

1 **4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

2 This analysis is based on a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation (see Appendix I)  
3 prepared for the project by Conejo Archeological Consultants (June 2013), as well as cultural  
4 resource analyses prepared for the Tajiguas Landfill Project Environmental Documents

5 **4.6.1 Setting**

6 4.6.1.1 Ecological Setting

7 The study area is located in the western half of the Santa Barbara Channel  
8 region, which supports a wide variety of habitats. There is a general elevational  
9 zonation of the upland vegetation from the beach through the coastal plain and  
10 foothills up the southern slopes of the Santa Ynez Mountains. Native  
11 vegetative habitats in the area include coastal strand, coastal bluff, coastal  
12 sage scrub, grassland, oak savanna, oak woodland, chaparral, and riparian  
13 woodland. Non-native habitats include ruderal vegetation (non-native weeds  
14 growing in disturbed areas) and cultivated areas. The various vegetation  
15 habitats in turn support a wide array of wildlife species.

16 The marine environment of the Santa Barbara Channel also supports a wide  
17 variety of habitats that include kelp beds, sandy beaches, rocky intertidal, bays,  
18 estuaries, and lagoons. Historically, the largest kelp beds on the California  
19 coast occurred between Point Conception and Rincon Point. Kelp beds support  
20 a large invertebrate community including abalone, crabs, clams, oysters,  
21 shrimp, lobster, and squid. Kelp beds also feed and provide shelter for  
22 numerous species of fish. Seals and sea lions feed in the kelp beds and haul  
23 out and breed on adjacent sandy beaches. The bays, estuaries, and lagoons  
24 are important habitats for resident bird species as well as migrating waterfowl.

25 The Mediterranean climate of the project area is typified by long, hot summers,  
26 and wet, mild winters. Perennial and seasonal drainages run down the slopes  
27 of the Santa Ynez Mountains and foothills to the coast.

28 The rich plant and animal resources of the surrounding terrestrial and marine  
29 environments, availability of fresh water, and Mediterranean climate combined  
30 to make the Santa Barbara Channel region a desirable location for prehistoric  
31 habitation and supported one of the highest prehistoric population densities  
32 among hunter-gatherers anywhere in the world. These same attributes would  
33 later encourage settlement of the Santa Barbara Channel region by the  
34 Spanish, Mexican, and American cultures.

1 The Tajiguas Landfill is located within Cañada de la Pila, a narrow coastal  
2 canyon within the Santa Ynez Mountain range. Pila Creek is seasonal and dry  
3 most of the year. The landfill has been in operation since 1967 and its use has  
4 resulted in major modifications to the canyon. Los Padres National Forest is  
5 located to the north of the landfill, while U.S. Highway 101, the Union Pacific  
6 Railroad tracks and the Pacific Ocean are located to the south. The lands to  
7 the east and west of the project site are primarily open space or used for  
8 agriculture.

#### 9 4.6.1.2 Regional Prehistoric Overview

10 This section briefly summarizes the regional and cultural history of the Santa  
11 Barbara coastal area. For detailed information on the description of time  
12 frames, establishment, organization, and cultural or physical affinities of earlier  
13 populations the reader is referred to Moratto (1984), King (1990), and Grant  
14 (1978).

15 The archaeological record indicates that sedentary populations occupied the  
16 coastal regions of California more than 9,000 years ago (Greenwood 1972).  
17 Several chronological frameworks have been developed for the Chumash  
18 region. One of the most definitive works on Chumash chronology is that of King  
19 (1990). King postulates three major periods; Early, Middle and Late. Based on  
20 artifact typologies from a great number of sites, he was able to discern  
21 numerous style changes within each of the major periods.

22 The Early Period (8000 to 3350 Before Present [B.P.]) is characterized by a  
23 primarily seed processing subsistence economy. The Middle Period (3350 to  
24 800 B.P.) is marked by a shift in the economic/subsistence focus from plant  
25 gathering and the use of hard seeds, to a more generalized hunting-maritime-  
26 gathering adaptation, with an increased focus on acorns. The full development  
27 of the Chumash culture, one of the most socially and economically complex  
28 hunting and gathering groups in North America, occurred during the Late Period  
29 (800 to 150 B.P.).

