

4.2

CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.2.1 INTRODUCTION

The Cultural Resources section of the EIR addresses cultural resources, specifically historic resources, in the project vicinity. Historic resources include structures, features, artifacts, and sites that date from Euroamerican settlement of the region. The analysis within this section of the EIR summarizes the existing setting with respect to historic resources, identifies thresholds of significance, describes the potential effects of the proposed project on resources, and sets forth mitigation measures that would be necessary to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Information for this section is primarily drawn from the Historical Effects Analysis Study (see Appendix G)¹ and the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Continuation Sheets (see Appendix H)² prepared by Historic Resource Associates, as well as the DPR 523 Primary Record and Building, Structure, and Object (BSO) Record prepared by Kara Brunzell (see Appendix I)³. In addition, information from the Davis General Plan is referenced.⁴

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project determined that the discovery of underlying archeological, paleontological, and/or tribal resources is not expected for the project area. As such, the Cultural Resources section of the EIR does not include a discussion of such resources and, instead, focuses on historical resources. See the Initial Study (see Appendix C) to this EIR for a detailed discussion regarding archaeological, paleontological, and tribal resources.

4.2.2 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project site is currently developed with a two-story, approximately 53,000-square-foot (sf) office building and associated site improvements, including two surface parking lots located to the north and east of the building. Approximately 118 trees are located at the site entry way, along the building perimeter, and throughout the parking lots. The remainder of the project site is vacant and is primarily dominated by weedy, ruderal vegetation. An approximately 12-foot-high soil berm surrounds the existing building and extends along the northern side of the parking lot located to the east of the building.

The following discussion includes a background on the historic context of the site, recent project site analysis, and a detailed description of the existing on-site building.

¹ Historic Resource Associates. *Historical Effects Analysis Study of 3820 Chiles Road, Davis, Yolo County, California 95616*. October 2017. Revised March 2018.

² Historic Resource Associates. *3820 Chiles Road, Davis, California. DPR 523 Continuation Sheets*. September 2017.

³ Brunzell, Kara. *3820 Chiles Road, Davis, California. DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record*. November 11, 2013.

⁴ City of Davis. *Davis General Plan*. Adopted May 2001. Amended through January 2007.

Historic Context of the Project Site

The 3820 Chiles Road building is now located well within the City boundaries of Davis, but when planning for the structure first began in 1964, the site was still on Yolo County land, some two miles east of Davis. Five years prior, in 1959, a local developer, Bruce Mace, and his sons, Herbert and C. Fredland, had begun developing the El Macero Country Club outside of Davis city limits. They intended the development to eventually include several hundred homes, a championship-grade golf course, and an extensive, up-scale commercial district located just off of Interstate 80. By July of 1964, construction had begun on a Standard Oil service station, and the Mace family announced plans to convert 23 acres of bean fields into a 250-room motel, the Voyager Inn, and the new offices for the Intercoast Life Insurance Company.

The Intercoast Life Insurance Company began business in 1932 as a health insurance provider for employees of Sutter Hospital in Sacramento. The business incorporated in 1936 as the Intercoast Hospitalization Insurance Association and began to expand coverage. In 1947, the company purchased an office at 3140 J Street in Sacramento and began issuing life insurance policies in addition to health plans. In 1961, the firm issued stock, becoming a publicly-traded company under the name of Intercoast Life Insurance Company. By 1964, Intercoast was doing business in 12 states and had 250 employees. Intercoast Life Insurance Company had outgrown the Sacramento headquarters and began searching for a new property. The company favored a large site with low land costs that would allow for later development, while also looking to remain closely connected to Sacramento. The Mace family property met the aforementioned needs and additionally offered high visibility from a heavily-traveled interstate that had recently been broadened to six lanes with improved access to Sacramento due to a newly expanded causeway. The nearby University of California, Davis (UC Davis) campus was also an attraction due to the potential availability of skilled employees. The president of Intercoast, Homer Martin, sealed the deal by relocating his own home to the El Macero Country Club, purchasing a lot along the 18th fairway.

The architectural firm selected for the design job was Barovetto & Thomas, with Silvio “Slim” Barovetto as lead. The firm was located on Alhambra Boulevard in Sacramento, but Barovetto lived in Davis, at 237 Rice Lane, and he belonged to a family that has left an indelible mark on Davis.

Silvio Barovetto’s father, Giovanni Barovetto, was an Italian immigrant who came to the U.S. in 1907 at the age of 30, accompanied by his bride, Giuseppina (Josephine) Barovetto (néé Rocca). A viticulturist by training and trade, Barovetto was recruited as an assistant by Professor Frederic Bioletti, who persuaded Barovetto to follow him to Davis, accepting an appointment in 1912 as a viticultural assistant for the University Farm in Davis. Silvio Barovetto was not on the faculty of the University and did not have teaching or research responsibilities, but served as a long-term and highly-skilled agricultural supervisor in a field critical to the University’s early success. His death on September 18, 1948 was treated as the lead news article in that week’s *Davis Enterprise*, where he was hailed as “one of the foremost authorities in his line of work” and “a substantial citizen” of the town. Around the time of his move to Davis, Giovanni Barovetto had purchased two lots at the corner of A and 2nd Street, a half block from the University. Shortly after, he had a Craftsman residence and a water tank tower built on the site. To what extent Giovanni Barovetto played a direct role in designing and/or building the two structures is unclear, though he was believed to be

personally responsible for later overseeing the conversion of the water tank into a tank house residence. Through most of Silvio Barovetto's childhood, the family lived in the converted tank house and rented the Craftsman home to boarders. Both properties have since been designated as Merit Resources by the City of Davis.

