Public Resources Code/State Health and Safety Code**

California Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) address the treatment of human remains or Native American artifacts. The code requires grading activities to be suspended if human remains or Native American artifacts are discovered during grading operations.

### **3.4.1.3 Local**

#### **a. City of Riverside General Plan**

The Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan 2025 contains policies related to the historic and prehistoric cultural resources in the City of Riverside (City). The policies are used in conjunction with the present and future goals of land use planning for the preservation of cultural resources. Part of this the Historic Preservation Element is a historic context, which identifies themes important in the development of the City, and which can be used to identify historic resources that reflect those themes. The Historic Preservation Element also discusses federal, state, and local incentives for historic preservation available.

The General Plan 2025 Historic Preservation Element also includes specific policies to reduce potential impacts and promote preservation of prehistoric and historic cultural resources:

#### ***Historic Preservation Element Objectives***

Objective HP-1.0: To use historic preservation principles as an equal component in the planning and development process.

- Objective HP-2.0: To continue an active program to identify, interpret and designate the City's cultural resources.
- Objective HP-3.0: To promote the City's cultural resources as a means to enhance the City's identity as an important center of Southern California history.
- Objective HP-4.0: To fully integrate the consideration of cultural resources as a major aspect of the City's planning, permitting and development activities.
- Objective HP-5.0: To ensure compatibility between new development and existing cultural resources.
- Objective HP-6.0: To actively pursue funding for a first-class historic preservation program, including money needed for educational materials, studies, surveys, staffing, and incentives for preservation by private property owners.
- Objective HP-7.0: To encourage both public and private stewardship of the City's cultural resources.

The General Plan 2025 FEIR includes two cultural resources related sensitivity maps, Figure 5.5-1, Archaeological Sensitivity, and Figure 5.5-2, Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity. Both maps use a ranking of Unknown, Low, Medium, and High, with the Unknown areas being primarily areas that were developed prior to the 1970s, including extant citrus groves. In the case of the Archaeological Sensitivity map, rankings are based on previous survey coverage and known archaeological site density. The Cultural Resources Sensitivity map is based on environmental conditions such as presence of reliable water sources, important vegetation communities, and topography.

## **b. City of Riverside Historical Resources Guidelines**

The Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code (Cultural Resources Code) outlines the criteria for Landmarks, Structures or Resources of Merit, and Historic Districts. A cultural resource may be eligible as a Landmark or Structure or Resource of Merit or as a contributor to a Historic District.

### ***Landmark Designation Criteria:***

- A. Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history;
- B. Is identified with persons or events significant to local, state, or national history;

- C. Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous material or craftsmanship;
- D. Represents the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect or important creative individual;
- E. Embodies elements that possess high artistic values or represents a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;
- F. Reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning or cultural landscape;
- G. Is one of the few remaining examples in the City, region, State, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type or specimen; or
- H. Has yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

***Structure or Resource of Merit Designation Criteria:***

- A. Has a unique location or singular characteristics or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood community or of the City;
- B. Is an example of a type of building which was once common but is now rare in its neighborhood, community, or area;
- C. Is connected with a business or use which was once common but is now rare;
- D. A Cultural Resource that could be eligible under Landmark Criteria no longer exhibiting a high level of integrity, however, retaining sufficient integrity to convey significance under one or more of the Landmark Criteria;
- E. Has yielded or may likely yield, information important in history or prehistory; or
- F. An improvement or resource that no longer exhibits the high degree of integrity sufficient for Landmark designation, yet still retains sufficient integrity under one or more of the Landmark criteria to convey cultural resource significance as a Structure of Resource of Merit.

***Historic District Designation Criteria:***

A historic district contains either (a) a concentration, linkage, or continuity of cultural resources, where at least 50 percent of the structures or elements retain significant historic integrity or (b) a thematically related grouping of cultural resources which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development, and which have been designated or determined eligible for designation as a historic district by the Historic Preservation Officer, Board, or City Council or is listed in the NRHP or the CRHR, or is a California Historical Landmark or a California Point of Historical Interest. In addition to one of the two, the area must also:

- A. Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history;
- B. Is identified with persons or events significant in local, State, or national history;
- C. Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
- D. Represents the work of notable builders, designers, or architects;
- E. Embodies a collection of elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;
- F. Reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning;
- G. Conveys a sense of historic and architectural cohesiveness through its design, setting, materials, workmanship, or association; or
- H. Has yielded or may likely yield, information important in history or prehistory.

**3.4.2 Environmental Setting****3.4.2.1 Historic Background**

The following culture chronology for Riverside County is based on a synthesis of the existing literature. The prehistory of Riverside County is characterized by three main periods: the Early Holocene, Middle Holocene, and Late Holocene.

**a. Early Holocene (10,000–7,000 B.P.)**

The early occupants of the Riverside area are archaeologically represented by a culture pattern known as the Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition (Bedwell 1970). This includes the Playa, San Dieguito, Lake Mojave, and Death Valley I complexes. It is defined by: site locations being on or near former pluvial lakeshores or along old streams; a focus on hunting mammals and collecting and gathering plant materials; a toolkit including chipped-stone crescents, large flake and core scrapers, choppers, scraper-planes, hammerstones, several types cores, drills and gravers, and a variety of flakes; A developed flaked-stone technology with percussion-flaked foliate knives and points, Silver Lake and Lake Mojave points, and a lack of ground stone artifacts. The people of Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition were adapted a wetter environment before the warmer climate led to the evaporation of the lakes (Moratto 1984).

**b. Middle Holocene (7,000–1,500 B.P.)**

The Millingstone Horizon occurs during this time period in western Riverside County. The Millingstone Horizon assemblages suggest a generalized subsistence focus with an emphasis on hard seeds. This emphasis is indicated by the increased frequency of slab and basin metates and the adoption of a mixed cobble/core-based tool assemblage composed primarily of crudely made choppers, scrapers, and cobble hammerstones. Projectile points are relatively rare, but late in the period, Elko type points are occasionally seen. Mortars and pestles appear in the Late Archaic, suggesting the use of acorns.