#### 30 4.6.1.3 Regional Ethnographic Overview

31 The project area lies within the historic territory of the Native American Indian  
32 group known as the Chumash. The Chumash occupied the region from San  
33 Luis Obispo County to Malibu Canyon on the coast, and inland as far as the  
34 western edge of the San Joaquin Valley, and the four northern Channel Islands  
35 (Grant 1978). The Chumash are subdivided into factions based on distinct  
36 dialects. The Barbareño Chumash occupied the narrow coastal plain from  
37 Point Conception to Punta Gorda in Ventura County (Grant, 1978). The name  
38 Barbareño is derived from the mission with local jurisdiction, Santa Barbara.

39

1 Chumash society developed over the course of some 9,000 years and achieved  
2 a level of social, political and economic complexity not ordinarily associated  
3 with hunting and gathering groups (Morrato, 1984). The prehistoric Chumash  
4 are believed to have maintained one of the most elaborate bead money  
5 systems in the world, as well as one of the most complex non-agricultural  
6 societies (King, 1990).

7 The Chumash aboriginal way of life ended with Spanish colonization. As  
8 neophytes brought into the mission system, they were transformed from  
9 hunters and gatherers into agricultural laborers and exposed to diseases to  
10 which they had no resistance. By the end of the Mission Period in 1834, the  
11 Chumash population had been decimated by disease and declining birthrates.  
12 Population loss as a result of disease and economic deprivation continued into  
13 the next century.

14 Today, many people claim their Chumash heritage in Santa Barbara County. In  
15 general, they place high value on objects and places associated with their past  
16 history, especially burials, grave goods, and archaeological sites.

#### 17 4.6.1.4 Regional Historic Overview

18 In 1769, Gaspar de Portola and Father Junipero Serra departed the newly  
19 established San Diego settlement and marched northward toward Monterey,  
20 with the objective to secure that port and establish five missions along the  
21 route. The combined sea and land 1769-1770 Portola expedition, which  
22 passed through Santa Barbara County on its way to Monterey, was the prelude  
23 to systematic Spanish colonization of Alta California.

24 In 1795, Jose Francisco Ortega (the original founder of the Santa Barbara  
25 Presidio) was granted six leagues known as the *Rancho Nuestra Senora del*  
26 *Refugio* (Cowan, 1977). This was the only land grant licensed under Spanish  
27 Rule in what today is known as Santa Barbara County. The Ortegases built  
28 adobes at Refugio and later at Tajiguas Canyon, Arroyo Hondo, and Cañada  
29 del Corral. They grew wheat, maintained a vineyard, and ran large herds of  
30 cattle and horses on the rancho.

31 By the early 1800's, Refugio Bay was a well-known port to ships visiting the  
32 California coast, as the captains could trade at the Ortega settlement free of the  
33 duties imposed by the Spanish colonial government (Bancroft 1886, Tomkins  
34 1960). However, the pirate Bouchard effectively ended the bay's era as a  
35 trading/smuggling port when he sacked and burned the Refugio hacienda in  
36 1818.

37

1 In 1822, Mexico gained its independence from Spain, and in 1834 the Missions  
2 were secularized and their lands granted as rewards for loyal service or in  
3 response to an individual's petition. Ortega's grandson, Don Jose Vicente  
4 Ortega obtained the *Rancho Nuestra Senora del Refugio* in 1834. By this time,  
5 separate Ortega ranchos had been established in the Arroyo Hondo, Arroyo  
6 Quemado, and Tajiguas canyons to the west (Tompkins, 1960).

7 Following conquest of California by the United States in 1847, California  
8 became a state in 1850. The U.S. Land Commission patented the claim of  
9 26,529 acres of *Rancho Nuestra Senora del Refugio* to Antonio Maria Ortega in  
10 1866. Declining cattle prices and a serious four-year drought in the 1860s led  
11 to the sale of various rancho lands throughout California.

12 The 357 acre landfill site opened in 1967 and has been in continual use for  
13 municipal solid waste disposal since then. Waste disposal operations take  
14 place approximately 1/4 mile from U.S. Highway 101 and occur within a 118  
15 acre permitted area. The 1,083 acre Baron Ranch was purchased by the  
16 County in 1991 to provide a buffer zone between the landfill and adjacent  
17 private holdings, to prevent future subdivision and residential development  
18 adjacent to the landfill, provide flexibility for RRWMD solid waste operations,  
19 provide options for mitigation and possible future public access.

#### 20 4.6.1.5 Records Search

21 A records search was conducted at the Central Coast Information Center on  
22 June 5, 2013. The records search included a review of all archaeological site  
23 records and investigative reports within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site.

#### 24 **Archaeological Sites**

25 Three archaeological sites are recorded within a 0.5-mile radius of the project  
26 site. There are no recorded sites or isolates within areas to be affected by the  
27 proposed Resource Recovery Project. The nearest archaeological site to the  
28 project site is CA-SBa-3494, which is located approximately 2,000 feet  
29 northwest of the nearest project component (composting area storage tank).  
30 Two prehistoric sites, CA-SBa-92 & CA-SBa-1990, are recorded at the mouth of  
31 Cañada de la Pila adjacent to the Tajiguas Landfill entrance. A description of  
32 these three sites is provided below.

33 CA-SBa-3494 was recorded as "...light density shell scatter (*chione*, *oyster*,  
34 *turritella*, *razor clam*) and a Monterey chert flake near the mouth of the canyon.  
35 This scatter could be a secondary deposit. A rock shelter is approximately 50'  
36 (15 meters) above the canyon in the north wall and 20' (6 meters) east of the  
37 scatter...The shelter measures about 6' (2 meters) in depth (front to back) by 7'  
38 (2 meters) in width and is about 5' (1.5 meters) in height. The ceiling is  
39 blackened. No indication of pictographs or petroglyphs was observed... (Brown,  
40 1998)."

1 In 2004, an Extended Phase 1 Archeological Investigation (SAIC, 2004) was  
2 completed at this site due to encroaching soil stockpiling activities. The results  
3 of the Investigation determined that the shell scatter associated with CA-SBa-  
4 3494 was a secondary, disturbed deposit, meaning that the cultural material  
5 originated from a different location. The shell fragments found on the modern  
6 ground surface may have eroded down from somewhere further up the small  
7 canyon, or may have been imported with the modern trash noted in the  
8 trenches. Further, no evidence of prehistoric or historic use was noted within  
9 the rock shelter, and the geologic feature has no association with the shell  
10 scatter below. CA-SBa-3494, therefore, consists of a light shell scatter that  
11 originated from an unknown source, and the site has no spatial integrity.

12 CA-SBa-92 may represent the remnants of a village site first recorded by D.B.  
13 Rogers in 1929 as “*Park*” (Rodgers Site No. 92) (Rodgers 1929). Ruby (1999a)  
14 indicates that only a low density scatter of shell and chert debitage is now  
15 visible on the surface of the site. The site area has been highly impacted by  
16 highway construction, buried gas and electric lines, and the road leading up to  
17 the Tajiguas Landfill. However, it is possible that the site maybe partially intact  
18 below the disturbed surfaces (Ruby, 1999a). CA-SBa-92 is located adjacent to  
19 the entrance road to the Tajiguas Landfill.

20 CA-SBa-1990 is located to near the entrance road to the Tajiguas Landfill and  
21 was recorded as a “*moderate density frequently used temporary campsite*”  
22 (Neff and Rudolph, 1986).

### 23 **Previous Archaeological Investigations**

24 Four archaeological investigations have been conducted within the Tajiguas  
25 Landfill property and are described below:

- 26 • Billman (1986) conducted a field survey of much of the Tajiguas Landfill  
27 property, and no cultural resources were identified within the areas  
28 surveyed.
- 29 • Brown (1998) conducted a ten-acre survey within northern portions of the  
30 Tajiguas Landfill property, and identified a rock shelter and associated  
31 small shell scatter, which was later designated site CA-SBa-3494. Brown  
32 (1998) recommended that the rock shelter be subjected to Extended  
33 Phase 1 archaeological testing.
- 34 • In 2004, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) conducted  
35 an Extended Phase 1 Archeological Investigation at CA-SBa-3494 and  
36 determined the site did not qualify as a unique resource under Public  
37 Resources Code 21083.2 because the rock shelter had no evidence for  
38 prehistoric or historic use, and the light shell scatter of material  
39 represented a redeposit from an unknown source. No further  
40 archaeological investigation or monitoring was recommended for CA-  
41 SBa-3494.

- Conejo Archeological Consultants conducted a survey of 62 acres for the Tajiguas Landfill Reconfiguration and Baron Ranch Restoration Project in 2008, which included approximately 11.8 acres just north of the proposed MRF/AD Facility site. No prehistoric or historic resources were identified during this field survey (Conejo Archeological Consultants, 2008).

### **Federal, State & County Listings**

The listings of the National Register of Historic Places (National Park Service, 2013), California Historical Landmarks (California Parks and Recreation, 2013) and California Points of Historical Interest (California Parks and Recreation, 1992) include no properties within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. The California State Historic Resources Inventory also lists no historic properties within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site (California Parks and Recreation, 2012). There are no Santa Barbara County Historical Landmarks or Places of Historical Merit within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site (Santa Barbara County, 2012).

#### **4.6.1.6 Field Reconnaissance**

The proposed project (including the relocated landfill maintenance building and the temporary landfill administration facilities) would primarily affect areas within the existing landfill footprint that have been highly disturbed. However, there are three locations where construction would extend into previously undisturbed areas; two small tank sites (water tanks site, composting area runoff collection tank site) and a slope cut-back area (west borrow area above MRF/AD Facility site). These areas were surveyed by Conejo Archeological Consultants on June 12, 2013. Travis Spier (Operations Manager) identified potential impact areas in the field. Both tank sites are located on ridges and encompass an approximate 0.5 acre impact area.

Linear transects spaced at approximately 30 feet apart were used to survey the two tank locations. Due to vegetative cover, ground surface visibility was approximately 35 percent overall. Survey methodology for the cut-back slope included walking the top ridge and base of the slope, with some scrambling over the landslide slump area. This area has been highly impacted by the original slope cutting. No evidence of prehistoric or historic resources was observed at either tank location or in the vicinity of the slope cut-back area.

#### **4.6.1.7 Native American Consultation**

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) sacred lands file search failed to identify any cultural resources within the immediate project area, but recommended a list of Native American individuals and organizations be contacted. The following NAHC list of recommended Chumash contacts were emailed or mailed a project description letter dated June 4, 2013, and asked to respond with any comments or concerns regarding the project:

- 1 • Alva-Padilla, Adelina, Chair Woman, Santa Ynez Tribal Elders Council
- 2 • Armenta, Vincent, Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians
- 3 • Arredondo, Frank
- 4 • Baker, Crystal, Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation
- 5 • Banuelos, Raudel Joe Jr., Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
- 6 • Cordero, Michael, Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation
- 7 • DeSoto, Ernestine
- 8 • Folkes, Beverly Salazar
- 9 • Garcia, Janet, Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation
- 10 • Guzman-Folkes, Randy
- 11 • Miller, Stephen William
- 12 • Owl Clan
- 13 • Pappo, Kathleen, Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
- 14 • Parra, Charles
- 15 • Parra-Hernandez, Melissa
- 16 • Pulido, Carol
- 17 • Romero, Freddy, Cultural Preservation Consultant, Santa Ynez Tribal
- 18 Elders Council
- 19 • Ruiz, John
- 20 • Tumamait, Julie, Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
- 21 • Tumamait, Patrick
- 22 • Tribal Administrator, Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians
- 23 • Unzueta, Gilbert M., Jr.
- 24 • Unzueta, Regina, Barbareño Chumash
- 25 • Vigil, Chief Mark Steven, San Luis Obispo County Chumash Council

26 To date, two Native American responses have been received. On June 10,  
27 2013, Mr. Romero of the Santa Ynez Tribal Elders Council emailed:

28 *Thank you for the notice of this proposed project. I do have some concern given*  
29 *the fact that there is a known rock shelter within the landfill area itself. But even*  
30 *beyond that given the cultural landscape of the area, there is the possibility for*  
31 *impact to unidentified cultural material.*

32

1 *I was wondering if you have noticed the local tribes and requested their input?*  
2 *I'm leaning more towards one of the 2 alternatives. That would be my*  
3 *recommendation. I don't know how much investigation has taken place or*  
4 *exhausted in terms of utilizing these alternatives, but I would rather see one of*  
5 *those areas utilized for this purpose.*

6 *I would very much like to see what the local tribes have to say about this project*  
7 *and hear their concerns. Should you receive any, would you share them with*  
8 *me?*

9 On June 19, 2013, Conejo Archeological Consultants emailed Mr. Romero a  
10 copy of the CA-SBa-3494 site record and a copy of SAIC's 2004 Extended  
11 Phase 1 Report. Mr. Romero responded that the tribe did not concur with the  
12 findings of the SAIC report.

13 Mr. Tumamait indicated the project alternatives are all located in areas sensitive  
14 for Native American cultural resources. On June 26, 2013, Mr. Tumamait and  
15 Ms. Maki discussed the recommendations that Conejo Archeological  
16 Consultants was providing for this project. Mr. Tumamait concurred with  
17 Conejo's recommendations, which have been incorporated into this Subsequent  
18 EIR.

## 19 **4.6.2 Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures**

### 20 4.6.2.1 Thresholds of Significance

#### 21 **State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5**

22 A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the  
23 significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant  
24 effect on the environment.

25 (1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource  
26 means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource  
27 or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical  
28 resource would be materially impaired.

29 (2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a  
30 project:

31 (A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical  
32 characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical  
33 significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the  
34 California Register of Historical Resources; or



1 (B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical  
2 characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical  
3 resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or  
4 its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements  
5 of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public  
6 agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance  
7 of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

8 (C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical  
9 characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance  
10 and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of  
11 Historical Resources as determined by a Lead Agency for purposes of  
12 CEQA.

13 **Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual**  
14 **– Cultural Resource Guidelines**

15 A project is considered to have a significant impact if it would damage an  
16 important cultural resource. For the purposes of CEQA, an "important  
17 archaeological resource" can be defined as having one or more of the following  
18 characteristics:

- 19 1. Is associated with an event or person with recognized significance in  
20 California or American history; or recognized scientific importance in  
21 prehistory.
- 22 2. Can provide information which is of both demonstrable public interest  
23 and useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable or  
24 archaeological research questions,
- 25 3. Has a special or particular quality such as oldest, best example, largest,  
26 or last surviving example of its kind.
- 27 4. Is at least 100 years old and possesses substantial stratigraphic  
28 integrity; or
- 29 5. Involves important research questions that historical research has  
30 shown can be answered only with archaeological methods.

31 4.6.2.2 Approved Tajiguas Landfill Expansion Project

32 The following is a summary of the impacts identified in 01-EIR-05 for the  
33 Tajiguas Landfill Expansion Project (see Section 3.5.3).

34

- 1                   • According to 01-EIR-05, the Tajiguas Landfill Expansion Project was  
2                   expected to result in direct disturbance to Site CA-SBa-3494 since the  
3                   site is located within the footprint of the landfill expansion. This impact  
4                   was considered significant and unavoidable (Class I). Mitigation  
5                   measures provided in 01-EIR-05 required further field surveys and, if  
6                   applicable, data recovery for all known or potential cultural sites subject to  
7                   ground disturbance. Pursuant to these mitigation measures, an Extended  
8                   Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation was conducted by SAIC in 2004  
9                   and monitored by Mike Lopez, Chumash monitor with DNA and  
10                  Associates. The investigation determined that the shell associated with  
11                  CA-SBa-3494 was a secondary, disturbed deposit and the rock shelter  
12                  was not associated with any prehistoric or historic cultural activity and no  
13                  further testing, monitoring or other measures were required.
- 14                  • 01-EIR-05 determined Sites CA-SBa-92, CA-SBa-1990 and SBA-iso-645  
15                  would not be directly impacted by landfill expansion, but may be indirectly  
16                  impacted through continued landfill operation and landfill closure  
17                  activities. These impacts were considered significant, but mitigable  
18                  (Class II) with the implementation of additional surveys if the sites were  
19                  subject to ground disturbance, stopping or redirecting work if cultural  
20                  remains were encountered, and cultural resource training program for  
21                  landfill staff.

22                  4.6.2.3 Approved Tajiguas Landfill Reconfiguration

23                         Based on field surveys completed for the Subsequent EIR prepared for the  
24                         Reconfiguration Project (see Conejo Archeological Consultants, 2008), landfill  
25                         reconfiguration would not impact any cultural resources at the Tajiguas Landfill  
26                         site.

27                  4.6.2.4 Proposed Tajiguas Resource Recovery Project

28                         **Impact TRRP CR-1: Ground disturbance associated with implementation**  
29                         **of the proposed project may result in damage to unknown archeological**  
30                         **resources at the landfill site – Class II Impact.**

31                         Based on past archeological field surveys and those conducted for the project,  
32                         no evidence of archeological resources were found in areas that would be  
33                         affected by project-related ground disturbance. However, excavation at the  
34                         tank sites has the potential to encounter unknown buried cultural resources.

35

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

**Mitigation Measures:**

**MM TRRP CR-1: Evaluation and Protection of Discovered Resources.** In the event that archaeological resources are exposed during construction, all earth disturbing work within the vicinity of the find shall be temporarily suspended or redirected until a professional archaeologist has been retained to evaluate the nature and significance of the find pursuant to a Phase 2 investigation. The RRWMD shall be notified immediately of any such find. The find shall be appropriately documented through a Phase 3 data recovery program and/or avoided if deemed necessary by a qualified archaeologist.

If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The above measures shall be reflected in the contract specifications for the Resource Recovery Project and shall be implemented if evidence of cultural resources are observed during project-related earth disturbing activities.

Monitoring: RRWMD shall monitor for compliance.

Residual Impacts. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce cultural resources Impact TRRP CR-1 associated with implementation of the proposed project to a level of less than significant.

**Relocated Landfill Facilities**

Operations facilities (primarily portable offices) may be temporarily relocated during the project construction period to an area north of the landfill top deck or to the southern portion of the landfill. Landfill equipment maintenance facilities would be relocated to the area north of the landfill top deck (see Figure 3-4). Cultural resources have not been found in the vicinity during previously completed archeological field surveys in the area. These facilities would be located within previously disturbed areas; therefore, discovery of cultural resources is not anticipated. Overall, no impacts to cultural resources would occur as a result of operation of relocation of landfill facilities.

1           4.6.2.5 Proposed Tajiguas Resource Recovery Project with Optional Comingled  
2           Source Separated Recyclables (CSSR) Component

3           The optional CSSR element would increase the building footprint of the MRF by  
4           approximately 10,000 square feet. This increase would occur within the  
5           proposed disturbance footprint of the project in areas constructed on  
6           engineered fill. No resources are recorded or expected to occur in these  
7           previously disturbed areas. Additionally, the number of employees on the site  
8           would increase by 20 during the day and there would be additional deliveries of  
9           recyclable materials and transport of sorted materials off-site after processing.  
10          These activities would occur within the same project footprint, with no increase  
11          in ground disturbance. Therefore, implementation of the optional CSSR  
12          element would not increase project-related impacts to cultural resources.

13          4.6.2.6 Extension of Landfill Life Impacts

14          **Impact TRRP CR-2: Project-related extension of the life of the Tajiguas**  
15          **Landfill would extend indirect impacts to archeological sites further in**  
16          **time – Class II Impact.**

17          As discussed in Section 3.4, project-related diversion of recyclable material and  
18          organic waste is anticipated to extend the life of the Tajiguas Landfill by about  
19          10 years. This effect would not involve any ground disturbance at the landfill  
20          site beyond what was been previously analyzed and permitted. The majority of  
21          the ground disturbance associated with construction of the remaining landfill  
22          disposal cells will occur prior to implementation of the proposed Resource  
23          Recovery Project, but with implementation, the rate of disposal in these  
24          constructed cells would be significantly reduced and delay overall closure of the  
25          landfill site. Therefore, CA-SBa-1990 and SBA-iso-645 may continue to be  
26          indirectly impacted through landfill operation (continued presence of landfill  
27          staff) and landfill closure activities. These impacts were considered significant,  
28          but mitigable (Class II) with the implementation of cultural resource training  
29          program for landfill staff, additional archeological investigation if these sites are  
30          impacted by closure or post-closure activities, and stopping or redirecting work  
31          if resource are discovered. These existing mitigation measures would continue  
32          to be applicable to the landfill over its extended life and no new landfill  
33          associated impacts to cultural resources would occur.

34          4.6.2.7 Decommissioning Impacts

35          Removal of project facilities (buildings, percolate tanks, bio-filters, buried  
36          pipelines, etc.) would occur within the construction disturbance area as shown  
37          in Figure 3-14. Therefore, no additional ground disturbance would be required  
38          that may encounter cultural resources. Any cultural resources found during  
39          construction would have been assessed and mitigated (if appropriate) as  
40          required under **Impact TRRP CR-1** and **MM TRRP CR-1**. Therefore, no  
41          additional cultural resources impacts would occur.

1           4.6.2.8 Cumulative Impacts of the Tajiguas Resource Recovery Project

2           The proposed project may incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts to  
3           cultural resources when considered with other planned projects in the region  
4           (see Section 3.6).

5           **Impact TRRP CR-CUM-1: Ground disturbance associated with the**  
6           **proposed project combined with disturbance associated with the**  
7           **cumulative projects could result in significant disturbance of unreported**  
8           **cultural resources – Class II Cumulative Impact; Project Contribution –**  
9           **Not Considerable with Mitigation (Class II).**

10          The project region (Gaviota coast) provides abundant resources for pre-historic  
11          human populations and includes numerous archeological sites, as indicated by  
12          14 sites located within 0.5 miles of the landfill site (Conejo Archeological  
13          Consultants, 2008), and over 240 pre-historic and historic archeological sites  
14          identified within the Gaviota Coast Plan Area (Santa Barbara County, 2013).

15          Significant impacts to archeological sites would occur as a result of the ~~Las~~  
16          ~~Varas/Edwards Ranch~~ and Paradiso del Mare projects, and indirect impacts to  
17          known sites would occur at Santa Barbara Ranch. In addition, these and other  
18          cumulative projects listed in Section 3.6 have the potential to disturb unreported  
19          cultural resources in the region.

20          The importance of cultural resources that may be discovered during  
21          implementation of these projects is unknown; therefore, the significance of such  
22          impacts cannot be determined. Given the cultural sensitivity of the area, most of  
23          these cumulative projects would also include measures requiring ground  
24          disturbing activities to be stopped or redirected if resources are discovered.  
25          However, such impacts are considered potentially significant for the purposes  
26          of this Subsequent EIR.

27          The proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts  
28          associated with recorded cultural resource sites and with implementation of  
29          site-specific cultural resource measures **MM TRRP CR-1**, the project's  
30          contribution to potentially significant impacts to unreported cultural resources in  
31          the region would not be cumulatively considerable.