In 1946, Silvio Barovetto co-founded the architectural firm of Barovetto & Thomas. The initial work performed by the firm is not clear, but by the early 1950s, they were receiving regular commissions for work on the UC Davis campus. The first assignments were for small-scale agricultural buildings. The first large commission was for Hoagland Hall (1959), home of the Soils and Plant Nutrition departments, followed by Titus Residence Hall (1959), the Young Hall Addition (1962), and the Hickey Gym addition (1963). The firm also devised a 1956 Master Plan for the UC Davis campus. By the early 1960s, the firm was receiving commissions for various commercial and education buildings throughout the greater Sacramento area. Such projects included at least three branch banking buildings in a Modern style in Sacramento, and the complete design from the ground up of American River College. Later projects included the Sacramento Community Center, the expansion of the Sacramento Medical Center (later UC Davis Medical Center), and the remodeling of the Senator Hotel and the Weinstocks building in Sacramento.

During the 1960s, the firm made its greatest impact in the City of Davis. Barovetto & Thomas received the commission for nearly every public facility built within the City during the decade. Such facilities included Davis High School (1960); Holmes Junior High School (1966); the elementary schools of North Davis (1957), Birch Lane (1962), and Pioneer (1966); the Davis Branch of the Yolo County Library (1968); and the master plan for Davis Community Park. Through the aforementioned buildings, Barovetta left a legacy of Modern architecture in the City that is an essential element of Davis's optimistic identity through the decade. During this era is when Barovetto received the commission for the Interstate Life Insurance Building, the only large corporate project that he would attempt in Davis. It should be noted that during the aforementioned period of time, the Barovetto family made another large impact on the Davis community. Silvio's son, John Barovetto, the oldest of his four children, has come to be recognized as a hometown hero for Davis for being a stand-out athlete in several sports, as well as for his time in the Army beginning in 1964, where he was later killed in 1968 while directing an armored personnel carrier that was attempting to rescue the crew and passengers of a downed helicopter. Based on a letter John sent home during his time in the Army that mentioned the plight of the Vietnamese internal refugees, the donation project "Operation Helping Hands" was started, where Davis residents sent food, soap, and other essential goods to Captain Barovetto for distribution. John Barovetto is commemorated today with a public park in his namesake near the eastern edge of the City.

The firm of Barovetto & Thomas continues to the current day, though the name has changed several times. The firm was known as Barovetto & Thomas from 1946 to 1967; then Barovetto, Carissimi and Rohrer from 1967 to 1969; Carissimi Rohrer Associates from 1969 until a date after 1994; and is now known as CRM Architects & Planners, still based in Sacramento. Over the years that he ran the firm, Silvio Barovetto gave many new architects a first start. His obituary in the *Sacramento Bee* credited him with launching the careers of at least six of Sacramento's premier architects, and he was remembered as a highly personable figure who cultivated life-long relationships with those he had mentored. He was a member of the Faculty Club at UC Davis and the Sutter Club in Sacramento. A devoted golfer, he was a charter member of the El Macero

Country Club, a connection that might have helped land him the Intercoast Life Insurance Company contract.

For the building at 3820 Chiles Road, Silvio Barovetto produced his boldest design to date, and perhaps ever, according to the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record, as the design was considered very modern for its time.⁵ The building was constructed in 1966 by Campbell Construction Company for Intercoast Life Insurance Company.

Historic records, particularly newspaper accounts, document the quick demise of Intercoast Life Insurance Company during the late 1960s, and, ultimately, the company's liquidation and acquisition, just five years after opening, by the Pacific Standard Life Insurance Company in 1971. While Pacific Standard Life Insurance Company bought Intercoast in 1970 and the corporate name changed, the Davis building remained the insurer's headquarters. The company employed 224 people in Davis and had more than \$700 million in assets. Pacific Standard Life Insurance carried on after the demise of Intercoast for nearly 20 years, but came to an end in the late 1980s. By the 1970s-1980s, the economy of Davis had diversified, with other financial institutions opening in Davis. The demise of Pacific Standard Life Insurance Company came as a result of national-level changes that swept through the financial industry during the 1980s. In 1983, a Texas real estate enthusiast, Gene Phillips, purchased Pacific Standard for \$30 million. Six years later, the company was insolvent and had laid off nearly all staff members. Pacific Standard Life Insurance Company was formally declared closed on December 30, 1999.

Both Intercoast Life Insurance Company and Pacific Standard Life Insurance Company played an important role in the economic history of Davis; however, the economic and sociocultural impact of the Intercoast Life Insurance Company on Davis and Yolo County is speculative, given that the company's import to the region was short-lived.

The Barovetto building on Chiles Road sat largely vacant since the demise of Pacific Standard Life Insurance Company. The flag poles and former company signs have all been removed and, in general, the site's external facilities and landscaping have fallen into a state of lightly-maintained disrepair. The building itself remains fully intact with strong integrity.