**c. Late Holocene (1,500 B.P. –1769)**

Shoshonean-speaking people from the Colorado River region moved westward into Riverside County (Moratto 1984) during the Late Holocene. Cultures representative of this time are the San Luis Rey Complex in northern San Diego County and western Riverside County and the Irvine Complex in Orange County (Meighan 1954; Moratto 1984; True et al. 1974). Early San Luis Rey sites are associated with bedrock outcrops and often have recognizable midden soils. The artifact assemblage includes metates, Cottonwood Triangular type projectile points, drills, bifacially flaked knives, bone awls, occasional steatite arrow shaft straighteners, and bone and shell ornaments (True and Waugh 1981). Later San Luis Rey sites consist of the same assemblage with the addition of Tizon Brown Ware ceramics, red and black pictographs, cremation remains in urns, and historic materials such as glass beads and metal objects.

**d. Ethnography**

The Project vicinity is in an area where the traditional territories of the Cahuilla, Luiseño, and the Gabrieliño intersect, according to Kroeber (1970) and Bean and Smith (1978).

The Cahuilla are one of the most southwesterly of the Shoshonean or Uto-Aztecan speakers. Traditional Cahuilla territory originally included western and part of central Riverside County and extended into northeastern San Diego and northwestern Imperial counties. According to Kroeber (1925), Cahuilla society consisted of two ceremonial divisions or moieties: wildcat and coyote. People were further divided into somewhat localized, patrilineal clans. Each clan had a chief: net in Cahuilla (Kroeber 1925:691). Some villages contained people of only one clan, but other villages had more than one clan. Also, people of one clan might live in more than one village. Chiefs were usually chosen by heredity. They were primarily concerned with economic issues such as determining where and when people should gather particular foods or hunt game, and for the correct maintenance of the ritual aspect of the clan. Choice hunting and gathering areas were owned by the clan. The clan chief also settled intraclan disputes and met with other nets to solve interclan problems and organize ceremonies among clans.

The Luiseno were Shoshonean or Uto-Aztecan-speaking populations that were found in northern San Diego, southern Orange, and southeastern Riverside Counties from the onset of ethnohistoric times through the present day. The basic unit of Luiseño social structure was the clan tribelet. The tribelet was composed of patrilineally related people who were politically and economically autonomous from neighboring tribelets. Unlike other Takic-speaking tribes that surround them, the Luiseño do not appear to have been organized into exogamous moieties (descent groups that married outside one's birth group), but may have been loosely divided into mountain-oriented groups and ocean-oriented groups (Bean and Shipek 1978). One or more clans would reside together in a village (Oxendine 1983). A heredity village chief held a position that controlled economic, religious, and warfare powers (Bean and Shipek 1978).

The Gabrieliño's tribal territory included the watersheds of the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana Rivers, all of the Los Angeles Basin, the coast from Aliso Creek in the south to Topanga Creek in the north, and the islands of San Clemente, San Nicholas, and Santa Catalina. Villages or tribelets were politically autonomous and made up of different lineages. Each lineage had its own leader and would seasonally leave the village to collect resource items. The Gabrieliño traded with the Serrano to the east. They traded their coastal shell through middlemen to the interior of southern California and the Southwest. Steatite from Santa Catalina was their main trade item.

#### **e. Historic Period**

The Spanish Period in California (1769–1821) represents a time of European exploration and settlement. Mission San Gabriel Arcangel, founded in September 1771 in what is now Montebello, claimed the areas around Riverside, Jurupa, San Jacinto, and the San Geronio Pass. Many Native American lands were taken over by the Spanish for cattle grazing (Cook 1976).



The Mexican Period (1821–1848) retained many of the Spanish institutions and laws. Two branches of the Sonora Road established in 1824, ran through Riverside County: (Hoover et. al. 2002). Cattle ranching still dominated the economy and the hide and tallow trade increased during the early part of the Mexican Period. The Spanish mission system was secularized by the Mexican government, and these lands allowed for the dramatic expansion of the rancho system. Two ranchos are within approximately 3 miles of the western end of the Project. Rancho La Sierra (Sepulveda) approximately 2.75 miles west of the Project, was originally granted to Vicenta Sepulveda in 1846. The original grant was for 17,774 acres and included what is now Norco and the western end of the City of Riverside. In the early 1900s, after several owners, Willits J. Hole bought the majority of Rancho La Sierra (Sepulveda) and established the Hole Ranch. The Hole Ranch was divided into four specialized farms: A, B, C, and D, with ranch headquarters on Ranch B. The next closest rancho to the Project vicinity was Rancho El Sobrante de San Jacinto, a rancho of approximately 49,000 acres granted to Maria del Rosario Estudillo de Aguirre in 1867. Rancho el Sobrante is approximately three miles to the southwest of the study area. In the 1830s and 1840s, an increasing number of Americans were settling in California.

American influence in the Riverside area began slowly, but the construction of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 spurred a great influx of homesteaders, developers, and speculators. The Southern California Colony Association, headed by John W. North founded the City of Riverside in the early 1870s, the first major development in what was to become Riverside County. The first orange trees were planted in 1871, and by 1882 a quarter of a million orange trees had been planted in the area. To supply water to the citrus groves, several canal systems, such as the Gage and Riverside canals, were built. The first railroad in the Project vicinity was the Santa Fe connecting Los Angeles with San Bernardino in 1885.

The Gage Canal was a development of Matthew Gage. Gage acquired land in the area and realized the possibility of increasing the value of his holdings by introducing a water source for irrigation. Gage, along with William Irving, and Gage's brother Robert, began work on a canal in 1885 (National Park Service [NPS] Form 2003). The first canal section, completed in 1886, was 12 miles long and a second eight-mile long section was completed in 1888 (NPS Form 2003). The Gage Canal contributed to the major expansion of the City's original boundaries, development of new subdivisions, and the further expansion of the citrus industry in the 1880s.

In 1883, the City of Riverside was incorporated. The County of Riverside was created in 1893 from a small (590 square miles) but wealthy part of San Bernardino County and a large (6,044 square miles) part of San Diego County (Gunther 1984:xiii as referenced in Ogden 1995). During the 1920s and 1930s, agriculture continued to be the main economic engine in Riverside County. Businesses, hotels, and theaters increased in the City. La Sierra College was founded by the Seventh-Day Adventists in 1927. After World

War II, residential tracts and commercial developments boomed. The completion of State Route 91 (SR-91) in the late 1950s increased opportunities for growth of business and residential development (Tibbet et al. 2008). Riverside experienced a population boom in the 1950s and 1960s that took the City from a small agrarian society to full-fledged cityhood.

#### **f. Victoria Avenue**

Victoria Avenue, completed in 1892, is a divided residential boulevard with extensive landscaping associated with the development of the Arlington Heights neighborhood. As the centerpiece of Arlington Heights, Victoria Avenue was planned as a two-lane, divided, 120-foot-wide palm-lined thoroughfare. Each traffic lane, originally unpaved, was approximately 19 feet wide, with a 36-foot-wide central median set aside for a streetcar line (NPS Form 2003). The Riverside Trust Company hired prominent landscape gardener, Franz Philip Hosp to landscape Victoria Avenue. The landscape design Hosp developed for Victoria Avenue was characterized by the planting of vista defining tall evergreen species within the right-of-way. Deciduous trees were planted in the median, adding a changing variation of color, texture and height as one transited the Avenue (NPS Form 2003). In 1924 Lilla Mylne began a campaign to add Ragged Robin roses to the landscaping of Victoria Avenue. Planting began in 1924 and continued into the 1930s (NPS Form 2003).

Victoria Avenue was specifically designed to complement the citrus groves and subdivisions along the route from downtown Riverside to the Arlington Heights subdivision, and to promote Riverside and the citrus industry to visitors and investors. The Arlington Trust Company saw it as a promotional tool for the sale and development of agricultural land in Riverside (NPS Form 2003).

Beginning in 1928, Victoria Avenue began to be referred to as a parkway. A “parkway” was defined by Charles H. Chaney, a planning consultant for the City, as a “route limited to passenger vehicles and made exceptionally agreeable as a route of pleasure travel by every possible means, but especially by the feeling of openness that comes only with plenty of width and by an ample enframing of trees, shrubs, and other plantations in the parallel wide sidewalk areas.” Victoria Avenue was specifically singled out by Chaney as a typical parkway (NPS Form 2003).

### **3.4.2.2 Existing Cultural Resources**

#### **a. Record Search**

The record search shows a total of 118 cultural resources recorded within one mile of the survey areas. Of these, two cultural resources are recorded within the Project survey areas. These are a 6.1-mile-long section of Victoria Avenue (CA-RIV-11361) and the Gage Canal (CA-RIV-4768). Victoria Avenue is listed on the National Register of Historic

Places (#00001267), is a California Historical Landmark, and is a City of Riverside Cultural Heritage Landmark #8. The Gage Canal (CA-RIV-4768) is a 20.13-mile canal beginning at the Santa Ana River and terminating at the Mockingbird Reservoir. The Gage Canal is City of Riverside Cultural Heritage Landmark #24. Three additional resources recorded adjacent to the boundaries of the survey areas are identified as CA-RIV-3553, CA-RIV-3637, and P-33-005577 and discussed below. However, because these three additional sites are located outside of the Project Impact Area (PIA); no further evaluation is included in the DEIR.

A small site (CA-RIV-3553) consisting of two milling features on separate boulders is mapped approximately 60 meters north of the proposed bridge alignment in the Alessandro Arroyo. The two features consist of a single slick each, on granitic boulders spaced approximately 20 meters apart, on the southwest side of the drainage. The site was recorded in 1989 by the Archaeological Research Unit of the University of California, Riverside.

A bedrock milling feature (CA-RIV-3637) consists of five slicks on a single granite boulder in a small seasonal drainage in the slope. This feature is mapped approximately 60 feet north of the Eastern Survey Area boundary. This site was also recorded in 1989 by the Archaeological Research Unit of University of California, Riverside and verified.

A single-story, single-family residential structure (P-33-005577) of wood-frame construction is located at 2612 Madison Street. The house was U shaped and exhibited many elements typical of the Craftsman architectural style. In 2007 the house was destroyed by fire. Aerial photographs show the remnants of the house were demolished between mid-2002 and late 2003. The location is now occupied by a single-family residence constructed in 2004.

## **b. Native American Consultation**

A reply from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was received on February 15, 2011, indicating that no Native American cultural resources were identified within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project. As part of the SB 18 consultation, the City included the people/tribes on the list supplied by the NAHC in their correspondence. Of the response letters received by the City, the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians indicated they would like to have government-to-government consultation, receive copies of any archaeological documentation, and be given notification prior to any ground disturbances including construction activities. The City has met with these three tribes about this Project. Representatives from Soboba, Pechanga, and San Manuel have been added to the list of groups to be notified when Project documents are ready for public review, and they will be notified before any ground disturbing activities are begun for the Project.

### **c. Survey Results**

#### ***Eastern and Alessandro Arroyo Survey Areas***

RECON conducted the historical resources surveys of the eastern survey area on July 12, 2011, and the Alessandro Arroyo Survey Area on April 1, 2011. Two previously unrecorded cultural resources were found during the survey. One milling feature (CA-RIV-10888) was found on the southwest side of the drainage, at the base of the slope next to the floodplain. The milling feature consists of a single slick on a boulder. The slick shows moderate use/wear. The boulder is oriented northwest-southeast, with the northwest end on the slope and the southeast end at the edge of the floodplain. No artifacts were seen in association with the feature, but ground visibility was low due to vegetation. This milling feature is within the Alessandro Arroyo within a meter of the proposed location of a bridge pier.

The second milling feature (CA-RIV-10887) was also found on the southwest side of the drainage, but part-way up the slope above the floodplain. This feature consists of a single milling element, a slick on a low profile granitic boulder. The slick shows moderate wear and the edges are exfoliating. This milling feature is approximately 18 meters outside the PIA, on the southwest side of Alessandro Arroyo. Because this site is located outside of the PIA; no further evaluation is included in the DEIR.

#### ***Western Survey Area***

RECON conducted the historical resources survey for the Western Survey Area on March 13, 2012. As discussed in Appendix E, due to lack of access for some private properties, a portion of the alignment for the Proposed C Street could not be accessed during the cultural resources survey, including parcels 237-100-002, 237-100-006, 237-100-007, 237-100-008, and 237-11-009. Two previously unrecorded and two previously recorded cultural resources were found during the survey. A house foundation and chimney (P-33-021019) were found immediately southwest of the proposed impact area for the Proposed C Street alignment. The chimney is of poured concrete, and the foundation is a combination of poured concrete perimeter wall foundation sections and poured slabs. The house is visible on 1948 and 1967 aerial photographs and on the 1967 Photorevised 1980 United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute Riverside West Topographic Map, respectively.

The Gage Canal (CA-RIV-4768) in this area is a concrete-lined open canal averaging 12 feet wide and approximately 3 feet 7 inches deep. The sides of the canal slope inward to the canal bottom at an angle of about 45 degrees. The canal passes underneath Washington Street by means of an arched concrete culvert.

The survey area contains two rows of standpipes (P-33-021020), which cross an orchard from within the survey area. The western of the two rows consists of four cylindrical

concrete standpipes about 12–15 inches tall. They are 10 inches in diameter and have closed tops. Each has four small metal sliding doors, measuring 2.5 by 1.5 inches, for release of water. The second row includes 18 standpipes of three different styles. These standpipes were not considered cultural resources.

Also within the Western Survey Area is Victoria Avenue (CA-RIV-11361). On Victoria Avenue the medians and shoulders are predominately of dirt with no curbs. The south side of the median west of the intersection has a low asphalt curb, and Madison Street on the north side of the intersection has concrete curbs and sidewalks. Madison Street also has dirt shoulders with no curbs at the intersection. Mexican fan palms line both sides and are planted in a double row in the median on Victoria Avenue. The Mexican fan palms are mature palms over 50 feet in height on both streets. Single rows of red ragged robin roses are planted along the edges of the median on Victoria Avenue and on a small patch on the southeast corner of the median.

#### **d. Site Evaluation under CEQA**

Cultural resources that have been evaluated and determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR are considered historical resources under the provisions of Public Resources Code, Sections 5020.1 and 5024.1. For planning purposes, all of the cultural resources in the survey area that have not yet been evaluated for their eligibility to the CRHR are considered to be historical resources until evaluated, with the exception of cultural isolates.

Section 5024.1(c) of the Public Resources Code addresses CEQA significance criteria. It indicates that a resource is determined significant and may be listed as an historical resource in the CRHR if it meets any of the following CRHR criteria related to 1) events, 2) persons important to our past, 3) distinctive characteristics of a type, period, construction, or individual, or 4) information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to meeting one of the four criteria, a resource must have integrity; that is, it must evoke the resource's period of significance or, in the case of criterion 4, it must retain reliable research data (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 14, Chapter 11.5 Section 4852(c)).

If a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, mitigation is required under CEQA. A substantial adverse change is defined as the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. Avoidance of the historical resource through project redesign is the preferred mitigation measure. If redesign is not feasible, minimizing impacts by limiting the degree of impacts or reducing the impact through construction monitoring are mitigation options.

### ***Significance Determination***

Based on the criteria described above, a significance determination was made for new and previously recorded sites. Each of these sites is discussed below.

The milling feature (CA-RIV-10888) was determined not to be significant under CEQA. It is a single bedrock milling feature with no associated artifacts and would have little research value itself to the prehistory of the area under Criterion 4. According to Love et al. (2001), “only one, or a few, bedrock milling features with no other artifacts nor any sign of midden, are the most ubiquitous site type in the Riverside–Corona–Norco area [...] They (milling features) are often called special-use sites because they were visited and used by Native Americans while gathering resources, but do not represent camp sites or villages.” The closest possible habitation site (CA-RIV-3640), is recorded between 300 meters and 730 meters north of CA-RIV-10888; the milling feature would not be considered a component of this site. The feature is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage or with the lives of persons important to our past. It does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or construction; represent the work of an important creative individual; or possess high artistic values. CA-RIV-10888 has been recorded using a California Department of Parks and Recreation Primary site form. Completion of the site form has exhausted the research potential of CA-RIV-10888.

The house foundation and chimney (P-33-021019) lacks sufficient integrity to qualify under any of the four criteria to be significant under CEQA. The building itself has been destroyed and only the foundation remains. The Riverside County Archives Office was contacted to determine if information was available connecting the property/house to the Gage Canal or to one of the local citrus packing houses that operated in the Arlington Heights area. No information was found indicating that the property/house was owned by either the Gage Canal Company or a packing house. The foundations alone are not a sufficient representation of the original building to qualify under Criteria 1 or 2 on their own. The remaining foundation displays no distinctive characteristics of a type or period of construction, uses no unusual construction materials, and does not possess high artistic values. The foundations that remain cannot yield, or are not likely to yield, information important in California or Riverside history or prehistory.

The group of standpipes (P-33-021020) does not qualify under any of the four criteria and are not significant under CEQA. The construction styles used for the standpipes are common to irrigation systems used in Riverside since the 1930s–1940s. Because of this relatively late earliest date of construction, the standpipes are too recent to be associated with the significant event of rise of the citrus industry on Riverside. Since the earliest date of construction is the 1930s–1940s, the standpipes cannot be associated with persons involved in the development of the citrus industry in Riverside. Because the style of construction used for these standpipes has not changed in approximately 70 years, they do not embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of

construction. They cannot yield, or are not likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Victoria Avenue (CA-RIV-11361) has been previously determined to be a historical resource under CEQA, is listed on the CRHR, and is on the City of Riverside Cultural Heritage Landmark list.

The Gage Canal (CA-RIV-4768) is a historical resource under CEQA because of its inclusion on a local register, in this case the City of Riverside Cultural Heritage Landmark list. The Gage Canal continues to be used to supply water for irrigation in Riverside and has been modified numerous times to update and maintain the canal system. Most importantly, the original dirt canal has been cement-lined, and many sections have been undergrounded. Modifications to the canal also include converting dirt to cement lining and changing wood flumes to pipes. These changes and updates have altered the physical composition of the canal. However, the Gage Canal meets Criteria 1 and 2 for listing on the CRHR.

The Gage Canal meets Criterion 1 because it contributed to the major expansion of the citrus industry in the City. The canal initially enabled its builder, Matthew Gage, to develop his own citrus groves and the residential development of Arlington Heights in the late 1880s. In the 1890s, Gage was able to sell water to other citrus growers, substantially contributing to the expansion of Western Riverside County agriculture. The Gage Canal also contributed to the real estate boom in Riverside in the late 1880s. By 1895, the City was the wealthiest city per capita in the United States due to the citrus industry.

The Gage Canal also meets Criterion 2 because of its association with Matthew Gage, a prominent person associated with the development of Riverside. Matthew Gage moved to Riverside in 1877 from Ireland. Gage acquired land in the area and, along with William Irving and his brother Robert, began work on the Canal in 1885 (NPS Form 2003). In 1889, he began work on Arlington Heights, a subdivision in the foothills west of the Gage Canal (NPS Form 2003). Gage is also associated with the development of Victoria Avenue, which is on the NRHP, the CRHR, and the City of Riverside Cultural Heritage Landmark list.

### **3.4.2.3 Existing Paleontological Resources**

Paleontological resources may be present in fossil-bearing soils and rock formations below the ground surface. Impact areas associated with each scenario were reviewed for paleontological sensitivity. Pursuant to the Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS), the Eastern and Arroyo PIAs have a “low sensitivity” for paleontological resources (RCLIS 2012). Pursuant to the County of Riverside General Plan Program EIR, the “Low Potential” category encompasses lands for which previous field surveys and documentation demonstrate as having a low potential for containing significant

paleontological resources subject to adverse impacts. The mapping of “low potential” areas within the RCLIS was based on actual documentation, and was not generalized to cover all areas of a particular rock unit on a geologic map. For instance, an area mapped as “Qal” may actually be a thin surficial layer of non-fossiliferous sediments which covers fossil-rich Pleistocene sediments. Also, an area mapped as granite may be covered by a Pleistocene soil horizon that contains fossils. Thus, actual sensitivity must be ultimately determined by both a records search and a field inspection by a paleontologist, and those areas designated as having a “low potential” include those areas for which field inspections have been completed.

The Western PIA, i.e., the alignment for the Proposed C Street, is identified as having “high sensitivity (High A)” (RCLIS 2012). Pursuant to the County of Riverside General Plan Program EIR, areas with a “High Potential” for paleontological resources include sedimentary rock units with a high potential for containing significant non-renewable paleontological resources and are rock units within which vertebrate or significant invertebrate fossils have been determined to be present or likely to be present. These units include, but are not limited to, sedimentary formations which contain significant non-renewable paleontological resources anywhere within their geographical extent, and sedimentary rock units temporally or lithologically suitable for the preservation of fossils. High sensitivity includes not only the potential for yielding abundant vertebrate fossils, but also for production of a few significant fossils that may provide new and significant (taxonomic, phylogenetic, ecologic, and/or stratigraphic) data. High sensitivity areas are mapped as either “High A” or “High B.”

High A is based on geologic formations or mappable rock units that are known to contain or have the correct age and depositional conditions to contain significant paleontological resources. These include rocks of Silurian or Devonian age and younger that have potential to contain remains of fossil fish and Mesozoic and Cenozoic rocks that contain fossilized body elements, and trace fossils such as tracks, nests, and eggs (County of Riverside 2003b).

### **3.4.3 Significance Determination Thresholds**

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts related to cultural, historical, and paleontological resources would be significant if the proposed Project would:

1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or



4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

### 3.4.4 Issue 1: Historical Resources

Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?

#### 3.4.4.1 Impact Analysis

##### Scenario 1

Under Scenario 1, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain closed, and no construction is proposed. No new roadway or other public facility improvements would be constructed, and **no significant impacts** to historical resources would occur.

##### Scenario 2

Under Scenario 2, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed, allowing traffic to pass through the existing residential communities. No new roadway or other public facility improvements would be constructed, and **no significant impacts** to historical resources would occur.

##### Scenario 3

Under Scenario 3, Overlook Parkway would be connected between Via Vista Drive and approximately 500 feet west of Sandtrack Road and over the Alessandro Arroyo. No historical resources are located within the Project impact areas. Therefore, **no significant impacts** to historical resources would occur under Scenario 3.

##### Scenario 4

Scenario 4 involves the same construction as Scenario 3 and the additional construction of Proposed C Street from Washington Street to the existing intersection of Victoria Avenue and Madison Street. As discussed under Scenario 3, the connection of Overlook Parkway would not impact historical resources. However, there are historic resources within the PIA for the Proposed C Street under Scenario 4. Pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, a “substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource” occurs as a result of a project that “materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Places.” Victoria Avenue and the Gage Canal are discussed in more detail below.

### ***Victoria Avenue***

The connection of the Proposed C Street to the existing intersection at Victoria Avenue requires several improvements related to traffic flow and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility, including changes to the lane configuration, signalization, and the addition of a crosswalk in the existing median.

The implementation of Scenario 4 would impact a section of Victoria Avenue (CA-RIV-11361) where the Proposed C Street, a new four-lane roadway, intersects it. The intersection improvements are proposed in a rural segment of Victoria Avenue south of Washington Street. This area has been less impacted by subdivision development and retains more integrity of the rural atmosphere associated with the period of significance. Intersection improvements for Victoria Avenue and Madison Street have been designed to retain and protect existing landscaping elements and limit the installation of new curbs and conversion of dirt shoulders to pavement along to Victoria Avenue; however, proposed intersection improvements that would be required to accommodate the proposed traffic lanes of Proposed C Street and ADA accessibility would alter Victoria Avenue. These improvements include: the installation of traffic lights at all four corners of the intersection and within the median; proposed curbs and additional asphalt associated with the intersection improvements would replace sections of the dirt shoulder; the construction of a crosswalk across the south median at the intersection would change the appearance of the existing plantings in median in that area.

Installation of traffic signals, the loss of median, shoulder area, or landscaping on Victoria Avenue, as a result of lane widening and the addition of curbs, would impact design elements of Victoria Avenue that were present during its time of significance from 1892 to the 1930s, and would constitute a substantial adverse change. Mature Mexican fan palms currently line both Victoria Avenue and Madison Street, and similar to the other proposed alterations along Victoria Avenue, their removal without replacement, or replacement with smaller palms, would be a significant historical impact. Additionally, the ragged robin roses planted in the median and on the southeast corner of the Victoria Avenue/Madison Street intersection contribute to the historic character of the Avenue and their removal would also be considered a significant historical impact. Altering the existing intersection with Victoria Avenue would result in significant changes to Victoria Avenue that would be **significant (S4-CUL-1)**.

### ***Gage Canal***

Plans for implementation of Scenario 4 include construction of the Proposed C Street, which would impact a section of the Gage Canal that is currently an open concrete-lined ditch. The proposed alignment for the Proposed C Street intersects the Gage Canal approximately 420 feet north of the southeastern end of the route, immediately south of the intersection of Washington Street and Dufferin Avenue. The new roadbed would be placed over the canal, and a culvert would be placed beneath to allow the continued flow

of water through the canal. Additionally, a portion of Washington Street (being vacated under Scenario 4) currently covering the Gage Canal would be removed, and this portion of Gage Canal would be exposed.

