

## 3.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The following discussion is based upon a cultural resource evaluation of the project site for the City of Lodi. This investigation included archival research of State records for identified archaeological sites, and a field reconnaissance of the project site conducted on December 11, 2002. The field reconnaissance was conducted in 50-foot transects over the entire shopping center site, and included a site reconnaissance of the potential Highway 12 widening area that will be a mitigation requirement of the project. Archival research included a review of pertinent literature and maps, and record reviews at the Central California Information Center, California State University, Stanislaus. The results of this cultural resources assessment are contained in a report on file with the City of Lodi Planning Department, 221 West Pine Street, Lodi, California.

### 3.6.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Prehistoric Resources

The archival research and field reconnaissance revealed that no prehistoric resources are located within the project site. One prehistoric burial site, CA-SJO-000032, had been recorded within a two-mile radius of the proposed shopping center location. This site was recorded in 1929 by Schenck-Dawson. According to the site record however, this burial site was destroyed in 1929 by scraping activities. This burial site would be beyond the boundaries of the project site, and would not be further altered or affected by the proposed retail center.

#### Historic Resources

The archival research and field reconnaissance revealed no historic resources within the project site. There is a partially fallen shed located on the project site that would be removed as a part of this project, but it is not considered to be of historic value.

Eight properties within a two-mile radius of the proposed project site are listed in the current *Historic Property Data File (Table 3.6-1)*. Seven of these properties are structures that are all currently being used for residential or commercial purposes and ranging in age from the early 1900's to the 1950's. A segment of the Woodbridge Irrigation Canal was also listed. None of these properties were found to be eligible for the *National Registry of Historic Places (NRHP)*.

An additional four properties recorded on Primary Records were identified within a two-mile radius of the project area. These properties were not listed in the current *Historic Property Data File, the* computer list of California's historic properties, maintained by the Office of Historic Preservation. These properties are all residences, none of which appear to be eligible for listing on the *NRHP*.

All of the aforementioned twelve properties are beyond the boundaries of the project site and would not be removed or otherwise altered or affected by the proposed retail center. Descriptions of the twelve sites found within a two-mile radius of the project site (although all are off-site) are described below in Table 3.6-1.

**TABLE 3.6-1  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN 2 MILE RADIUS OF THE PROJECT SITE**

<b>Site Number</b>	<b>Recorded By and Date</b>	<b>Site Description</b>
P-39-004236	Unk.	Woodbridge Irrigation Canal (segment) Constructed ca. 1891 (est.)
P-39-004237	M. Bowen and L. Fryman (1999)	Quonset Hut with false front. Constructed/moved ca. 1950's (est.) Currently used for commercial purposes.
P-39-004238	M. Bowen and L. Fryman (1999)	Two story, 'Queen Anne' style, residence and detached garage. Constructed ca. 1910.
P-39-004239	M. Bowen and L. Fryman (1999)	'Minimal Traditional' style residence and detached garage. Constructed ca. 1945 (est.)
P-39-004240	M. Bowen and L. Fryman (1999)	'Minimal Traditional' style residence and detached garage. Constructed ca. 1946
P-39-004241	M. Bowen (1999)	Residence and detached garage. Constructed ca. 1947
P-39-004242	M. Bowen and L. Fryman (1999)	'Craftsmen Bungalow' style residence. Constructed ca. 1908 (est.)
P-39-004243	M. Bowen and L. Fryman (1999)	'Craftsmen Bungalow' style residence and five accessory buildings. Former dairy complex. Constructed ca. 1918
P-39-004282	D. Byrd (2001)	Wood-frame 'Ranch-style' house and attached garage. Constructed ca. 1952
P-39-004283	D. Byrd (2001)	Residence and detached garage. Constructed ca. 1951
P-39-004284	D. Byrd (2001)	Residence and detached garage. Constructed ca. 1950
P-39-004285	D. Byrd (2001)	'Craftsman Bungalow' residence, pumphouse, two garages and a carport. Constructed ca. 1922
Source: Tremaine & Associates, 2002.		