Recent Project Site Analysis

UC Davis began a lease of the property in 2014 for 20 years with an option to purchase the building and the site at a favorable price. After considering the purchase of the building, UC Davis decided not to exercise the option to purchase due to poor location and seismic issues discovered by consulting engineers. Remedying the seismic issues would have added considerable, but unknown, costs to an anticipated rehabilitation of the building. The locational issue was not distance from the UC Davis campus, but isolation, as 3820 Chiles Road is not adjacent to other offices and providers of support services. After extensive due diligence, UC Davis concluded that, despite a favorable purchase price and the University's interest in physical

⁵ Brunzell, Kara. *3820 Chiles Road, Davis, California. DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record*. November 11, 2013.

expansion, the building was not worth rehabilitating in light of the building's structural and locational limitations.

After taking back possession of the property in 2015, with the intention of restoring the building, the property owner assembled a study team to assess the practicality of developing the site with the existing structure as the centerpiece of an office/research and development (R&D) park. The team was composed of a contractor, an architect, an engineer, two commercial real estate brokers, and the owner. The team concluded saving the building was impractical, due to a combination of structural and design issues. Paramount among these were seismic deficiencies identified by engineers retained by UC Davis. Other major impediments identified by the study team included its isolated location, gross deficiencies with respect to Title 24 and ADA requirements, obsolete design and layout, and the vault-like basement.

The study team concluded that rehabilitating the building would cost what a new building would cost without meeting modern design standards for commercial buildings and could cost considerably more with unknown expenses. Far from representing an asset for economic development, the site and obsolete building could stand dark for many years. As such, the owner determined the existing structure should be demolished in favor of uses for which current demand exists. After confronting the impracticality of restoring the obsolete building, the study team analyzed the feasibility of demolishing the building and developing a new office/R&D park on the site, without the burden of the existing building.

Multiple plot plans and pro formas were considered. The challenge was two-fold. First, commercial real estate brokers on the team argued that R&D and office tenants prefer to co-locate with similar uses and with service providers in a "campus" environment, which resonated with UC Davis' second reason for leaving the site. To overcome the first challenge, the team proposed incorporating open space amenities for employees and visitors on the proposed site. In the current market, the team determined the site should include five parking spaces per 1,000 sf of building rather than the required four spaces. Such provisions materially reduce the buildable square footage. Secondly, the brokers estimated a five- to seven-year buildout of any office/R&D park built on the site. In addition to tying up millions of dollars in infrastructure, such time restraints exacerbates risk by making the project vulnerable to any new, larger research park approved in the interim.

The City's Deputy Chief Innovation Officer subsequently contacted the property owner in August 2015 expressing interest in using the building to stimulate economic development in Davis. The City remained interested in the possibility that the building could be used to attract a major technology firm from the Bay Area. An informal arrangement was agreed upon under which the City economic development team and Greater Sacramento CEO, Barry Broome, would draw the property to the attention of a specific internationally-known tech giant and/or other firms expressing interest in the region. The owner could pursue alternative uses, but was asked to support the economic development effort by having a rendering of the building drawn for use by economic development officers of the City and Greater Sacramento. The owner additionally developed a printed brochure and two-minute animated rendering in an effort to attract tech industry giants to Davis. After the passage of a full year, local officials indicated that they had not been able to identify a single prospective tenant to show the materials requested.

In the summer of 2016, Cushman and Wakefield, an international commercial real estate brokerage firm, assessed the viability of creating a new office building on the site. The site-specific numbers were very close to numbers produced by the 2015 Study Team. Subsequently in 2017, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) analyzed the viability of developing the site under four land use scenarios, with three of the four options requiring demolition of the existing structure: adaptive reuse of the existing building for office/R&D use; construction of a new office/R&D building; construction of mid-sized retail; or construction of for-sale and rental housing as contemplated in the proposed project.⁶

EPS determined that developing the site for office/R&D purposes, either by adaptively reusing the old building or by starting with new construction, is not economically feasible. Adaptive reuse would require one-time and on-going losses, having an estimated total present value of \$6.6 million even when zero cost is attached to the land. Under such a scenario, the building would retain locational and functional limitations. New construction of an office/R&D building would yield a more functional building without remedying locational limitations, but was still estimated to lose approximately \$4.1 million without allowance for land costs. EPS identified low commercial rents prevailing in the Davis and regional markets as the source of the estimated losses. For an office/R&D project to be feasible for an investor and lender, monthly lease rates would have to rise by approximately 50 percent (\$2.90 per gross leasable square foot), which would not be feasible in the current market. An unsubsidized adaptive reuse project would be viable in a lease rate regime of \$5.00 per square foot per month.

The conclusion of EPS that office/R&D is infeasible on the site corroborates the previously discussed findings: the decision of UC Davis not to purchase and renovate the building following their 2014 due diligence; the findings of the 2015 Study Group and the 2016 Cushman & Wakefield analysis; and the fruitless marketing efforts of the owner, his brokers, and City and regional economic development authorities since early 2015.

The demand for rental housing in Davis is well documented. The 2017 Apartment Vacancy and Rental Rate Survey prepared for UC Davis indicates a vacancy rate of just 0.2 percent. While several apartment projects are currently proposed or recently approved, recent projects have focused on purpose-designed student housing, such as the approved Sterling Apartments, Lincoln40, and proposed Plaza 2555, Nishi, and Davis Live projects. In a Housing Workshop presentation to the Davis City Council on July 11, 2017, City staff noted that 816 to 1,059 new apartment units would be required to meet existing student housing needs. Existing needs exclude both general community growth needs and demand on city rental units due to UC Davis growth. Based on such information, the best viable option for the project site would be demolition of the existing structure for residential development.

⁶ Historic Resource Associates. *Historical Effects Analysis Study of 3820 Chiles Road, Davis, Yolo County, California 95616*. October 2017. Revised March 2018.

Existing On-Site Building Details

According to the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record, the existing on-site building is a two-story, reinforced concrete, office building that was designed in “New Formalism” style of architecture. As stated above, the building was originally built between 1965 and 1966, designed by Silvio Barovetto of Barovetto & Thomas of Sacramento, and built by Campbell Construction Company for Intercoast Life Insurance Company.

The building is currently approximately 188 feet by 148 feet, with a 40-foot by 60-foot, two-story, interior courtyard with seven arches on the shorter sides, with a gross size of 53,000 sf. The rectangular building has a symmetrical design, with the main, public entrance on the longest axis of the north side of the building (see Figure 4.2-1). An employee and deliveries entrance is located adjacent to a parking lot on the east. The central interior courtyard, located towards the northwest corner of the building, opens through both building levels. The flat-roofed building is completely surrounded on the upper level by concrete arches that are supported by a footing or base cantilevered four feet out from the lower-level walls. The arches, which are flush with the roof, are less structural than ornamental, and unlike the pilasters, appear to carry only the membrane of the roof. The arch openings, nine each on the building’s longer sides and five each on the shorter, are rectangular with rounded corners and are silhouetted against a background of dark gray tile and tinted windows (see Figure 4.2-2). The lower level is hidden from street view by a 10-foot-high berm that completely surrounds the building with the exception of a narrow opening off the east parking lot. Windows on the lower level are smaller and irregularly placed.

Figure 4.2-1
View of Existing Building Entrance



**Figure 4.2-2
View of Existing Building Side**



Separate from the main building is a single-story promontory structure, approximately 50 feet by 10 feet, which juts out from the front entrance, with flights of stairs on both sides. A 40-foot bridge connects the promontory structure to the main building's public entrance on the top floor. On top of the promontory structure, linearly arranged along the long axis, are the bases for three flag poles. The three original 60-foot flag poles were removed at an unknown date. The promontory structure is a closed structure without interior space nor doors or windows. The building sits on a parcel of approximately 7.4 acres. The building and employee parking lot are set back from the frontage road by about 200 feet, with a large lawn area in front. The berm that surrounds the building extends from the front of the building to an additional 600 feet to the east, creating a long, low revetment that conceals the employee parking lot and originally provided a base for the company sign. The sign was made from 30 separate letters, each approximately three feet by five feet, that were spaced along the berm and individually lit at night. The sign is not present any longer and was likely removed following the failure of the insurance company in 1989.⁷ In general, the site's external facilities and landscaping have fallen into a state of lightly-maintained disrepair. The building itself remains fully intact with strong integrity.

4.2.3 REGULATORY CONTEXT

Federal, State, and local governments have developed laws and regulations designed to protect significant cultural resources that may be affected by actions that they undertake or regulate. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act

⁷ Brunzell, Kara. *3820 Chiles Road, Davis, California. DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record*. November 11, 2013.

(CEQA) are the basic federal and State laws governing preservation of historic resources of national, regional, State, and local significance.

Federal Regulations

The following are the federal environmental laws and policies relevant to cultural resources.

Section 106 for the National Historical Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966

Federal regulations for cultural resources are governed primarily by Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966. Section 106 of NHPA requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and affords the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The Council's implementing regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties," are found in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800. The goal of the Section 106 review process is to offer a measure of protection to sites, which are determined eligible for listing on the NRHP. The criteria for determining NRHP eligibility are found in 36 CFR Part 60. Amendments to the Act (1986 and 1992) and subsequent revisions to the implementing regulations have, among other things, strengthened the provisions for Native American consultation and participation in the Section 106 review process. While federal agencies must follow federal regulations, most projects by private developers and landowners do not require this level of compliance. Federal regulations only come into play in the private sector if a project requires a federal permit or if the project uses federal funding.

National Register of Historic Places

NRHP is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. The NRHP includes listings of resources, including: buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, State, or local level. Resources over 50 years of age can be listed on the NRHP. However, properties under 50 years of age that are of exceptional significance or are contributors to a district can also be included on the NRHP. Four criteria are used to determine if a potential resource may be considered significant and eligible for listing on the NRHP. The criteria include resources that:

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

A resource can be individually eligible for listing on the NRHP under any of the above four criteria, or the resource can be listed as contributing to a group of resources that are listed on the NRHP.