The canal is important because of its contribution to the development of Riverside and the citrus industry, and because of its association with its builder, Matthew Gage. The canal's route would remain the same, and it would still function to supply water to the surrounding area. The proposed modifications to the canal would not alter these characteristics which define its significance; the canal would retain its integrity of location, setting, and association, and in the areas where it is still an open canal, integrity of feeling and design. Therefore, the proposed covering of a minimal section of Gage Canal to accommodate the proposed road would be **less than significant**.

### **Off-site**

The off-site improvements, such as signalizing intersections or adding turn lanes, are needed at key intersections to accommodate flows and mitigate Level of Service (LOS) impacts for all four Scenarios. Proposed mitigation measures include alterations to intersections along Victoria Avenue, including: Washington Street at Victoria Avenue, Madison Street/Proposed C Street at Victoria Avenue, and Arlington Avenue at Victoria Avenue.

A new traffic signal at Washington Street and Victoria Avenue would not require the removal of trees or landscape elements; therefore, no loss to the median would occur. The proposed lane configurations would be accommodated within the existing roadway without impacting the existing shoulders on Victoria Avenue. In addition, the median would be extended to accommodate the crosswalk. Other intersections along Victoria Avenue would also require improvements. Improvements such as the installation of traffic signals, crosswalks in the median, and additional pavement on the shoulder as a result of lane widening constitute a substantial adverse change to Victoria Avenue and would be considered **significant** for the same reasons as discussed above (see **S4-CUL-1**).

#### **3.4.4.2 Significance of Impacts**

Because maintaining the gates would not require construction, no significant impacts to historical resources would occur under Scenarios 1, 2 and 3.

The connection of Overlook Parkway east to Alessandro Boulevard would not result in significant impacts related to historic resources. Also, impacts to the Gage Canal under Scenario 4 would be less than significant. However, construction of the Proposed C Street at the intersection of Victoria Avenue and Madison Street under Scenario 4 would be significant (**S4-CUL-1**).

Because the off-site improvements propose upgrades and alterations to intersections along Victoria Avenue, which is considered a historic resource, off-site impacts would also be significant.

### 3.4.4.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

The preferred method to reduce the level of adverse change to below a level of significant effect to Victoria Avenue for Scenario 4 would be to design the Project so that no alterations were made to the existing intersection. If changes to the existing intersection of Victoria Avenue and Madison Street cannot be avoided, design steps could be implemented that would reduce the impact as follows (**S4-CUL-1**):

**MM-CUL-1:** To reduce impacts related to traffic improvements at intersections along Victoria Avenue, the following design measures shall be implemented:

- Traffic lights shall be low profile signals or signals suspended on wires.
- New curbs shall be designed as low as possible and constructed of asphalt.
- Curbs shall match the small section of rolled asphalt curb that exists on Victoria and extend away from the actual intersection for as short a distance as feasible.
- Plants within areas that would be either permanently or temporarily impacted by the intersection changes along Victoria Avenue shall be salvaged prior to commencement of construction activities and used for landscaping after construction is finished. Plantings in disturbed areas shall replicate the pre-disturbance design as far as species type, maturity/height, and grouping of plants, including mature Mexican fan palms and ragged robin roses. Specifically, the ragged robin roses planted in the median and on the southeast corner of the Victoria Avenue/Madison Street intersection shall be salvaged and replanted in the median, moving some of the other plants back to reproduce the original dimensions and density of the pre-construction condition. Where salvaging of plants is impractical, new plants of the same species and size shall be replanted.

### Off-site

Implementation of traffic mitigation measures for intersections along Victoria Avenue would result in a significant impact to Victoria Avenue, which would require mitigation.

Design steps are required to would reduce the impact. Therefore, the Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-1** would also apply.

#### 3.4.4.4 Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-1** for Scenario 4 and off-site improvements (for all scenarios) would reduce the impact to Victoria Avenue, but not to below a level of significance. Therefore, impacts to Victoria Avenue are **significant and unavoidable**.

### 3.4.5 Issue 2: Archaeological Resources

Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

#### 3.4.5.1 Impact Analysis

##### Scenario 1

Under Scenario 1, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain closed, and no ground disturbance would occur. **No significant impacts** to archaeological resources would occur under Scenario 1.

##### Scenario 2

Under Scenario 2, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed, allowing traffic to pass through the existing residential communities. Because no new roadway would be constructed, no ground disturbance would occur. **No significant impacts** to archaeological resources would occur under Scenario 2.

##### Scenario 3

Under Scenario 3, Overlook Parkway would be connected between Via Vista Drive and Sandtrack Road and over the Alessandro Arroyo. Both temporary and permanent impacts from construction activities are included in the assessment of Project-related impacts to cultural resources. Temporary impacts include work areas for crews and equipment within a construction easement on either side of the proposed roadways. Construction staging would be accommodated primarily on Overlook Parkway and other existing roadways. Permanent impacts occur from activities such as regrading, installation of the bridge abutments, and paving. However, as noted above, the single milling feature within the Project area (CA-RIV-10888) was determined to not be significant under CEQA because it has no associated artifacts and would have little research value itself to the prehistory of the area under Criterion 4. This site has been

recorded, and completion of the site form has exhausted the research potential. Furthermore, the milling feature is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage or with the lives of persons important to our past; it does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or construction; represent the work of an important creative individual; or possess high artistic values.

Project components proposed in the Alessandro Arroyo would occur in areas of alluvial deposition, and there is the potential for buried cultural resources that cannot be identified at the survey level. In the Alessandro Arroyo, the bridge supports would be placed in the floodplain where there is the possibility of buried cultural resources in the alluvial deposits associated with Alessandro Arroyo. The potential for buried cultural resources is lower in the alignment for the fill crossing of Overlook Parkway to the east; however, the potential for resources still exists. Since there is the possibility of subsurface prehistoric or historic deposits to be present that could be uncovered during construction activities, a potentially **significant impact (S3-CUL-1)** to subsurface archaeological resources could result from the development of Scenario 3.

## Scenario 4

Scenario 4 involves the same construction as Scenario 3, and therefore would result in potential significant impacts to subsurface prehistoric or historic deposits that may be present and uncovered during construction activities as described above. The same potential for buried cultural resources, as described for Overlook Parkway under Scenario 3, would apply under Scenario 4 to the construction of Proposed C Street in areas of alluvial deposition. Scenario 4 also includes the construction of the Proposed C Street between Washington Street and the existing intersection of Victoria Avenue and Madison Street. Two cultural resource sites were identified within the western survey area, however, neither the house foundation (P-33-021019) nor the standpipes (P-33-021020) is considered a potentially significant historical resource under federal, CEQA, or local guidelines. Implementation of Scenario 4 would, therefore, not have a significant impact on these cultural resources. However, because the house foundation is located in close proximity to the alignment for the Proposed C Street, there is the possibility that buried features associated with the house foundation immediately south of the Project vicinity may be present. Since there is the possibility of subsurface prehistoric or historic deposits to be present that could be uncovered during construction activities, a potentially **significant impact (S4-CUL-2)** could result from the development of Scenario 4.

Additionally, a portion of the alignment for the Proposed C Street could not be accessed during the cultural resources survey. Therefore, the presence or absence of cultural resources on parcels 237-100-002, 237-100-006, 237-100-007, 237-100-008, and 237-11-009 could not be determined, and impacts to unknown archaeological resources are potentially **significant (S4-CUL-3)**.

## Off-site

Off-site improvements such as signalization and restriping would occur in existing intersections and would not require grading. For these reasons, there would be **no impacts** to archaeological resources from off-site improvements

### 3.4.5.2 Significance of Impacts

No impacts to archaeological resources would occur under either Scenarios 1 or 2.

Under Scenario 3, potential significant impacts to subsurface prehistoric or historic deposits that may be present and could be uncovered during construction activities associated with the connection of Overlook Parkway (**S3-CUL-1**) were identified.

Under Scenario 4, impacts to subsurface prehistoric or historic deposits that may be present and could be uncovered during construction activities associated with the connection of Overlook Parkway are similarly potentially significant (**S4-CUL-2**). In addition, construction of the Proposed C Street could potentially impact additional unknown archaeological resources (**S4-CUL-3**).

There would be no significant impacts to archaeological resources from off-site improvements

### 3.4.5.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Construction of Overlook Parkway could potentially impact additional unknown archaeological resources (**S3-CUL-1** and **S4-CUL-2**).

**MM-CUL-2:** To reduce impacts to archaeological resources during grading and other ground disturbing activities of previously undisturbed deposits, monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and Native American representative shall occur for the construction of Overlook Parkway and the Proposed C Street, including within the Alessandro Arroyo. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections shall be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Native American Monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits shall be determined by the Project Archaeologist.

If previously unknown subsurface resources are found during grading, the Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American monitor, shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially

significant cultural resources. At the time of discovery, the City shall be notified and measures shall be implemented to insure any Project-related impacts are reduced to a level below significance. Construction activities shall be allowed to resume in the affected area only after the City has concurred with the evaluation. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist and approved by the City, then carried out using professional archaeological methods.

The Project Archaeologist shall submit monthly status reports to the City Public Works Department starting from the date of the Notice to Proceed to termination of implementation of the grading monitoring program. The reports shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction.

Upon completion of the Project, if no archaeological resources are encountered during grading, then a final Negative Monitoring Report shall be submitted substantiating that grading activities are completed and no cultural resources were encountered. Monitoring logs showing the date and time that the monitor was on site must be included in the Negative Monitoring Report.

If archaeological resources were encountered during grading, the Project Archaeologist shall provide a Monitoring Report stating that the field grading monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The report shall detail all cultural artifacts and deposits discovered during monitoring and the anticipated time schedule for completion of the curation phase of the monitoring.

Construction of the Proposed C Street could potentially impact additional unknown archaeological resources (**S4-CUL-3**). Mitigation is detailed below.

**MM-CUL-3:** To reduce impacts to archaeological resources for the Proposed C Street, prior to commencement of grading, the unsurveyed portions of the route shall be surveyed by a qualified archaeologist to determine if cultural resources are present. The survey shall follow City of Riverside guidelines in effect at the time of the survey. If no cultural resources are found during the survey, no additional work is required prior to construction.



Should cultural resources be found in the Project impact area during the survey, the road alignment shall be redesigned to avoid the resource. If the Project cannot be feasibly redesigned to avoid the resource, a testing program shall be implemented under the direction of the City's Historic Preservation Officer according to the following steps.

1. The testing program shall be written by an archaeologist qualified by the City of Riverside as a Principal Investigator and follow current guidelines for testing of cultural resources. Testing programs shall consist of a combination of site mapping and the excavation of an appropriate number of test units and shovel test pits. The testing program shall be used to identify subsurface deposits and to define site boundaries. Testing will also determine the integrity of each resource, including presence of disturbance to the site, extent of disturbance, and if any intact subsurface deposits remain. This testing program will also determine whether the portions of the sites in the proposed Area of Potential Effect are significant historical resources under City of Riverside and CEQA criteria.
2. If testing determines a resource is significant under City of Riverside or CEQA guidelines, a research design and data recovery program shall be required to mitigate Project related impacts to a level below that of significance. The research design/data recovery program shall be written by a City of Riverside archaeologist qualified as a Principal Investigator. The research design/data recovery program shall identify important research questions and explain procedures to be used in the excavation, analysis, and curation of recovered materials.

Completion of this program would adequately mitigate impacts to cultural resources in the unsurveyed portions of Proposed C Street by assessing and collecting potential significant information from the resources and reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

#### **3.4.5.4 Significance after Mitigation**

With implementation of Mitigation Measures **MM-CUL-2** and **MM-CUL-3**, impacts to subsurface archaeological resources that may be present and uncovered during construction of Overlook Parkway would be reduced to a level less than significant.

### **3.4.6 Issue 3: Paleontological Resources**

Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

### 3.4.6.1 Impact Analysis

Significant impacts to paleontological resources would occur if the proposed Project alters or destroys any significant paleontological resource. Significant paleontological resources are fossils or assemblages of fossils that are unique, unusual, rare, uncommon, 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 (City of Riverside 2007a)

#### Scenario 1

Under Scenario 1, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain closed. Because no new roadway would be constructed, no ground disturbance would occur. Therefore, this scenario would not destroy a unique paleontological resource/site or geologic feature. Thus, there would be **no impact**.