### 3.6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. For the purposes of this project, a cultural impact is considered significant if the project would:

- ❖ Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5;
- ❖ Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5; and/or
- ❖ Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

**IMPACT 3.6-A Prehistoric Resources: One prehistoric site was located southwest of, but off of the project site. Records research indicates that no prehistoric resources have been identified on the project site. The project site does not appear to be located in a sensitive prehistoric resources area, and the potential to uncover unknown sites during construction of the project is considered to be minimal. (Less Than Significant Impact).**

No prehistoric cultural materials were identified on the project site from a records search, or found on the project site during the Tremaine & Associates reconnaissance survey.

One prehistoric burial site (CA-SJO-000032) was recorded over one mile southwest of (and off of) the project site. This burial site was recorded in 1929. It appears the site was also destroyed that same year by scraping activities. Given this site's distance from the project site, and its reported destruction, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would have any impact on the prehistoric burial site and a less than significant impact to prehistoric resources would occur.

**Mitigation 3.6-A: Due to the prehistoric burial site's distance from the project site and its reported destruction in 1929, this project would not have any impact on the prehistoric site therefore no mitigation is required. (Less Than Significant Impact)**

**IMPACT 3.6-B Historic Resources: Historic resources were identified in the project area, but outside the boundaries of construction or operation of the project and Highway 12 widening area. Since the proposed project would not remove or alter any historic resources, a less than significant impact would result. (Less Than Significant Impact).**

As described above, a total of twelve historic properties are located within a two-mile radius of the project site. These structures, however, lie outside the boundaries of the project site and Highway 12 widening area and would not be removed or otherwise altered or affected by the proposed retail center. In addition, none of these properties have been deemed to be eligible for listing on the National Registry of Historic Places.

**Mitigation 3.6-B:** The project would result in less than significant impacts to historic resources and, therefore, no mitigation is required. (Less Than Significant Impact).

**IMPACT 3.6-C Burial Sites:** One prehistoric burial site was located southwest of, but off of the project site. Records research indicates that no burial sites have been identified on the project site. (Less Than Significant Impact).

One prehistoric burial site is located over a mile southwest of the project site. This burial site was recorded in 1929. It appears the site was also destroyed that same year by scraping activities. Given its distance from the project site, and its reported destruction, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would have any impact on the prehistoric burial site.

**Mitigation 3.6-C:** Due to the prehistoric burial sites distance from the project site and its reported destruction in 1929, this project would not have any impact on the prehistoric site therefore no mitigation is required. (Less Than Significant Impact).

**IMPACT 3.6-D Undiscovered Previously Unknown Resources:** While evidence indicates a lack of known prehistoric resources and burial sites, there is the potential for the discovery of such resources during grading or construction of the proposed project. (Potentially Significant Impact).

Records research and site reconnaissance survey of the project site and Highway 12 widening area indicate the absence of known prehistoric resources and human remains. In fact, the records search indicates that historic resources have been recorded in the project vicinity (i.e., within two miles) but no prehistoric resources. However, there is the potential that prehistoric resources could be uncovered during grading or project construction and a potentially significant impact would result.

**Mitigation 3.6-D.** If any prehistoric or historic artifacts, or other indications of cultural resources are found once project construction is underway, all work must stop within 20 meters (66 feet) of the find. A qualified archaeologist shall be consulted for an immediate evaluation of the find before resuming groundbreaking construction activities within 20 meters of the find.

If the find is determined to be an important archaeological resource, the resource shall be either avoided, if feasible, or recovered consistent with the requirements of Appendix K of the State CEQA Guidelines.

In the event of discovery or recognition of human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, no further excavation or disturbance of a project site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains can occur until the County Coroner has been informed and determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the remains are of Native American origin, the lead agency must solicit the Native American Heritage Commission to see whether that agency can identify descendents of the deceased Native American(s). If, within 24 hours of being notified by the Commission, such descendents offer the lead agency

recommendations for treating or disposing of the remains and any associated grave goods, such recommendations should be followed, unless the landowner disagrees with the recommendation, in which case the Native American Heritage Commission shall mediate the dispute. If the Native American Commission could not mediate a dispute between the descendents and the landowner to the latter's satisfaction, further work on the project may proceed, but the landowner must rebury the remains and any grave goods "with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to subsurface disturbance."

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK