7.0 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR"; "DEIR") considers and evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed Project on historical, cultural, and paleontological resources. Cultural resources are defined as prehistoric and historic sites, structures, and districts, or any other physical evidence associated with human activity considered important to a culture, a subculture, or a community for scientific, traditional, religious, or any other reason. Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and formations which have produced fossil material.

For analysis purposes, cultural resources may be categorized into four groups: archaeological resources (prehistoric and historical); historic properties, buildings, and districts; areas of importance to Native Americans; and paleontological resources (fossilized remains of plants and animals). Cultural resource impacts include those to existing historic resources (i.e., historic districts, landmarks, etc.) and to archaeological and paleontological resources.

Concepts and Terminology for Evaluation of Cultural Resources

The following definitions are common terms used to discuss the regulatory requirements and treatment of cultural resources:

Cultural resource is the term used to describe several different types of properties: prehistoric and historical archaeological sites; architectural properties such as buildings, bridges, and infrastructure; and resources of importance to Native Americans.

Historic property is a term defined by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion on, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property.

Historical resources is a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) term that includes buildings, sites, structures, objects, or districts, each of which may have historical, prehistoric, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific importance, and is eligible for listing or is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or a local registry of historical resources.

Paleontological resources is defined as including fossilized remains of vertebrate and invertebrate organisms, fossil tracks and trackways, and plant fossils. A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil-bearing rock strata.

7.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

7.1.1 Cultural Setting

The proposed Project is the house of worship buildings and ancillary improvements proposed to be developed by the applicant. This proposed Project, as defined in the Project application, would occupy approximately 17 acres in the northwest corner of the Property. The proposed Project also includes a series of retaining walls to accommodate the lower-level parking areas, a sound wall along the western property line, and modifications and improvements to the existing spillway on the pond located in the south-central portion of the Project site. This area will be accessed during the construction of the Project from the Project site by way of existing dirt roads.

The Project site is located southeast of the intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and Nightwatch Drive in southeastern Placer County. Based on Rocklin 7.5-minute United States Geological Survey (USGS, 1967) Topographic Map, the site is located in the southwest quarter of Section 28, Township 11, North 7 Range East MDM. As defined in Chapter 1.0, Introduction, of this DEIR, the Project site is the real property described by the Project application and comprises a single parcel identified by two assessor's parcel numbers (APN 046-050-006 and APN 046-050-008) totaling 74.2 acres, bordered by Sierra College Boulevard on the north between Nightwatch Drive and Ridge Park Drive and on the south by property at the end of Oak Hill Lane in Granite Bay. The Project vicinity as used herein is the nearby or adjacent area surrounding the Project site in which significant effects would occur either directly or indirectly as a result of the Project.

7.1.1.1 Prehistory

Until recently, only a small number of archeological studies had been conducted in the Project vicinity. This is because earlier archaeological excavations had focused either on the large village sites in the San Joaquin Delta region and along the larger waterways in the Central Valley or on the higher elevation areas in proposed reservoir sites, along major waterways in the Sierra Nevada. The property is located between three areas with defined archaeological sequences: the Oroville locality to the north, the Central Sierra area to the east, and the Central Valley/Delta area to the west. These sequences include many similar artifact types and dates for major cultural changes, but there are also significant differences between them. At this time, it has not been defined which of these sequences best reflects the prehistory of the property or whether a separate local sequence is necessary to adequately describe the region. It appears that the prehistoric cultures in the Project vicinity may have been more closely related to the Sierra Nevada native cultures than those of either the Delta or Oroville area (City of Rocklin, 2008; Peak and Associates, 2009). The reader is referred to **Appendix 7.0-1** for greater details on the region's prehistory provided in the Cultural Resource Assessment conducted for the Project by Peak and Associates in December 2009.

7.1.1.2 Ethnography

Prior to the arrival of Euro-Americans in the region, California was inhabited by groups of Native Americans speaking more than 100 different languages and occupying a variety of ecological settings. Kroeber (1925) and others recognized the uniqueness of California Native Americans and classified them as belonging to the California culture area. Kroeber (1925) further subdivided California into four subculture areas: Northwestern, Northeastern, Southern, and Central. The Central area encompasses most of the Project Area and includes the Nisenan, which were the southern linguistic group of the Maidu tribe. Kroeber (1925) indicated that the range of the Maidu tribe may be described as being "the region from the Sacramento River east to the crest of the Sierra Nevada" and that the Maidu are the second branch of the Penutian family. The Nisenan spoke a dialect which identified them from the Northern Maidu and they diverged into two distinct cultural groups known as the Valley Nisenan and the Mountain (or Foothill and Hill) Nisenan (Placer County Historical Society, 2009). Kroeber (1925) distinguished three dialects of Nisenan – Northern Hill Nisenan, Southern Hill Nisenan, and Valley Nisenan.