A resource can be considered significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Once a resource has been identified as significant and potentially eligible for the NRHP, the resource's historic integrity must be evaluated. Determining a resource's integrity is a crucial part of assessing a potential resource's significance. The National Park Service identifies the types of integrity as a function of the seven factors listed below:

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred;
- **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property;
- **Setting** is the physical environment of the historic property;
- **Materials** are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property;
- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory;
- **Feeling** is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time; and
- **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

Integrity is based on significance: why, where, and when a property is important. Only after significance is fully established is the issue of integrity addressed. Ultimately, the question of integrity is answered by whether or not a potential resource retains the identity for which the resource is significant. Therefore, a resource may experience change over time, but if that resource retains the identity that makes the resource historic, the resource can be deemed historic despite changes having occurred over time. A resource must have at least two types of integrity and meet one of the four criteria listed above in order to qualify for the National Register.

State Regulations

The following are the State environmental laws and policies relevant to cultural resources.

California Environmental Quality Act

State historic preservation regulations affecting the project include the statutes and guidelines contained in CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 and Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines). CEQA requires lead agencies to consider the potential effects of a project on historic resources and unique archaeological resources. An "historic resource" includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript that is historically or archaeologically significant (PRC Section 5020.1). Under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, a resource is considered "historically significant" if the resource meets one or more of the following CRHR criteria:

1. The resource is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California history; or

2. The resource is associated with the lives of important persons from our past; or
3. The resource 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; or
4. The resource has yielded, or may be likely to yield, important information in prehistory or history.

In addition, the resource must retain integrity. Historical buildings, structures, and objects are usually eligible under Criteria 1, 2, and 3 based on historical research and architectural or engineering characteristics. The CEQA lead agency makes the determination of eligibility based on the results of the test program. Cultural resources determined eligible for the NRHP by a federal agency are automatically eligible for the CRHR.

CEQA requires preparation of an EIR if a proposed project would cause a “substantial adverse change” in the significance of a historical resource. A “substantial adverse change” would occur if a proposed project would result in 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 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1)). Material impairment of an historic resource is an action or alteration that adversely affects the physical characteristics of the resource, thus impairing the resource from conveying the historical significance of that resource (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2)).

California Register of Historic Places

The State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) maintains the CRHR. Properties that are listed on the NRHP are automatically listed on the CRHR, along with State Landmarks and Points of Interest. The CRHR can also include properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

Local Regulations

The following are the City of Davis’ policies relevant to historic cultural resources.

City of Davis General Plan

The applicable Davis General Plan policies and standards relating to cultural resources are presented below.

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Goal HIS 1 | Designate, preserve and protect the archaeological and historic resources within the Davis Community. |
| Policy HIS 1.2 | Incorporate measures to protect and preserve historic and archaeological resources into all planning and development. |

Standard HIS 1.2a: A cultural resources survey shall be required for development sites where cultural resource conditions are not known (as required by the Planning and Building Department). Resources within a project site that cannot be avoided should be evaluated. Additional research and test excavations, where appropriate, should be undertaken to determine whether the resource(s) meets CEQA and/or NRHP significance criteria. Impacts to significant resources that cannot be avoided will be mitigated in consultation with the lead agency for the project. Possible mitigation measures include:

- a data recovery program consisting of archaeological excavation to retrieve the important data from archaeological sites;
- development and implementation of public interpretation plans for both prehistoric and historic sites;
- preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction of historic structures according to Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties;
- construction of new structures in a manner consistent with the historic character of the region; and
- treatment of historic landscapes according to the Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Landscapes.

Goal HIS 2 Promote public awareness of the prehistoric and historic past of the Davis area.

Policy HIS 2.1 Add to the knowledge and understanding of Davis' past.

City of Davis Municipal Code

The following are applicable sections of the City's Municipal Code related to historic resources.

8.19.020 Demolitions in general

Demolition in the City may not occur without prior issuance of a demolition permit. The requirements for obtaining a demolition permit are included in the City's Municipal Code, Section 8.19.020. Demolition of structures carried out in accordance with Section 8.19.020 are generally considered ministerial projects, and thus are exempt from CEQA. However, as shown below, an exception to the CEQA exemption exists for demolition involving a structure identified as a historic resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

- A. Demolitions carried out in accordance with this section shall be statutorily exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15268 of CEQA as ministerial projects provided such a demolition is not for a structure identified as a historic resource, or a resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA Guidelines.

40.23 Historical Resources Management

The purpose of Section 40.23 of the City's Municipal Code is to identify, designate, protect, enhance, and perpetuate historic resources throughout the City. Section 40.23 further establishes a historical resources management commission, with various powers enumerated in Section 40.23.050, including the power to designate historical resources. Section 40.23.060, Davis Register of Historical Resources (DRHR) designation criteria, enumerates the criteria that must be used to designate a historical resource as a landmark, a merit resource, or a historic district and be listed on the DRHR. The key elements of the aforementioned criteria are as follows:

- A. **Landmarks.** Upon the recommendation of the historical resources management commission and approval of the city council a historical resource may be designated a landmark if the resource meets any of the following four criteria at the local, state, or national level of significance and retains a high level of historic integrity as defined by this article.
1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns in the history of Davis, California, or the nation; or
 2. Associated with the lives of significant persons in the history of Davis, California, or the nation; or
 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, architectural style or method of construction; or that represents the work of a master designer; or that possesses high artistic values; or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
 4. Has yielded or may likely yield archaeological or anthropological information important in the study of history, prehistory, or human culture.
- B. **Merit resources.** Upon the recommendation of the historical resources management commission and approval of the city council a historical resource may be designated a merit resource if the resource meets one of the following four criteria at the local level of significance and possesses historic integrity as defined under this article:
1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns in the history of Davis; or
 2. Associated with the lives of significant persons in the history of Davis; or
 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, architectural style or method of construction; or that represent the work of a master designer; or that possess high artistic values; or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
 4. Has yielded or may likely yield archaeological or anthropological information important in the study of history, prehistory, or human culture
- C. **Historic districts.** Upon the recommendation of the historical resources management commission and approval of the city council a group of historical resources may be designated an historic district if the district meets any of the following significance criteria:

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns in the history of Davis, California, or the nation; or
2. Associated with the lives of significant persons in the history of Davis, California, or the nation; or
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, architectural style or method of construction; or that represent the work of a master designer; or that possess high artistic values; or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
4. Has yielded or may likely yield archaeological or anthropological information important in the study of history, prehistory, or human culture.

It should be noted that if a resource is deemed to be NRHP or CRHR eligible, the resource is automatically listed on the DRHR.

South Davis Specific Plan

The South Davis Specific Plan does not contain any goals, objectives, or policies specifically related to cultural resources.

4.2.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The section below describes the standards of significance and methodology used to analyze and determine the proposed project's potential impacts related to cultural resources. In addition, a discussion of the project's impacts, as well as mitigation measures where necessary, is also presented.

Standards of Significance

A cultural impact may be considered to be significant if implementation of the proposed project would result in any of the following:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries;
- Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Issues Not Discussed Further

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix C) determined that development of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to cultural resources with mitigation incorporated related to the following:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

In addition, the Initial Study determined that with implementation of mitigation, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:

- Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

For the reasons cited in the Initial Study, the impacts discussed above are not analyzed further in this EIR.

Method of Analysis

The information and analysis presented in this section of the EIR is primarily based on the Historical Effects Analysis Study (see Appendix G) and DPR 523 Continuation Sheets (see Appendix H) prepared by Historic Resource Associates, as well as the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record prepared by Kara Brunzell (see Appendix I). The methodology used for the aforementioned documents is described in further detail below.

DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record

In November 2013, Kara Brunzell completed a DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record focused on the existing structure at 3820 Chiles Road. The Brunzell evaluation relies upon review of numerous archived articles published in the Davis Enterprise and the Sacramento Bee, as well as other local publications, and a site visit. The information gathered by Brunzell was used to determine the potential historicity of the subject structure. Evaluation of the structure by Kara Brunzell was conducted on November 21, 2013.

DPR 523 Continuation Sheets

The DPR 523 Continuation Sheets is an update to the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record prepared for the existing building by Kara Brunzell as described above. The DPR 523 Continuation Sheets, similar to the Primary Record and BSO Record, rely upon review of existing documents related to the existing property and a site visit documenting the current condition of the existing structure. The DPR 523 Continuation Sheets were completed by Dana E. Supernowicz on September 4, 2017 and were used to determine the potential historicity of the on-site structure. The purpose of the Continuation Sheets was to update and reexamine the building at 3820 Chiles Road, taking into consideration the building's history, architecture, and the requisite criteria that should be applied to determine if indeed the building has historic significance at the local, regional, State, or national level.

Historical Resource Analysis Study

Historic Resource Associates completed a Historical Resources Analysis focused on the existing structure at 3820 Chiles Road. The Historical Resources Analysis used the information gathered from the DPR 523 Primary Record, BSO Record, and Continuation Sheets described above, as well as review of a number of other existing documents, to evaluate the subject structure's eligibility to be considered a historical resource pursuant to CEQA.

Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The following discussion of impacts is based on the implementation of the proposed project in comparison with the standards of significance identified above.

4.2-1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Based on the analysis below, even with mitigation, the impact is *significant and unavoidable*.

The existing on-site structure is 52 years old and, thus, would meet the prerequisite for eligibility for listing on the NRHP. Accordingly, the structure is evaluated against each NRHP and CRHR eligibility criterion, as well as the DRHR criteria as set forth in Section 40.23 of the City's Municipal Code, in further detail below in order to determine the structure's eligibility for listing and designation as a historic resource.

NRHP Criterion A/CRHR Criterion 1 and Davis Historical Landmark Criteria

For NRHP and CRHR eligibility under NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1, respectively, a resource must be associated with one or more event or historic theme of importance. According to the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record, based on the building's association with the broad patterns of the history of Davis, the commercial development of Yolo County and the City of Davis, and the financial crisis of the late 1980s in California, the building was considered eligible for listing under NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1. However, according to Historic Resource Associates' update provided in the DPR 523 Continuation Sheets, while both Intercoast Life Insurance Company and Pacific Standard Life Insurance Company helped boost the local economy, so did many

other local firms, large and small, including UC Davis. In addition, the original firm that occupied the subject property, Intercoast Life Insurance Company, was only in the building for a few short years (1966-1970). As a result, according to the DPR 523 Continuation Sheets, the building is not eligible for listing under NRHP Criterion A or CRHR Criterion 1.

Similarly, the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record originally determined the building to be considered a Davis landmark resource, eligible for listing on the DRHR. A landmark resource means buildings, structures, objects, signs, features, sites, places, areas, cultural landscapes or other improvements of the highest scientific, aesthetic, educational, cultural, archaeological, architectural, or historical value to the citizens of the City of Davis. A landmark is deemed to be so important to the historical and architectural fabric of the community that loss of the resource would be deemed a major loss to the community. According to the DPR 523 Continuation Sheets, neither the property's architectural design, past owners, nor association with UC Davis would elevate the building to listing as a Davis Landmark property. While the property is significant architecturally, as described in further detail below, the place or contribution to the community as a whole is not substantiated by the historical evidence. As such, the building is not eligible for listing under the DRHR as a Davis historical landmark.⁸

NRHP Criterion B/CRHR Criterion 2 and Davis Merit Resource Criteria 1 and 2

Under NRHP Criterion B/CRHR Criterion 2, eligibility for listing would apply only to resources associated with individuals whose specific contributions to history can be identified and documented as significant in our past. Similarly, for Criteria 1 and 2 for listing on the DRHR as a merit resource, a resource must be associated with significant historic events and/or lives of significant persons in the history of Davis. The existing on-site structure is considered eligible for inclusion in the DRHR as a merit resource⁹ due to the building's association with the life of Silvio Barovetto, a prominent architect, who, according to the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record, helped define the character of Davis during the 1960s. In addition, members of the Barovetto family across three generations have been prominent public figures in Davis.

Although Silvio Barovetto and the Barovetto family are considered historically important for the City of Davis, and the building is eligible for inclusion in the DRHR as a merit resource, Barovetto & Thomas were prolific architects with architectural designs represented in a number of other buildings in Sacramento and throughout northern California. Silvio Barovetto's work in such other areas was less central to the emergence of a sense of place. In addition, while Silvio Barovetto, whose family is well known in Davis, designed the subject property along with Thomas, the building is not personalized nor does the building have a strong association with Barovetto, as does the Barovetto family residence located at 209 2nd Street in Davis. Accordingly, based on the DPR 523

⁸ Historic Resource Associates. *3820 Chiles Road, Davis, California. DPR 523 Continuation Sheets*. September 2017.

⁹ *Ibid.*

Continuation Sheets, the individual significance of Silvio Barovetto is not large enough to merit statewide or national significance such that the on-site structure would be considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR under NRHP Criterion B/CRHR Criterion 2.¹⁰

NRHP Criterion C/CRHR Criterion 3 and Davis Merit Resource Criterion 3

Under NRHP Criterion C/CRHR Criterion 3, a resource could be eligible for listing if the resource illustrates important concepts in design and planning, if the landscape reflects an important historical trend, is distinguished in design or layout, and is the result of skilled craftsmanship. The existing building is considered a standout example of mid-century Modern architecture in a New Formalism style, and, thus, embodies the distinctive characteristics of that type and period of construction. It should be noted that, according to the Historical Resources Analysis, simply because a building was designed in the “New Formalism” approach to Postmodernist architecture does not automatically qualify the structure as historically significant. The postmodernist style is also represented in Davis in a variety of commercial/office buildings, particularly those buildings built on the UC Davis campus during the 1960s; however, the campus does not have good examples of the “New Formalism” style of Postmodernist architecture.

Another consideration is the association with the subject property and architects Barovetto & Thomas, whose work embodies many of the elements of Postmodernist design. New Formalism is an architectural design that developed in the U.S. during the mid-1950s and flourished in the 1960s, evidenced by hundreds of commercial, civic, and institutional buildings constructed in such a style. Buildings designed in the New Formalism style exhibited many Classical elements, particularly uniform symmetry, proportion, scale, stylized colonnades, and entablatures. Modern reinforced concrete and precast concrete materials allowed for a wide variety of applications of the style. Edward Durrell Stone's New Delhi American Embassy (1954), which blended the architecture of the east with modern western concepts, is considered to be the beginning of New Formalism architecture in America.

In summary, the subject building was designed in a Postmodernist style of architecture by the prominent local architectural firm of Barovetto & Thomas, whose work is also featured on a number of buildings in Davis, as well as Yolo and Sacramento County. Assuming New Formalism is a significant form of Postmodernist architecture, the subject property at 3820 Chiles Road is an important example of that form of architecture in Davis. Equally important is the association of the building with the architectural firm of Barovetto & Thomas, whose work reflects an important chapter of architectural design in Davis after World War II. Therefore, the building represents an important local example of Postmodernist commercial or corporate architecture of the late 1960s and is eligible for listing per NRHP Criterion C/CRHR Criterion 3.¹¹

¹⁰ Brunzell, Kara. *3820 Chiles Road, Davis, California. DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record*. November 11, 2013.

¹¹ Historic Resource Associates. *3820 Chiles Road, Davis, California. DPR 523 Continuation Sheets*. September 2017.

In addition, Criterion 3 for listing on the DRHR as a merit resource is whether a resource embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, architectural style or method of construction; represents the work of a master designer; possesses high artistic values; or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. Based on the discussion above, the property is significant architecturally and is considered eligible for listing on the DRHR as a merit resource per Criterion 3. While a similar criterion exists for eligibility as a Davis historical landmark, for the reasons described under NRHP Criterion A/CRHR Criterion 1 and Davis Historical Landmark Criteria above, the building's sense of place or contribution to the community as a whole is not substantiated by the historical evidence. As such, the building is not eligible for listing under the DRHR as a Davis historical landmark.

NRHP Criterion D/CRHR Criterion 4 and Davis Merit Resource Criterion 4

In rare instances, buildings themselves can serve as sources of important information about historic construction materials or technologies. To be eligible under NRHP Criterion D/CRHR Criterion 4 and Criterion 4 for listing on the DRHR as a merit resource, a site must have yielded or have the potential to yield important information. The existing building does not appear to be a principal source of such important information. Accordingly, based on the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record, as well as the DPR 523 Continuation Sheets, the property is ineligible for listing on the NRHP, CRHR, or DRHR under Criterion D/4, for informational or scientific values, as the building does not provide for such information.

Davis Historic District Criteria

As defined by the City of Davis, a "Historic District" means a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. The importance of a district is derived from being a unified entity, although often composed of a wide variety of resources. The identity of a Historic District results from the interrelationship of the resources, which could convey a visual sense of the overall historic environment or be an arrangement of historically- or functionally-related properties. The subject property does not fall within a geographical or geophysical location that is unified by both location, setting, and temporally discreet development, in part as a result of contemporary infill within the neighborhood. As a result, the existing building is not considered part of a historic district and is not eligible for listing on the DRHR as such.

Integrity

Eligibility for listing rests on significance, as well as integrity of a resource. A property must have both factors to be considered eligible. Loss of integrity, if sufficiently great, would overwhelm the historical significance of a resource and render the resource ineligible. According to the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record, the subject property retains integrity. The DPR 523 Continuation Sheets confirm that since the DPR 523 Primary Record and BSO Record was completed in 2013, few, if any, changes have

occurred to the subject property. Therefore, the architectural integrity of the building's design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, location, and association remains high.

Conclusion

Based on the above, the existing structure at 3820 Chiles Road is determined to be historically significant to the City of Davis and eligible for listing on the DRHR as a merit resource. The building is also eligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR under NRHP Criterion C and CRHR Criterion 3. As such, the structure is considered a historic resource per the requirements of CEQA.

Due to the structure being considered a historic resource per the requirements of CEQA, demolition of the structure, which would occur under the Preferred Site Plan and Alternative B, would be considered a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Therefore, the impact would be considered *significant*.

Mitigation Measure(s)

Implementation of the following mitigation measure for both the Preferred Site Plan and Alternative B would require proper documentation and recording of the historic resource. However, additional feasible mitigation to fully mitigate for the loss of the historic resource does not exist. Therefore, even with mitigation, the impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

4.2-1 *Prior to demolition of the existing on-site building, the applicant shall:*

- a) *Retain a qualified architectural historian, as approved by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability, to prepare a "Historic Documentation Report." The report shall include current photographs of each building displaying each elevation, architectural details or features, and overview of the buildings, together with a textual description of the building along with additional history of the building, its principal architect or architects, and its original occupants. The photo-documentation shall be done in accordance to HABS/HAER guidelines, which should include archival quality negatives and prints. The final Report shall be deposited with the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability, the Hattie Weber Museum, and the State Office of Historic Preservation, and other appropriate organizations and agencies as identified by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability.*
- b) *Place and maintain a publicly accessible space for a memorial or interpretive plaque/display on or near the former location of the subject property, identifying the former location of the building, its*

original owner, and its historic significance as it relates to Postmodern architectural design.

Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The following discussion of impacts is based on the implementation of the proposed project in combination with other proposed and pending projects in the region. Refer to Chapter 5, Statutorily Required Sections, of this EIR for more detail.

4.2-2 Cumulative development in the City of Davis, in conjunction with the development of the proposed project, could contribute incrementally to the regional loss of historic resources in the City of Davis. Based on the analysis below, the cumulative impact would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact.

While some historic resources may have regional significance, the resources themselves are site-specific, and impacts to them are project-specific. For example, impacts to a historic resource at one project site are generally not made worse by impacts from another project to a completely separate historic resource at another site. Rather, the resources and the effects upon them are generally independent. A possible exception to the site-specific nature of historic resource impacts would be a historic resource that represents the last known example of its kind or is part of larger resources such as a single building along an intact historic Main Street. For such a resource, cumulative impacts, and the contribution of the proposed project to them, may be cumulatively significant. Such is not the case for the proposed project.

As discussed above, the existing on-site structure, while determined to be considered a historic resource, is not considered part of a historic district, as the subject property does not fall within a geographical or geophysical location that is unified by both location, setting, and temporally discreet development. In addition, while the building represents a relatively rare example of Postmodernist architecture in Davis, other representative properties exist in Davis that fall under the same broad classification. Thus, the loss of the existing building at 3820 Chiles Road would not result in the demise of the last building of its type or design in Davis.

Based on the above, any potential impacts resultant of the proposed project would only affect the existing on-site resource. Similarly, any potential impacts to historic resources due to other individual developments in the City would be project- and site-specific and would not likely affect other sites throughout the City, with the rare exception that the resource is part of a larger historic district. In addition, similar to the proposed project, future development within the City would be subject to environmental review and would be required to implement all feasible mitigation to ensure that impacts are reduced to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, cumulative development in the City of Davis, in conjunction with the development of the proposed project, would result in a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact related the regional loss of historic resources in the City of Davis.

Mitigation Measure(s)
None required.