#### Scenario 2

Under Scenario 2, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed, allowing traffic to pass through the existing residential communities. Because no new roadway would be constructed, no ground disturbance would occur. Therefore, this scenario would not destroy a unique paleontological resource/site or geologic feature. Thus, there would be **no impact**.

#### Scenario 3

Under Scenario 3, Overlook Parkway would be connected between Via Vista Drive and Sandtrack Road and over the Alessandro Arroyo. Construction activity, including ground disturbance and grading, would occur for the fill crossing and bridge. This scenario would not result in impacts to a unique paleontological resource. The easterly extension of Overlook Parkway over the Alessandro Arroyo is located in a low paleontological sensitivity area. As described in Section 3.4.2.3 above, the “Low Potential” category encompasses lands for which previous field surveys and documentation demonstrate as having a low potential for containing significant paleontological resources subject to adverse impacts. The mapping of “low potential” areas within the RCLIS was based on actual documentation, and was not generalized to cover all areas of a particular rock unit on a geologic map. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources under Scenario 3 would be **less than significant**.

## Scenario 4

Similar to Scenario 3, Project components related to construction of Overlook Parkway would be located in an area with a low potential for paleontological resources. However, construction activities west of Washington Street associated with construction of the Proposed C Street could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource. The Proposed C Street would be located in an area with high paleontological sensitivity. Ground-disturbing activities in fossil-bearing soils and rock formations have the potential to damage or destroy paleontological resources that may be present below the ground surface. Although roadway construction would not require deep excavation, construction-related and earth-disturbing actions associated with the new road could damage or destroy fossils in rock units. As with archaeological resources, paleontological resources are generally considered to be historical resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3)(D). Consequently, damage or destruction to these resources could result in a **significant impact (S4-CUL-4)**.

### Off-site

No grading activities would occur as a result of the off-site improvements. Therefore, no unique paleontological resource/site or geologic feature would be destroyed. Thus, there would be no impact.

#### 3.4.6.2 Significance of Impacts

No impacts to paleontological resources would occur under Scenarios 1 or 2.

Because all construction would occur in low sensitivity potential areas for paleontological resources impacts to paleontological resources under Scenario 3 would be less than significant.

Because of the high sensitivity potential areas for paleontological resources within the area in and around the Proposed C Street, Project grading under Scenario 4 could potentially destroy fossil remains, resulting in a significant impact to paleontological resources (**S4-CUL-4**).

No impacts to paleontological resources would occur under as a result of off-site improvements

#### 3.4.6.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

Significant impacts to paleontological resources are most often mitigated by the implementation of a monitoring program carried out under the supervision of a qualified paleontologist (**S4-CUL-4**).

**MM-CUL-4:** The grading contractor shall be responsible for the monitoring for paleontological resources during all grading activities. If any fossils are found, all grading activities shall be stopped and the grading contractor shall contact the City. The City shall retain a qualified Paleontological Resources Monitor that shall be on-site to monitor as determined necessary by the Qualified Paleontologist and the City. The grading monitoring program shall comply with the following requirements during grading:

1. The Qualified Paleontological Resources Monitor shall have the authority to direct, divert, or halt any grading/excavation within 50 feet of the find until such time that the sensitivity of the resource can be determined and the appropriate salvage implemented.
2. The Qualified Paleontological Resources Monitor shall immediately contact the City.
3. The Qualified Paleontologist Resources Monitor shall determine if the discovered resource is significant under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. If it is not significant, the paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed and the significance determination, and grading/excavation shall resume.
4. If the paleontological resource is significant or potentially significant and if the City determines that avoidance is not feasible, the Qualified Paleontological Resources Monitor, shall complete the following tasks in the field:
  - a. An excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the Project on the qualities that make the resource important. Requirements of the plan shall include:
    - Salvage unearthed fossil remains, including simple excavation of exposed specimens or, if necessary, plaster-jacketing of large and/or fragile specimens or more elaborate quarry excavations of richly fossiliferous deposits;
    - Record stratigraphic and geologic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains, typically including a detailed description of all paleontological localities within the Project site, as well as the lithology of fossil-bearing strata within the measured stratigraphic section, if feasible, and photographic documentation of the geologic setting; and

- Transport the collected specimens to a laboratory for processing (cleaning, curation, cataloging, etc.).
- b. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to implementation.

#### **3.4.6.4 Significance after Mitigation**

With implementation of Mitigation Measure **MM-CUL-4**, impacts to paleontological resources associated with Scenario 4 would be reduced to a level less than significant.

### **3.4.7 Issue 4: Religious/Sacred Uses and Human Remains**

Would the proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

#### **3.4.7.1 Impact Analysis**

##### **Scenario 1**

Scenario 1 does not involve construction or ground disturbing activity; therefore, this scenario would not disturb any human remains. Thus, there would be **no impact**.

##### **Scenario 2**

Scenario 2 does not involve construction or ground disturbing activity; therefore, this scenario would not disturb any human remains. Thus, there would be **no impact**.

##### **Scenario 3**

Scenario 3 would entail construction and ground disturbing activity. While there are no known burial sites or cemeteries within the Project vicinity; in the unlikely event of the discovery of human remains, the City will be required to conform with the procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) requiring that all work shall halt in the area if discovery occurs. Therefore, impacts from Scenario 3 would be **less than significant** impact.

##### **Scenario 4**

Scenario 4 would entail construction and ground-disturbing activity for the connection of Overlook Parkway and the Proposed C Street. While there are no known burial sites or cemeteries within the Project vicinity, in the unlikely event of the discovery of human remains the City will be required to conform with the procedures set forth in the

California Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) requiring that all work shall halt in the area if discovery occurs. Therefore, Scenario 4 would result in a **less than significant** impact.

### **Off-site**

No grading activities would occur as a result of the off-site improvements. Therefore, no unique paleontological resource/site or geologic feature would be destroyed. Thus, there would be no impact.

#### **3.4.7.2 Significance of Impacts**

No impacts would be associated with Scenarios 1 and 2.

In the unlikely event of the discovery of human remains during construction of the proposed components under Scenarios 3 and 4, the City will be required to conform with the procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5), and impacts would be less than significant.

No impacts would be associated with off-site improvements.

#### **3.4.7.3 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting**

No mitigation would be required.