The Foothill and Hill Nisenan peoples (also known as Mountain Nisenan), which were found in the Project Area, were distinctive from the Valley Nisenan and were loosely organized into tribelets or districts with large central villages, surrounded by smaller villages. These are often referred to as winter villages by older Native Americans. These central villages and their leaders seemed to have had power or control over the surrounding smaller villages and camps and specific surrounding territory. The Nisenan depended on activities attuned to the seasons and the accompanying growth of plant foods, the seasonal movements and migration of the animals, and the runs of fish (Wilson and Towne, 1978; City of Rocklin, 2008).

While the Hill Nisenan to the east in the foothills carried on trade with the valley peoples and shared some of the cultural traits, their culture was said to lack the complexity and richness of the Valley Nisenan. The Hill Nisenan had a different natural resource base to utilize, which required more movement and more intense use of the available resources. They developed a local culture that was more closely related to the gathering, storage, and year-round use of the acorn, continual foraging of resources by everyone in the village group, and specialized hunting methods. The foothill people relied more on foraging for food than the Valley people, for immediate use or short-term storage, and did not gather for future needs. As a result, they were required to travel in their use of the land. The Hill Nisenan people had lower population densities and a higher number of campsites than Valley people, which reflected their more limited ability to acquire and use the fewer available resources (City of Rocklin, 2008).

The reader is referred to **Appendix 7.0-1** for greater details on the region's ethnography provided in the Cultural Resource Assessment conducted for the Project by Peak and Associates, Inc., in December 2009.

7.1.1.3 History

Euro-American contact with Native American groups living in the Central Valley of California began during the last half of the eighteenth century. The Spanish period in California lasted from about 1769 to 1821. This was a time when the Spanish missions dominated lives of both the Spanish and the Native Americans in California. The Nisenan had brief contact with the Spanish when explorer Gabriel Moraga traveled through the valley in 1806, Father Duran in 1818, and with the Spanish and Mexican expeditions and escaping missionized Indians. This early contact with the Spanish was said to be limited to the southern edge of Nisenan territory. No record exists of the Nisenan being removed to the missions. They did experience the pressures of Miwoks displaced from their lands on their southern borders (Placer County Historical Society, 2009; Wilson and Towne, 1978).

The Mexican Period (ca. 1821–1848) in California is an outgrowth of the Mexican Revolution, and its accompanying social and political views affected the mission system. The Nisenan's first real contact with the Anglos came with the trappers such as Jed Smith and the Hudson Bay Company men after 1828. The trappers established camps in the Nisenan territory and these contacts were peaceful. A devastating epidemic, said to be malaria, spread through the Sacramento Valley in 1833. This epidemic was disastrous to the Valley Nisenan. It is estimated that 75 percent of the native population died in this epidemic. The Mountain Nisenan were not largely affected by the epidemic or early settlers until the discovery of gold and the ensuing Gold Rush. The end of the Mexican-American War and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 marked the beginning of the American period (ca. 1848–Present) in California history.

James Marshall discovered the presence of gold, while working for John Sutter, near the settlement of Coloma in 1848. The Gold Rush of the mid-nineteenth century permanently disrupted the culture of the Nisenan as the gold rush settlers killed many of them or chased them from the land. The persecution of the Nisenan had begun and soon their culture was no longer viable (Wilson and Towne, 1978). Descendents of the nineteenth century Nisenan still reside in south Placer County but the traditional lifeways have not been seen in the Rocklin area since 1904 (Placer County Historical Society, 2009).

The latter half of the nineteenth century witnessed a growing immigration of Euro-Americans into the area. The population growth in the area was accompanied by regional cultural and economic changes. These changes are highlighted by the development of Sacramento and other towns in the area. Placer County was formed three years after the discovery of gold. The county was the fast-growing county at the time and was formed from portions of Sutter and Yuba counties on April 25, 1851, with Auburn as the county seat. Placer County was named from the Spanish word for sand or gravel deposits containing gold. Miners washed away the gravel, leaving the heavier gold, in a process known as "placer mining." Gold mining was a major industry through the 1880s, but gradually the new residents transitioned to farming the fertile foothill soil and harvesting lumber, as well as finding employment with the Southern Pacific Railroad (Placer County Historical Society, 2009).

Please refer to **Appendix 7.0-1** for greater details on the region's history as provided in the Cultural Resource Assessment conducted for the Project by Peak and Associates, Inc., in December 2009.

7.1.1.4 Known Cultural Resources

A review of the files maintained at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System was conducted by center staff on November 3, 2009. According to NCIC files, no portion of the Project site has been previously inspected by archeologists and no prehistoric period or historic period resources have been recorded on the Project site. Several other surveys have been conducted in the Project vicinity. There is a recorded historic site within one-quarter mile of the Project.

The Project site was completely surveyed in 2003 by Peak & Associates. The team covered the area in 5- to 10-meter-wide transects, carefully checking for evidence of prehistoric or historic resources. Where necessary, small holes were excavated to allow examination of the sediments. There was no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites within the Project site. Site 1, a potentially eligible prehistoric period resource recorded in 2003, is located adjacent to the Project.

7.1.1.5 Native American Coordination

PMC requested a sacred lands search and a list of Native American contacts from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The results of the sacred lands search were received on November 19, 2009 (see **Appendix 7.0-2**) and did not identify any Native American sacred lands within the Project site. However, NAHC noted that the absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any Project area. Any human remains or cultural material unexpectedly discovered must instigate a recognized collection of proper procedures. PMC contacted all tribal representation groups on the list provided by the NAHC, through written correspondence. PMC received a letter from the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria regarding the Project and EIR. The letter stated, "Should excavations for site testing or data recovery become necessary, we would like to be informed in order to provide on-site tribal monitors." This request has been incorporated in the mitigation measures for the Project.

PMC requested a new sacred lands search and a list of Native American contacts from the NAHC and received the results on June 23, 2011 (see **Appendix 7.0-3**). The results again did not identify any Native American sacred lands within the Project site. PMC again contacted all tribal representation groups on the list provided by the NAHC, through written correspondence. PMC received a letter from the Shingle Springs Rancheria regarding the Project and EIR. The letter

stated, "If during the progress of the project new information or human remains are found we would like to be able to go over our process with you that we currently have in place to protect such important and sacred artifacts (especially near rivers and streams)." This request has been incorporated in the mitigation measures for the Project.

7.1.2 Paleontological Setting

Paleontology is defined as a science dealing with the life of past geological periods as known from fossil remains. Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and formations that have produced fossil material. Such locations and specimens are important nonrenewable resources. CEQA offers protection for these sensitive resources and requires that they be addressed during the environmental impact report process.

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology paleontological database conducted by PMC did not identify any previously identified paleontological resources on the Project site; however, the potential may exist for inadvertent discovery of unique archaeological resources during ground-disturbing Project construction activities (University of California, Berkeley, 2009).

7.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

7.2.1 Federal

National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service and includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. Structures, sites, buildings, districts, and objects over 50 years of age can be listed in the NRHP as significant historic resources. However, properties under 50 years of age that are of exceptional importance or are contributors to a district can also be included in the NRHP. The criteria for listing in the NRHP include resources that:

- a) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;
- b) Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- 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.

7.2.2 State

California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both "historical resources" and "unique archaeological resources." Pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC)

Section 21084.1, a "project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on unique archaeological resources.

"Historical resource" is a term with a defined statutory meaning (PRC, Section 21084.1; determining significant impacts to historical and archaeological resources is described in the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[a], [b]). Under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), historical resources include the following:

- 1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1).
- 2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, will be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- 3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource will be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1), including the following:
 - a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
 - b) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - c) 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
 - d) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- 4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

As noted above, CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will impact unique archaeological resources. Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that "'unique archaeological resource' means an archaeological artifact, object, or site

about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- a) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- b) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- c) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person."

Treatment options under Section 21083.2 include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable methods of mitigation under Section 21083.2 include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds that the artifacts would not meet one or more of the criteria for defining a unique archaeological resource).

Section 7050.5(b) of the California Health and Safety Code (CHSC) specifies protocol when human remains are discovered. The code states:

In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27492 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (e) requires that excavation activities be stopped whenever human remains are uncovered and that the county coroner be called in to assess the remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are those of Native Americans, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. At that time, the lead agency must consult with the appropriate Native Americans, if any, as timely identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. Section 15064.5 directs the lead agency (or applicant), under certain circumstances, to develop an agreement with the Native Americans for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

In addition to the mitigation provisions pertaining to accidental discovery of human remains, the State CEQA Guidelines also require that a lead agency make provisions for the accidental discovery of historical or archaeological resources, generally. Pursuant to Section 15064.5, subdivision (f), these provisions should include "an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an historical or unique archaeological resource, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation should be available. Work could continue on other

parts of the building site while historical or unique archaeological resource mitigation takes place."

Paleontological resources are classified as nonrenewable scientific resources and are protected by state statute (Public Resources Code Chapter 1.7, Section 5097.5, Archeological, Paleontological, and Historical Sites, and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines). No state or local agencies have specific jurisdiction over paleontological resources. No state or local agency requires a paleontological collecting permit to allow for the recovery of fossil remains discovered as a result of construction-related earthmoving on state or private land in a project site.

7.2.2 Local

Placer County General Plan

The Placer County General Plan Policy Document was adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors in 1994. **Table 7-1** lists the General Plan policies that relate to cultural and paleontological resources and the proposed Project and provides an analysis of the Project's consistency with these policies. While this DEIR analyzes the Project's consistency with the Placer County General Plan pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), the determination of the Project's consistency with the General Plan rests with the Placer County Board of Supervisors. Any environmental impacts associated with any inconsistency with General Plan policies are addressed under the impact discussions of this EIR.

TABLE 7-1
GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS – CULTURAL RESOURCES

General Plan Policies	Consistency Determination	Analysis
Policy 5.D.6: The County shall require that discretionary development projects identify and protect from damage, destruction, and abuse, important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment. Such assessments shall be incorporated into a Countywide cultural resource data base, to be maintained by the Department of Museums.	Consistent	A Cultural Resource Assessment for the proposed Project was performed by Peak & Associates, Inc. in December 2009 and is attached to this document as Appendix 7.0-1 .
Policy 5.D.7: The County shall require that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant paleontological or cultural resources whenever possible. Unavoidable impacts, whenever possible, shall be reduced to a less than significant level and/or shall be mitigated by extracting maximum recoverable data. Determination of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeological (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups), historical, or paleontological consultants, depending on the type of resources in question.	Consistent, with Mitigation	All potentially significant cultural and paleontological resource impacts are reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures 7-2 and 7-3 .

Granite Bay Community Plan

Table 7-2 lists the Community Plan policies that relate to cultural and paleontological resources and the proposed Project and provides an analysis of the Project's consistency with these policies. While this Draft EIR analyzes the Project's consistency with the Granite Bay Community Plan pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), the determination of the Project's consistency with the Community Plan rests with the Placer County Board of Supervisors. Any environmental impacts associated with inconsistency with Community Plan policies are addressed under the impact discussions of this DEIR.

TABLE 7-2
COMMUNITY PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS – CULTURAL RESOURCES

Community Plan Policies	Consistency Determination	Analysis	
Cultural Resources Policy 1: Identify and protect from destruction and abuse all representative and unique historical and archaeological sites.	Consistent, with Mitigation	All potentially significant cultural and paleontological resource impacts are reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures 7-2 and 7-3 .	

7.3 IMPACTS

7.3.1 Standards of Significance

Following PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1, and Section 15064.5 and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, cultural resource impacts are considered to be significant if implementation of the Project considered would result in any of the following:

- 1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, respectively.
- 2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, respectively.
- 3) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.
- 4) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines "substantial adverse change" as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource is materially impaired.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5, subdivision (b)(2), defines "materially impaired" for purposes of the definition of "substantial adverse change" as follows:

The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a Project:

1) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and

that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or

- 2) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the Project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- 3) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

CEQA requires that if a project would result in an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, or would cause significant effects on a unique archaeological resource, then alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered. Therefore, prior to assessing effects or developing mitigation measures, the significance of cultural resources must first be determined. The steps that are normally taken in a cultural resources investigation for CEQA compliance are as follows:

- Identify potential historical resources and unique archaeological resources;
- Evaluate the eligibility of historical resources; and
- Evaluate the effects of the project on eligible historical resources.

7.3.2 Methodology

Efforts to identify cultural resources which could be affected by the Project included review of the records search completed by the North Central Information Center, at California State University, Sacramento, and review of the cultural resource assessment report prepared by Peak and Associates (Peak and Associates, 2009). According to the cultural resource assessment, the Project area was completely surveyed on July 11, 2003, for a previous landowner by a team of three qualified archeologists: Ann Peak, Chris Chaloupka, and Sue Merritt. The team covered the area in 5- to 10-meter-wide transects, carefully checking for evidence of prehistoric or historic resources. Where necessary, small holes were excavated to allow examination of the sediments. In addition, a sacred lands file search was completed by NAHC, and Native American representatives were mailed written correspondence by Peak and Associates, requesting information regarding cultural resources on July 18, 2008, and June 29, 2011 (see **Appendices 7.0-2** and **7.0-3**). Furthermore, a search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) collections database was completed. The potential impacts of the Project on cultural resources were evaluated by considering both construction and operational impacts.

7.3.3 Project-Level Impacts and Mitigation Measures

IMPACT 7.1: Potential Destruction or Damage to Known and Undiscovered Prehistoric and Historic Resources

The Project site is vacant and undeveloped. In addition, according to the Cultural Resource Assessment conducted for the proposed Project by Peak and Associates, there is no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites or resources within the Project site. However, according to surveys conducted in the vicinity of the Project site, there is one recorded resource site located adjacent to the Project site. This site was found to possess a deposit of intact prehistory that has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history and is therefore a potentially eligible historic resource (Peak and Associates, 2007). The proximity of the Project site to this potentially eligible historic site could result in short-term impacts to the recorded resource site during Project construction. Therefore, in order to ensure that no unanticipated disturbance occurs to this resource site during Project construction, protective orange field fencing will be installed around the site perimeter to keep construction debris and construction support vehicles off the site surface. Thus, the proposed Project is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or affect any historical buildings or sites. This impact is **less than significant** and no further mitigation is required.

IMPACT 7.2: Potential Destruction or Damage to Known and Undiscovered Archaeological Resources

The levels of archaeological investigations conducted for the proposed Project are adequate to identify known prehistoric and historic resources in the area. As described previously in this section, the Project area was completely surveyed on July 11, 2003, by a team of qualified archeologists who determined that there was no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites or resources within the Project area. However, since there is a possibility of unanticipated and accidental archaeological discoveries (of human remains, bone, or fossils) during ground-disturbing construction-related activities, there is the potential for unanticipated and accidental archaeological discoveries made during Project construction to have a **potentially significant** impact on significant archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measure 7-2 Mitigate for Potential Cultural Resources

The final improvement plans approved by the County shall include a note which states, that if during the course of construction cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone, isolated artifacts, or other features) are discovered, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency shall be notified, and a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. Determination of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeologist (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups). The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums shall also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s). Prior to the commencement of Project excavations, all construction personnel shall be informed of the potential to inadvertently uncover cultural resources and human remains and the procedures to follow subsequent to an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources or human remains. In addition, should excavations for site testing or data recovery become necessary, both the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria shall be informed in order to provide on-site tribal monitors.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of mitigation measure 7-2 would reduce this impact to a **less than significant** level.

IMPACT 7.3: Potential Destruction or Damage to a Unique Paleontological Resource or Geological Feature

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology paleontological database conducted by PMC did not identify any previously identified paleontological resources on the Project site or in the immediately adjacent area. Previous cultural resource studies have concluded that the rocks which underlie the Project site carry almost no potential to yield significant fossils. As such, the proposed Project is expected to have no known significant impact on paleontological resources. However, development of the Project site during construction, particularly grading and excavation activities, has the potential to adversely impact undiscovered paleontologic resources on the Project site and on adjoining areas associated with the Project's off-site improvements. This would be considered a **potentially significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure 7-3 Mitigate for Potential Paleontological Resources

If human remains are discovered, all work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency shall be notified, and the County Coroner must be notified, according to Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, and the procedures outlined in CEQA Section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed.

A note shall be required on the final improvement plans approved by the County, that if paleontological resources are discovered on-site, the applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to observe all grading and excavation activities throughout both phases of Project construction and to salvage fossils as necessary. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance and shall establish, in cooperation with the Project developer, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. If major paleontological resources are discovered, which require temporarily halting or redirecting of grading, the paleontologist shall report such findings to the Project developer and to the Placer County Department of Museums and Planning Department. The paleontologist shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the Project developer, that ensure proper exploration and/or salvage. Excavated finds shall first be offered to a State-designated repository such as the Museum of Paleontology, University of California, Berkeley, or the California Academy of Sciences. Otherwise, the finds shall be offered to the Placer County Department of Museums for purposes of public education and interpretive displays. These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources, shall be subject to approval by the Department of Museums. The paleontologist shall submit a follow-up report to the Department of Museums and Planning Department, which shall include the period of inspection, an analysis of the fossils found, and present repository of fossils.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of mitigation measure 7-3 would reduce this impact to a **less than significant** level.